

CODEBOOK

BURUNDI URBAN COMMUNITY DATA

Migration and Development: A World in Motion

Maastricht Graduate School of Governance,
Maastricht University

CONTACT INFORMATION:

Maastricht Graduate School of Governance

Migration and Development Project

P.O. Box 616, 6200MD Maastricht, The Netherlands

Phone: + 31 43 388 4650 Fax: + 31 43 388 4864

E-mail: migration-mgsog@maastrichtuniversity.nl

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
2. INTERVIEWER SHEET (IS)				
IS_1	Interviewer code	1	18	33.33
		3	18	33.33
		16	18	33.33
		Total	54	100.00
IS_2a	Day of the interview	1. Monday	9	16.67
		2. Tuesday	9	16.67
		3. Wednesday	9	16.67
		4. Thursday	9	16.67
		5. Friday	9	16.67
		6. Saturday	9	16.67
		Total	54	100.00
IS_2b	Month of the interview	1. January	0	0.00
		2. February	0	0.00
		3. March	54	100.00
		Total	54	100.00
IS_2c	Year of the interview	2011	54	100.00
		Total	54	100.00
IS_3a	Start of the interview hour	1	2	3.70
		2	2	3.70
		9	2	3.70
		10	17	31.48
		11	22	40.74
		12	5	9.26
		13	4	7.41
		Total	54	100.00
IS_3b	Start of the interview minute	n = 54 R = 0 - 54		
IS_5	Language in which the interview was conducted	1. French	0	0.00
		2. English	0	0.00
		3. Kirundi	51	94.44
		4. Swahili	3	5.56
		5. Other	0	0.00
		Total	54	100.00
IS_6	Country in which the interview was conducted	1. Burundi	54	100.00
		2. Afghanistan	0	0.00
		3. Morocco	0	0.00
		4. Ethiopia	0	0.00
		Total	54	100.00
IS_7	Province in which the interview	1. Bubanza	0	0.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
	was conducted	2. Bujumbura Rural	0	0.00
		3. Bururi	0	0.00
		4. Cankuzo	0	0.00
		5. Cibitoke	0	0.00
		6. Gitega	0	0.00
		7. Karuzi	0	0.00
		8. Kayanza	0	0.00
		9. Kirundo	0	0.00
		10. Makamba	0	0.00
		11. Muramvya	0	0.00
		12. Muyinga	0	0.00
		13. Mwaro	0	0.00
		14. Ngozi	0	0.00
		15. Rutana	0	0.00
		16. Ruyigi	0	0.00
		17. Bujumbura Mairie	54	100.00
		Total	54	100.00
IS_8	Commune in which the interview was conducted	n = 54 R = 49 - 59		
IS_9	community in which the interview was conducted	n = 54 R = 7 - 60		
3. IDENTIFICATION OF THE COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE (ID)				
ID_1	Position of community representative	1. community leader	33	61.11
		2. Elderly person who is knowledgeable on community history and current affairs	5	9.26
		3. Teacher	1	1.85
		4. Religious leader	2	3.70
		6. Other	13	24.07
		Total	54	100.00
ID_2	Gender of the community representative	1. Male	47	87.04
		2. Female	7	12.96
		Total	54	100.00
ID_3	Age of the community representative	n = 54 R = 24- 85	M = 44.50	SD = 12.75
ID_4	Educational attainment of the community representative	1. No formal education	3	5.56
		2. Pre-school (Koran school)	0	0.00
		3. Incomplete primary	9	16.67
		4. Primary	3	5.56
		5. Incomplete secondary	17	31.48
		6. Secondary	2	3.70

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		7. Special secondary/preliminary professional/ technical (bachelor)	7	12.96
		9. Undergraduate (bachelor)	6	11.11
		10. Masters or higher	7	12.96
		Total	54	100.00
ID_5	Years that the community representative has been living in this community	n = 54 R = 3 - 80	M = 26.91	SD = 17.38
A. BASIC CHARACTERISTICS				
A.A COLLINE HISTORY, LANGUAGE AND CULTURE				
AA_1	Time of existence of the community (years)	n = 21 R = 12 - 110	M = 36.86	SD = 23.66
AA_2	Language spoken in community in daily communication	1. French 2. English 3. Kirundi 4. Swahili 5. Other Total	0 0 46 8 0 54	0.00 0.00 85.19 14.81 0.00 100.00
AA_3	Average age of marriage for males in this community	n = 54 R = 13 - 35	M = 26.07	SD = 5.16
AA_4	Average age of marriage for females in this community	n = 54 R = 10 - 35	M = 21.33	SD = 4.83
A.B COLLINE POPULATION				
AB_1	Number of people living in this community	n = 45 R = 20 - 6000	M = 1320.69	SD = 1177.39
AB_2	Change in community population in the past five years	1. Increased 2. Decreased 3. Remained the same Total	49 1 4 54	90.74 1.85 7.41 100.00
AB_3	Number of people with which the community population changed in the past five years	n = 38 R = 0 - 780	M = 231.45	SD = 199.74
AB_4a	Main reasons (1) for increase, decrease or lack of change in community population	Births Easy life Growth of the city Illegal marriage	31 1 2 2	62.00 2.00 4.00 4.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		Internal migration	1	2.00
		It is not far of the city centre	1	2.00
		N.A.	1	2.00
		New couples	1	2.00
		New moving	1	2.00
		New occupants	3	6.00
		Prostitution	1	2.00
		Return of certain populations	1	2.00
		Returnees	1	2.00
		The elderly are leaving	1	2.00
		The neighbourhood is less expensive	1	2.00
		The neighbourhood is well equipped	1	2.00
		Total	50	100
AB_4b	Main reasons (2) for increase, decrease or lack of change in community population	Births	8	16.00
		Close to the city	1	2.00
		Close to the interior of the country	1	2.00
		Easy life	1	2.00
		Easy life in this neighbourhood	1	2.00
		Illegal marriage	2	4.00
		Immigration	15	30.00
		Less births	1	2.00
		Moving from other neighbourhood	1	2.00
		N.A.	8	16.00
		Neighbourhood in peace	1	2.00
		New construction	2	4.00
		New couples	2	4.00
		New tenants	2	4.00
		Not far from the university	1	2.00
		Plots are less expensive	1	2.00
		Repatriation	1	2.00
		Simple neighbourhood	1	2.00
		Total	50	100.00
AB_5	Number of households run by females only	n = 51 R = 1 - 100	M = 26.55	SD = 22.60
AB_6	Number of households run by children younger than 18 only	n = 49 R = 0 - 30	M = 5.67	SD = 6.58
B. COMMUNITY+A496 ISSUES				
B_1a	Most important problem affecting this community	1. Crime/ theft	6	11.11
		2. Lack of water	11	20.37
		3. Lack of electricity	2	3.70
		4. Poor access to health care	4	7.41
		5. Poor access to education	1	1.85
		6. Bad transportation	0	0.00
		7. Traffic accidents	0	0.00
		8. Poor environment	2	3.70

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		9. Lack of employment opportunities	20	37.04
		10. Lack of available land	0	0
		11. Security/ conflict	2	3.70
		12. Corruption	1	2.85
		13. Waste disposal	1	1.85
		14. Other	4	7.41
		Total	54	100.00
B_1b	Second most important problem affecting this community	1. Crime/ theft	6	11.11
		2. Lack of water	12	22.22
		3. Lack of electricity	9	16.67
		4. Poor access to health care	2	3.70
		5. Poor access to education	2	3.70
		6. Bad transportation	1	1.85
		7. Traffic accidents	2	3.70
		8. Poor environment	2	3.70
		9. Lack of employment opportunities	7	12.96
		10. Lack of available land	0	0.00
		11. Security/ conflict	1	1.85
		12. Corruption	1	1.85
		13. Waste disposal	4	7.41
		14. Other	5	9.26
		Total	54	100.00
B_1c	Third most important problem affecting this community	1. Crime/ theft	6	11.11
		2. Lack of water	1	1.85
		3. Lack of electricity	6	11.11
		4. Poor access to health care	3	5.56
		5. Poor access to education	2	3.70
		6. Bad transportation	2	3.70
		7. Traffic accidents	0	0.00
		8. Poor environment	3	3.70
		9. Lack of employment opportunities	11	20.37
		10. Lack of available land	1	1.85
		11. Security/ conflict	1	1.85
		12. Corruption	2	3.70
		13. Waste disposal	2	3.70
		14. Other	14	25.93
		Total	54	100.00
C. INFRASTRUCTURE				
C.A. ROADS AND TRANSPORTATION				
CA_1b	Main route that people take to reach this community during rainy season	1. Paved road	2	3.70
		2. Dirt road	26	48.15
		3. Mixed paved and dirt road	18	33.33
		4. Footpath	0	0.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		5. Horse trail	0	0.00
		6. River/ sea	0	0.00
		7. Other	8	14.81
		Total	54	100.00
CA_1c	Main route that people take to reach this community during dry season	1. Paved road	2	3.70
		2. Dirt road	26	48.15
		3. Mixed paved and dirt road	18	33.33
		4. Footpath	0	0.00
		5. Horse trail	0	0.00
		6. River/ sea	0	0.00
		7. Other	8	14.81
		Total	54	100.00
CA_2b	Rating of roads to reach this community during rainy season	1. Very bad	12	22.22
		2. Bad	22	40.74
		3. Medium	13	24.07
		4. Good	7	12.96
		5. Very good	0	0.00
		Total	54	100.00
CA_2c	Rating of roads to reach this community during dry season	1. Very bad	3	5.56
		2. Bad	15	27.78
		3. Medium	21	38.89
		4. Good	12	22.22
		5. Very good	3	5.56
		Total	54	100.00
CA_3	Change of roads to this community in the past five years	1. Worsened a lot	4	7.41
		2. Worsened	10	18.52
		3. Stayed the same	20	37.04
		4. Improved	14	25.93
		5. Improved a lot	6	11.11
		Total	54	100.00
C. B. WATER, SANITATION, ELECTRICITY AND LIGHTING				
CB_1_1	Availability of electricity in the community	1. Yes, functional	45	83.33
		2. Yes, but not functional	3	5.56
		3. No	6	11.11
		Total	54	100.00
CB_2_1	Quality of electricity in the community	1. Very poor	7	14.58
		2. Poor	4	8.33
		3. Medium	13	27.08
		4. Good	17	35.42
		5. Very good	7	14.58
		Total	48	100.00
CB_3_1	Portion of the community covered	1. Almost no community memb	4	8.33

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
	by electricity	2. Less than half of the community members	6	12.50
		3. Around half of the community members	11	22.92
		4. More than half of the community members	9	18.75
		5. Almost all of the community members	18	37.50
		Total	48	100.00
CB_4_1	Change in electricity in the past five years	1. Worsened a lot	2	3.70
		2. Worsened	8	14.81
		3. Stayed the same	26	48.15
		4. Improved	17	31.48
		5. Improved a lot	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
CB_1_2	Availability of public lighting in the community	1. Yes, functional	3	5.56
		2. Yes, but not functional	12	22.22
		3. No	39	72.22
		Total	54	100.00
CB_2_2	Quality of public lighting in the community	1. Very poor	11	73.33
		2. Poor	1	6.67
		3. Medium	0	0.00
		4. Good	1	6.67
		5. Very good	2	13.33
		Total	15	100.00
CB_3_2	Portion of the community covered by public lighting	1. Almost no community memb	10	66.67
		2. Less than half of the community members	2	13.33
		3. Around half of the community members	0	0.00
		4. More than half of the community members	0	0.00
		5. Almost all of the community members	3	20.00
		Total	15	100.00
CB_4_2	Change in public lighting in the past five years	1. Worsened a lot	11	20.37
		2. Worsened	4	7.41
		3. Stayed the same	37	68.52
		4. Improved	1	1.85
		5. Improved a lot	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
CB_1_3	Availability of piped water in the community	1. Yes, functional	45	83.33
		2. Yes, but not functional	4	7.41
		3. No	5	9.26

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		Total	54	100.00
CB_2_3	Quality of piped water in the community	1. Very poor 2. Poor 3. Medium 4. Good 5. Very good Total	7 8 7 14 13 49	14.29 16.33 14.29 28.57 26.53 100.00
CB_3_3	Portion of the community covered by piped water	1. Almost no community memb 2. Less than half of the community members 3. Around half of the community members 4. More than half of the community members 5. Almost all of the community members Total	2 7 10 3 27 49	4.08 14.29 20.41 6.12 55.10 100.00
CB_4_3	Change in piped water in the past five years	1. Worsened a lot 2. Worsened 3. Stayed the same 4. Improved 5. Improved a lot Total	2 10 25 14 3 54	3.70 18.52 46.30 25.93 5.56 100.00
CB_1_4	Availability of sewage/ drains in the community	1. Yes, functional 2. Yes, but not functional 3. No Total	14 3 37 100	25.93 5.56 68.52 100.00
CB_2_4	Quality of sewage/ drains in the community	1. Very poor 2. Poor 3. Medium 4. Good 5. Very good Total	1 4 5 5 2 17	5.88 23.53 29.41 29.41 11.76 100.00
CB_3_4	Portion of the community covered by sewage/ drains	1. Almost no community memb 2. Less than half of the community members 3. Around half of the community members 4. More than half of the community members 5. Almost all of the community members Total	1 1 5 2 8 17	5.88 5.88 29.41 11.76 47.06 100.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
CB_4_4	Change in sewage/ drains in the past five years	1. Worsened a lot	7	12.96
		2. Worsened	2	3.70
		3. Stayed the same	34	62.96
		4. Improved	10	18.52
		5. Improved a lot	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
CB_1_5	Availability of garbage collection in the community	1. Yes, functional	31	57.41
		2. Yes, but not functional	3	5.56
		3. No	20	37.04
		Total	54	100.00
CB_2_5	Quality of garbage collection in the community	1. Very poor	4	11.76
		2. Poor	7	20.59
		3. Medium	6	17.65
		4. Good	12	35.29
		5. Very good	5	14.71
		Total	34	100.00
CB_3_5	Portion of the community covered by garbage collection	1. Almost no community memb	1	2.94
		2. Less than half of the community members	4	11.76
		3. Around half of the community members	6	17.65
		4. More than half of the community members	14	41.18
		5. Almost all of the community members	9	26.47
		Total	34	100.00
CB_4_5	Change in garbage collection in the past five years	1. Worsened a lot	1	1.85
		2. Worsened	7	12.96
		3. Stayed the same	15	27.78
		4. Improved	20	37.04
		5. Improved a lot	11	20.37
		Total	54	100.00
C.C HOUSING AND LAND				
CC_1	Rating of availability of housing in this community	1. Very poor	20	37.04
		2. Poor	18	33.33
		3. Medium	12	22.22
		4. Good	3	5.56
		5. Very good	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
CC_2	Change of availability of housing in the past five years	1. Worsened a lot	15	27.78
		2. Worsened	16	29.63
		3. Stayed the same	16	29.63

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		4. Improved	6	11.11
		5. Improved a lot	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
CC_3	Rating of availability of land in this community	1. Very poor	23	42.59
		2. Poor	6	11.11
		3. Medium	23	42.59
		4. Good	1	1.85
		5. Very good	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
CC_4	Change in availability of land in the past five years	1. Worsened a lot	8	14.81
		2. Worsened	13	24.07
		3. Stayed the same	31	57.41
		4. Improved	1	1.85
		5. Improved a lot	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
C. D FACILITIES				
CD_1_1	Presence of a health centre/ clinic in this community	1. Yes	22	40.74
		3. No	32	59.26
		Total	54	100.00
CD_2_1	Number of households having access to a health centre/ clinic	1. Almost no households	0	0.00
		2. Less than half of the households	4	18.18
		3. Around half of the households	7	31.82
		4. More than half of the households	3	13.64
		5. Almost all households	8	36.36
		Total	22	100.00
CD_3_1	Reasons why some people do not have access to health centre/ clinic	1. Income level	11	50.00
		2. Occupation	1	4.55
		3. Social status (class)	0	0.00
		4. Age	0	0.00
		5. Gender	0	0.00
		6. Race/ ethnicity	0	0.00
		7. Language	0	0.00
		8. Religious beliefs	0	0.00
		9. This service does not have enough capacity	7	31.82
		10. Other	0	0.00
		N.A.	3	13.64
		Total	22	100.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
CD_4a_1	Time (hours) to reach a health centre/clinic if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 0	M = 0	SD = 0
CD_4b_1	Time (minutes) to reach a health centre/ clinic if it not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 45	M = 10.24	SD = 11.61
CD_5_1	Type of transportation to reach a health centre/clinic if it is not available in this community	1. On foot 2. By horse/ mule/ donkey 3. By bicycle 4. By private car or motorcycle 5. By bus 6. By taxi 7. By boat 8 Other Total	30 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 32	93.75 0.00 0.00 0.00 6.25 0.00 0.00 0.00 100.00
CD_1_2	Presence of a hospital in this community	1. Yes 2. No Total	2 52 54	3.70 96.30 100.00
CD_2_2	Number of households having access to a hospital	1. Almost no households 2. Less than half of the households 3. Around half of the households 4. More than half of the households 5. Almost all households Total	0 0 0 1 1 2	0.00 0.00 0.00 50.00 50.00 100.00
CD_3_2	Reasons why some people do not have access to a hospital	1.Income level 2. Occupation 3. Social status (class) 4. Age 5. Gender 6. Race/ ethnicity 7. Language 8. Religious beliefs 9. This service does not have enough capacity 10. Other N.A. Total	1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2	50.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 50.00 100.00
CD_4a_2	Time (hours) to reach a hospital if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 2	M = 0.19	SD = 0.48

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
CD_4b_2	Time (minutes) to reach a hospital if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 45	M = 20.80	SD = 13.06
CD_5_2	Type of transportation to reach a hospital if it is not available in this community	1. On foot 2. By horse/ mule/ donkey 3. By bicycle 4. By private car or motorcycle 5. By bus 6. By taxi 7. By boat 8 Other Total	37 0 0 6 9 0 0 0 52	71.15 0.00 0.00 11.54 17.31 0.00 0.00 0.00 100.00
CD_1_3	Presence of a pharmacy in this community	1. Yes 2. No Total	15 39 54	27.78 72.22 100.00
CD_2_3	Number of households having access to a pharmacy	1. Almost no households 2. Less than half of the households 3. Around half of the households 4. More than half of the households 5. Almost all households Total	0 3 3 2 7 15	0.00 20.00 20.00 13.33 46.67 100.00
CD_3_3	Reasons why some people do not have access to a pharmacy	1. Income level 2. Occupation 3. Social status (class) 4. Age 5. Gender 6. Race/ ethnicity 7. Language 8. Religious beliefs 9. This service does not have enough capacity 10. Other N.A. Total	9 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 5 15	60.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 6.67 0.00 33.33 100.00
CD_4a_3	Time (hours) to reach a pharmacy if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 1	M = 0.02	SD = 0.14
CD_4b_3	Time (minutes) to reach a pharmacy if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 45	M = 12.93	SD = 11.42

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
CD_5_3	Type of transportation to reach a pharmacy if it is not available in this community	1. On foot	37	94.87
		2. By horse/ mule/ donkey	0	0.00
		3. By bicycle	0	0.00
		4. By private car or motorcycle	0	0.00
		5. By bus	2	5.13
		6. By taxi	0	0.00
		7. By boat	0	0.00
		8 Other	0	0.00
		Total	39	100.00
CD_1_4	Presence of a pre-school in this community	1. Yes	19	35.19
		2. No	35	64.81
		Total	54	100.00
CD_2_4	Number of households having access to a pre-school	1. Almost no households	0	0.00
		2. Less than half of the households	3	15.79
		3. Around half of the households	4	21.05
		4. More than half of the households	4	21.05
		5. Almost all households	8	42.11
		Total	19	100.00
CD_3_4	Reasons why some people do not have access to a pre-school	1. Income level	9	47.37
		2. Occupation	0	0.00
		3. Social status (class)	1	5.26
		4. Age	0	0.00
		5. Gender	0	0.00
		6. Race/ ethnicity	0	0.00
		7. Language	0	0.00
		8. Religious beliefs	0	0.00
		9. This service does not have enough capacity	3	15.79
		10. Other	1	5.26
		N.A.	5	26.32
Total	19	100.00		
CD_4a_4	Time (hours) to reach a pre-school if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 0	M = 0.00	SD = 0.00
CD_4b_4	Time (minutes) to reach a pre-school if it not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 45	M = 10.57	SD = 10.58
CD_5_4	Type of transportation to reach a pre-school if it is not available in this community	1. On foot	35	100.00
		2. By horse/ mule/ donkey	0	0.00
		3. By bicycle	0	0.00
		4. By private car or motorcycle	0	0.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		5. By bus	0	0.00
		6. By taxi	0	0.00
		7. By boat	0	0.00
		8 Other	0	0.00
		Total	35	100.00
CD_1_5	Presence of a primary school in this community	1. Yes	20	37.04
		2. No	34	62.96
		Total	54	100.00
CD_2_5	Number of households having access to a primary school	1. Almost no households	0	0.00
		2. Less than half of the households	1	5.00
		3. Around half of the households	1	5.00
		4. More than half of the households	2	10.00
		5. Almost all households	16	80.00
		Total	20	100.00
CD_3_5	Reasons why some people do not have access to a primary school	1. Income level	2	10.00
		2. Occupation	0	0.00
		3. Social status (class)	0	0.00
		4. Age	0	0.00
		5. Gender	0	0.00
		6. Race/ ethnicity	0	0.00
		7. Language	0	0.00
		8. Religious beliefs	0	0.00
		9. This service does not have enough capacity	4	20.00
		10. Other	0	0.00
		N.A.	14	70.00
		Total	20	100.00
CD_4a_5	Time (hours) to reach a primary school if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 -1	M = 0.02	SD = 0.14
CD_4b_5	Time (minutes) to reach a primary school if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 30	M = 8.81	SD = 8.65
CD_5_5	Type of transportation to reach a primary school if it is not available in this community	1. On foot	34	100.00
		2. By horse/ mule/ donkey	0	0.00
		3. By bicycle	0	0.00
		4. By private car or motorcycle	0	0.00
		5. By bus	0	0.00
		6. By taxi	0	0.00
		7. By boat	0	0.00
		8 Other	0	0.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		Total	34	100.00
CD_1_6	Presence of a secondary school in this community	1. Yes 2. No Total	15 39 54	27.78 72.22 100.00
CD_2_6	Number of households having access to a secondary school	1. Almost no households 2. Less than half of the households 3. Around half of the households 4. More than half of the households 5. Almost all households Total	0 3 2 2 8 15	0.00 20.00 13.33 13.33 53.33 100.00
CD_3_6	Reasons why some people do not have access to a secondary school	1. Income level 2. Occupation 3. Social status (class) 4. Age 5. Gender 6. Race/ ethnicity 7. Language 8. Religious beliefs 9. This service does not have enough capacity 10. Other N.A. Total	9 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 4 15	60.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 13.33 0.00 26.67 100.00
CD_4a_6	Time (hours) to reach a secondary school if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 1	M = 0.02	SD = 0.14
CD_4b_6	Time (minutes) to reach a secondary school if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 30	M = 13.54	SD = 10.82
CD_5_6	Type of transportation to reach a secondary school if it is not available in this community	1. On foot 2. By horse/ mule/ donkey 3. By bicycle 4. By private car or motorcycle 5. By bus 6. By taxi 7. By boat 8 Other Total	39 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 39	100.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 100.00
CD_1_7	Presence of water distribution in this community	1. Yes 2. No	26 28	48.15 51.85

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		Total	54	100.00
CD_2_7	Number of households having access to water distribution	1. Almost no households 2. Less than half of the households 3. Around half of the households 4. More than half of the households 5. Almost all households Total	1 7 4 2 12 26	3.85 26.92 15.38 7.69 46.15 100.00
CD_3_7	Reasons why some people do not have access to water distribution	1. Income level 2. Occupation 3. Social status (class) 4. Age 5. Gender 6. Race/ ethnicity 7. Language 8. Religious beliefs 9. This service does not have enough capacity 10. Other N.A. Total	19 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 0 4 26	73.08 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 11.54 0.00 15.38 100.00
CD_4a_7	Time (hours) to reach water distribution if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 0	M = 0.00	SD = 0.00
CD_4b_7	Time (minutes) to reach water distribution if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 30	M = 10.85	SD = 12.34
CD_5_7	Type of transportation to reach water distribution if it is not available in this community	1. On foot 2. By horse/ mule/ donkey 3. By bicycle 4. By private car or motorcycle 5. By bus 6. By taxi 7. By boat 8 Other Total	18 0 0 1 9 0 0 0 28	64.29 0.00 0.00 3.57 32.14 0.00 0.00 0.00 100.00
CD_1_8	Presence of a market on this community	1. Yes 2. No Total	8 46 54	14.81 85.19 100.00
CD_2_8	Number of households having access to a market	1. Almost no households 2. Less than half of the	0 0	0.00 0.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		households		
		3. Around half of the households	0	0.00
		4. More than half of the households	0	0.00
		5. Almost all households	8	100.00
		Total	8	100.00
CD_3_8	Reasons why some people do not have access to a market	1. Income level	0	0.00
		2. Occupation	0	0.00
		3. Social status (class)	0	0.00
		4. Age	0	0.00
		5. Gender	0	0.00
		6. Race/ ethnicity	0	0.00
		7. Language	0	0.00
		8. Religious beliefs	0	0.00
		9. This service does not have enough capacity	2	25.00
		10. Other	0	0.00
		N.A.	6	75.00
		Total	8	100.00
CD_4a_8	Time (hours) to reach a market if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 0	M = 0.00	SD = 0.00
CD_4b_8	Time (minutes) to reach a market if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 50	M = 17.70	SD = 11.43
CD_5_8	Type of transportation to reach a market if it is not available in this community	1. On foot	33	71.74
		2. By horse/ mule/ donkey	0	0.00
		3. By bicycle	1	2.17
		4. By private car or motorcycle	1	2.17
		5. By bus	11	23.91
		6. By taxi	0	0.00
		7. By boat	0	0.00
		8 Other	0	0.00
		Total	46	100.00
CD_1_9	Presence of public transportation in this community	1. Yes	23	42.59
		2. No	31	57.41
		Total	54	100.00
CD_2_9	Number of households having access to public transportation	1. Almost no households	0	0.00
		2. Less than half of the households	1	4.35
		3. Around half of the households	1	4.35
		4. More than half of the	3	13.04

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		households		
		5. Almost all households	18	78.26
		Total	23	100.00
CD_3_9	Reasons why some people do not have access to public transportation	1. Income level	6	26.09
		2. Occupation	0	0.00
		3. Social status (class)	1	4.35
		4. Age	0	0.00
		5. Gender	0	0.00
		6. Race/ ethnicity	0	0.00
		7. Language	0	0.00
		8. Religious beliefs	0	0.00
		9. This service does not have enough capacity	2	8.70
		10. Other	0	0.00
		N.A.	14	60.87
		Total	23	100.00
CD_4a_9	Time (hours) to reach public transportation if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0-0	M = 0.00	SD = 0.00
CD_4b_9	Time (minutes) to reach public transportation if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 30	M = 6.78	SD = 8.42
CD_5_9	Type of transportation to reach public transportation if it is not available in this community	1. On foot	31	100.00
		2. By horse/ mule/ donkey	0	0.00
		3. By bicycle	0	0.00
		4. By private car or motorcycle	0	0.00
		5. By bus	0	0.00
		6. By taxi	0	0.00
		7. By boat	0	0.00
		8 Other	0	0.00
		Total	31	100.00
CD_1_10	Presence of a public phone in this community	1. Yes	39	72.22
		2. No	15	27.78
		Total	54	100.00
CD_2_10	Number of households having access to a public phone	1. Almost no households	0	0.00
		2. Less than half of the households	7	17.95
		3. Around half of the households	1	2.56
		4. More than half of the households	6	15.38
		5. Almost all households	25	64.10
		Total	39	100.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
CD_3_10	Reasons why some people do not have access to a public phone	1. Income level	10	25.64
		2. Occupation	0	0.00
		3. Social status (class)	1	2.56
		4. Age	0	0.00
		5. Gender	0	0.00
		6. Race/ ethnicity	0	0.00
		7. Language	0	0.00
		8. Religious beliefs	0	0.00
		9. This service does not have enough capacity	4	10.26
		10. Other	1	2.56
		N.A.	23	58.97
	Total	39	100.00	
CD_4a_10	Time (hours) to reach a public phone if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 0	M = 0.00	SD = 0.00
CD_4b_10	Time (minutes) to reach a public phone if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 45	M = 4.67	SD = 10.00
CD_5_10	Type of transportation to reach a public phone if it is not available in this community	1. On foot	15	100.00
		2. By horse/ mule/ donkey	0	0.00
		3. By bicycle	0	0.00
		4. By private car or motorcycle	0	0.00
		5. By bus	0	0.00
		6. By taxi	0	0.00
		7. By boat	0	0.00
		8 Other	0	0.00
			Total	15
CD_1_11	Presence of an internet café/ connection in this community	1. Yes	13	24.07
		2. No	41	75.93
		Total	54	100.00
CD_2_11	Number of households having access to an internet café/ connection	1. Almost no households	4	30.77
		2. Less than half of the households	5	38.46
		3. Around half of the households	2	15.38
		4. More than half of the households	0	0.00
		5. Almost all households	2	15.38
			Total	13
CD_3_11	Reasons why some people do not have access to an internet café/ connection	1. Income level	5	38.46
		2. Occupation	0	0.00
		3. Social status (class)	2	15.38
		4. Age	0	0.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		5. Gender	0	0.00
		6. Race/ ethnicity	0	0.00
		7. Language	0	0.00
		8. Religious beliefs	0	0.00
		9. This service does not have enough capacity	4	30.77
		10. Other	0	0.00
		N.A.	2	15.38
		Total	13	100.00
CD_4a_11	Time (hours) to reach an internet café/connection if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 1	M = 0.04	SD = 0.19
CD_4b_11	Time (minutes) to reach an internet café/connection if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 30	M = 13.57	SD = 11.23
CD_5_11	Type of transportation to reach an internet café/connection if it is not available in this community	1. On foot	38	92.68
		2. By horse/ mule/ donkey	0	0.00
		3. By bicycle	0	0.00
		4. By private car or motorcycle	0	0.00
		5. By bus	3	7.32
		6. By taxi	0	0.00
		7. By boat	0	0.00
		8 Other	0	0.00
		Total	41	100.00
CD_1_12	Presence of a post office in this community	1. Yes	3	5.56
		2. No	51	94.44
		Total	54	100.00
CD_2_12	Number of households having access to a post office	1. Almost no households	0	0.00
		2. Less than half of the households	0	0.00
		3. Around half of the households	2	66.67
		4. More than half of the households	0	0.00
		5. Almost all households	1	33.33
		Total	3	100.00
CD_3_12	Reasons why some people do not have access to a post office	1. Income level	1	33.33
		2. Occupation	0	0.00
		3. Social status (class)	0	0.00
		4. Age	0	0.00
		5. Gender	0	0.00
		6. Race/ ethnicity	0	0.00
		7. Language	0	0.00
		8. Religious beliefs	0	0.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		9. This service does not have enough capacity	1	33.33
		10. Other	0	0.00
		N.A.	1	33.33
		Total	3	100.00
CD_4a_12	Time (hours) to reach a post office if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 1	M = 0.04	SD = 0.19
CD_4b_12	Time (minutes) to reach a post office if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 45	M = 20.07	SD = 12.65
CD_5_12	Type of transportation to reach a post office if it is not available in this community	1. On foot	42	82.35
		2. By horse/ mule/ donkey	0	0.00
		3. By bicycle	0	0.00
		4. By private car or motorcycle	4	7.84
		5. By bus	5	9.80
		6. By taxi	0	0.00
		7. By boat	0	0.00
		8 Other	0	0.00
		Total	51	100.00
CD_1_13	Presence of a bank in this community	1. Yes	5	9.26
		2. No	49	90.74
		Total	54	100.00
CD_2_13	Number of households having access to a bank	1. Almost no households	1	20.00
		2. Less than half of the households	1	20.00
		3. Around half of the households	1	20.00
		4. More than half of the households	0	0.00
		5. Almost all households	2	40.00
		Total	5	100.00
CD_3_13	Reasons why some people do not have access to a bank	1. Income level	3	60.00
		2. Occupation	0	0.00
		3. Social status (class)	0	0.00
		4. Age	0	0.00
		5. Gender	0	0.00
		6. Race/ ethnicity	0	0.00
		7. Language	0	0.00
		8. Religious beliefs	0	0.00
		9. This service does not have enough capacity	0	0.00
		10. Other	0	0.00
		N.A.	2	40.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		Total	5	100.00
CD_4a_13	Time (hours) to reach a bank if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 1	M = 0.02	SD = 0.14
CD_4b_13	Time (minutes) to reach a bank if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 55	M = 20.00	SD = 12.70
CD_5_13	Type of transportation to reach a bank if it is not available in this community	1. On foot 2. By horse/ mule/ donkey 3. By bicycle 4. By private car or motorcycle 5. By bus 6. By taxi 7. By boat 8 Other Total	37 0 0 4 8 0 0 0 49	75.51 0.00 0.00 8.16 16.33 0.00 0.00 0.00 100.00
CD_1_14	Presence of a mto in this community	1. Yes 2. No Total	4 50 54	7.41 92.59 100.00
CD_2_14	Number of households having access to a mto	1. Almost no households 2. Less than half of the households 3. Around half of the households 4. More than half of the households 5. Almost all households Total	2 0 0 0 2 4	50.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 50.00 100.00
CD_3_14	Reasons why some people do not have access to a mto	1. Income level 2. Occupation 3. Social status (class) 4. Age 5. Gender 6. Race/ ethnicity 7. Language 8. Religious beliefs 9. This service does not have enough capacity 10. Other N.A. Total	2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 4	50.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 50.00 100.00
CD_4a_14	Time (hours) to reach a mto if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 1	M = 0.02	SD = 0.14

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
CD_4b_14	Time (minutes) to reach a mto if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 55	M = 21.48	SD = 12.11
CD_5_14	Type of transportation to reach a mto if it is not available in this community	1. On foot 2. By horse/ mule/ donkey 3. By bicycle 4. By private car or motorcycle 5. By bus 6. By taxi 7. By boat 8 Other Total	32 0 0 4 14 0 0 0 50	64 0.00 0.00 8.00 28.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 100.00
CD_1_15	presence of a mfi in this community	1. Yes 2. No Total	4 50 54	7.41 92.59 100.00
CD_2_15	Number of households having access to a mfi	1. Almost no households 2. Less than half of the households 3. Around half of the households 4. More than half of the households 5. Almost all households Total	0 2 1 0 1 4	0.00 50.00 25.00 0.00 25.00 100.00
CD_3_15	Reasons why some people do not have access to a mfi	1. Income level 2. Occupation 3. Social status (class) 4. Age 5. Gender 6. Race/ ethnicity 7. Language 8. Religious beliefs 9. This service does not have enough capacity 10. Other N.A. Total	0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 4	0.00 0.00 25.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 75.00 100.00
CD_4a_15	Time (hours) to reach a mfi if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 1	M = 0.02	SD = 0.14
CD_4b_15	Time (minutes) to reach a mfi if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 45	M = 20.95	SD = 11.27

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
CD_5_15	Type of transportation to reach a mfi if it is not available in this community	1. On foot	37	74.00
		2. By horse/ mule/ donkey	0	0.00
		3. By bicycle	1	2.00
		4. By private car or motorcycle	4	8.00
		5. By bus	8	16.00
		6. By taxi	0	0.00
		7. By boat	0	0.00
		8 Other	0	0.00
		Total	50	100.00
CD_1_16	Presence of security/ police services in this community	1. Yes	16	29.63
		2. No	38	70.37
		Total	54	100.00
CD_2_16	Number of households having access to security/ police services	1. Almost no households	0	0.00
		2. Less than half of the households	0	0.00
		3. Around half of the households	1	6.25
		4. More than half of the households	4	25.00
		5. Almost all households	11	68.75
		Total	16	100.00
CD_3_16	Reasons why some people do not have access to security/ police services	1. Income level	1	6.25
		2. Occupation	0	0.00
		3. Social status (class)	0	0.00
		4. Age	0	0.00
		5. Gender	0	0.00
		6. Race/ ethnicity	0	0.00
		7. Language	0	0.00
		8. Religious beliefs	0	0.00
		9. This service does not have enough capacity	7	43.75
		10. Other	0	0.00
		N.A.	8	50.00
Total	16	100.00		
CD_4a_16	Time (hours) to reach security/police services if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 0	M = 0.00	SD = 0.00
CD_4b_16	Time (minutes) to reach security/police series if it is not available in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 45	M = 10.37	SD = 9.92
CD_5_16	Type of transportation to reach security/ police services if it is not available in this community	1. On foot	37	97.37
		2. By horse/ mule/ donkey	0	0.00
		3. By bicycle	0	0.00
		4. By private car or motorcycle	1	2.63

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		5. By bus	0	0.00
		6. By taxi	0	0.0
		7. By boat	0	0.00
		8 Other	0	0.00
		Total	38	100.00
D. ECONOMIC SITUATION				
D.A ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES				
DA_1a	Most important economic activity for men in this colline (english)	Agriculture	2	3.70
		Authors	1	1.85
		Business	8	14.81
		Civil servants	9	16.67
		Commision agents (real estate)	1	1.85
		Construction	2	3.70
		Construction help	1	1.85
		Construction, taxi, bicycle	1	1.85
		Day workers	1	1.85
		Employees	1	1.85
		Handicraft	2	3.70
		Informal small business	4	7.41
		Manual workers	2	3.70
		Officers	11	20.37
		Senior civil servants	1	1.85
		Small business	4	7.41
		Small business and businessmen	1	1.85
		Taxi driver	1	1.85
		Worker (agriculture)	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
DA_1b	Second most important economic activity for men in this colline	Agriculture	3	5.56
		Business	9	16.67
		Business (smal and big)	1	1.85
		Business and small informal business	1	1.85
		Car driver	1	1.85
		Carpentry, welding, plumping	1	1.85
		Civil servants	1	1.85
		Commission agents (real estate, telephones)	1	1.85
		Construction, plumbing, weldin	1	1.85
		Driver	1	1.85
		Extraction of stones, clay	1	1.85
		Handicraft	3	5.56
		Mechanic	1	1.85
		Mechanic, welding, hair saloons	1	1.85

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		Missing	2	3.70
		N.A.	6	11.11
		Neighborhood business	1	1.85
		Traders	5	9.26
		Transport (drivers, conveyors)	3	5.56
		Welding	2	3.70
		Workers	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
DA_1c	Third most important economic activity for men in this community	Agriculture	1	1.85
		Businessmen	1	1.85
		Carpentry	2	3.70
		Contractors	1	1.85
		Cook	1	1.85
		Doctors, lawyers, expats	1	1.85
		Employers	1	1.85
		Fishing	1	1.85
		Handicraft	1	1.85
		Masonry, plumbing, culture	1	1.85
		Missing	15	27.78
		N.A.	15	27.78
		Officers	4	7.41
		Officers (educators)	1	1.85
		Sewing, embroidery, jewelry, b	1	1.85
		Small business	1	1.85
		Transport (drivers), carpentry	1	1.85
		Transport (drivers, conveyors)	3	5.56
		Welding	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
DA_2a	Most important economic activity for women in this community	Agriculture	7	12.96
		Agriculture (in other locations)	1	1.85
		Business	6	11.11
		Civil servants	6	11.11
		Daily workers	1	1.85
		Embroidery	1	1.85
		Food product sales	2	3.70
		Hack (agriculture)	1	1.85
		Masonry	2	3.70
		Officers	11	20.37
		Senior officers	2	3.70
		Small business	11	20.37
		Small informal business	3	5.56
		Total	54	100.00
DA_2b	Second most economic activity for women in this community	Agriculture	1	2.13
		Business	5	10.64
		Businessmen	5	10.64
		Businessmen (small informal bu	1	2.13
		Civil servants	1	2.13

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		Employees	1	2.13
		Masonry	1	2.13
		Masonry, welding	1	2.13
		Missing	7	12.96
		N.A.	11	23.40
		Officers	4	8.51
		Sewing, embroidery	1	2.13
		Small business	13	27.66
		Small informal business	2	4.26
		Total	54	100.00
DA_2c	Third most important economic activity for women in this	Agriculture	1	1.85
		Beverage sales	1	1.85
		Doctors, lawyers, expats	1	1.85
		Farmer	1	1.85
		Missing	27	50.00
		N.A.	18	33.33
		Officers	2	3.70
		Welding	2	3.70
		Welding, embroidery	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
DA_3a	Most important economic activity for children aged below 12 in this community	Agriculture	1	1.85
		Handicraft	1	1.85
		Mechanic	1	1.85
		Mechanic (help)	1	1.85
		Missing	23	42.59
		N.A.	15	27.78
		Small business	12	22.22
		Total	54	100.00
DA_3b	Second most important economic activity for children aged below 12 in this community	Missing	35	64.81
		N.A.	18	33.33
		Small business	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
DA_3c	Third most important economic activity for children aged below 12 in this community	Missing	35	64.81
		N.A.	19	35.19
		Total	54	100.00
DA_4a	Most important economic activity for children aged between 12 and 18 in this community	Agriculture	3	5.56
		Artists	1	1.85
		Business	1	1.85
		Extraction of stones, clay	1	1.85
		Fishing	1	1.85
		Hair saloon	1	1.85
		Hairdressing, carpentry, welding	1	1.85
		Hairdressing, welding studio	1	1.85
		Handicraft	6	11.11
		Masonry (aid)	1	1.85

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent	
		Mechanic, welding, carpentry	1	1.85	
		Missing	9	16.67	
		N.A.	6	11.11	
		Small business	16	29.63	
		Small informal business	2	3.70	
		Small informal business (donuts)	1	1.85	
		Transport (conveyors)	1	1.85	
		Transport (drivers, conveyors)	1	1.85	
		Total	54	100.00	
DA_4b	Second most important economic activity for children aged between 12 and 18 in this community	Agriculture	1	1.85	
		Business	1	1.85	
		Collection of metal	1	1.85	
		Conveyors	1	1.85	
		Farmers	1	1.85	
		Food products (donuts, peanuts)	1	1.85	
		Hack (agriculture)	1	1.85	
		Hair saloon, welding studio	1	1.85	
		Hair saloon	1	1.85	
		Hairdressing	1	1.85	
		Handicraft	1	1.85	
		Masonry	2	3.70	
		Masonry (aid)	2	3.70	
		Mechanic	1	1.85	
		Missing	18	33.33	
		N.A.	13	24.07	
		Small business	6	11.11	
		Transport (drivers, conveyors)	1	1.85	
		Total	54	100.00	
DA_4c	Third most important economic activity for children aged between 12 and 18 in this community	Agriculture	1	1.85	
		Fishing	1	1.85	
		Job in NGOs	1	1.85	
		Missing	29	53.70	
		N.A.	17	31.48	
		Small business	1	1.85	
		Small informal business	1	1.85	
		Transport (bus conveyors)	1	1.85	
		Transport (conveyors)	1	1.85	
		Transport (drivers, conveyors)	1	1.85	
		Total	54	100.00	
D.B WORKING AGE					
DB_1	Average age at which males start working full time	n = 54	R = 10 - 30	M = 20.48	SD = 5.70
DB_2	Average age at which females start working full time	n = 54	R = 12 - 30	M = 19.52	SD = 5.83

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
DB_3	Number of males younger than 18 that are currently engaged in paid employment	1. Almost none	41	75.93
		2. Less than half of them	12	22.22
		3. Around half of them	0	0.00
		4. More than half of them	1	1.85
		5. Almost all of them	0	0.00
		Total	54	100.00
DB_4	Number of females younger than 18 that are currently engaged in paid employment	1. Almost none	45	83.33
		2. Less than half of them	8	14.81
		3. Around half of them	1	1.85
		4. More than half of them	0	0.00
		5. Almost all of them	0	0.00
		Total	54	100.00
DB_5	Number of males younger than 12 that are currently engaged in paid employment	1. Almost none	52	96.30
		2. Less than half of them	2	3.70
		3. Around half of them	0	0.00
		4. More than half of them	0	0.00
		5. Almost all of them	0	0.00
		Total	54	100.00
DB_6	Number of females younger than 12 that are currently engaged in paid employment	1. Almost none	53	98.15
		2. Less than half of them	1	1.85
		3. Around half of them	0	0.00
		4. More than half of them	0	0.00
		5. Almost all of them	0	0.00
		Total	54	100.00
D. C. EMPLOYMENT				
DC_1	Rating of availability of employment in this community	1. Very low	40	47.07
		2. Low	7	12.96
		3. Medium	6	11.11
		4. High	1	1.85
		5. Very high	0	0.00
		Total	54	100.00
DC_2	Change of availability of employment in the past five years	1. Worsened a lot	29	53.70
		2. Worsened	17	31.48
		3. Stayed the same	5	9.26
		4. Improved	3	5.56
		5. Improved a lot	0	0.00
		Total	54	100.00
D. D SUBJECTIVE WELLBEING				
DD_1	Description of economic situation in most households in this community	1. They are finding it very difficult	10	18.52
		2. They are finding it difficult	20	37.04
		3. They are coping (neutral)	17	31.48

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		4. They are living comfortably	5	9.26
		5. They are living very comfortably	2	3.70
		Total	54	100.00
DD_2	Living conditions in this community compared to neighboring communities	1. Much worse than in other communities	7	12.96
		2. Worse than in other communities	12	22.22
		3. The same as in other communities	23	42.59
		4. Better than in other communities	9	16.67
		5. Much better than in other communities	3	5.56
		Total	54	100.00
DD_3	Change in living conditions in this community compared to five years ago	1. Worsened a lot	13	24.07
		2. Worsened	18	33.33
		3. Stayed the same	12	22.22
		4. Improved	11	20.37
		5. Improved a lot	0	0.00
		Total	54	100.00
D. E DIFFERENCES BETWEEN COLLINE MEMBERS				
DE_1_1	Differences in education	1. Not at all	10	18.52
		2. A little bit	9	16.67
		3. Somewhat	24	44.44
		4. Much	10	18.52
		5. Very much	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
DE_1_2	Differences in wealth/ material possessions	1. Not at all	3	5.56
		2. A little bit	6	11.11
		3. Somewhat	25	46.30
		4. Much	14	25.93
		5. Very much	6	11.11
		Total	54	100.00
DE_1_3	Differences in landholdings	1. Not at all	22	40.74
		2. A little bit	9	16.67
		3. Somewhat	15	27.78
		4. Much	8	14.81
		5. Very much	0	0.00
		Total	54	100.00
DE_1_4	Differences in social status (class)	1. Not at all	9	16.67
		2. A little bit	13	24.07

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		3. Somewhat	30	55.56
		4. Much	1	1.85
		5. Very Much	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
DE_1_5	Differences in employment	1. Not at all	2	3.70
		2. A little bit	10	18.52
		3. Somewhat	25	46.30
		4. Much	5	9.26
		5. Very much	12	22.22
		Total	54	100.00
DE_1_6	Differences in food security	1. Not at all	3	5.56
		2. A little bit	11	20.37
		3. Somewhat	29	53.70
		4. Much	6	11.11
		5. Very much	5	9.26
		Total	54	100.00
DE_1_7	Differences in religion	1. Not at all	32	59.26
		2. A little bit	2	3.70
		3. Somewhat	3	5.56
		4. Much	14	25.93
		5. Very much	3	5.56
		Total	54	100.00
DE_1_8	Differences in ethnicity	Not at all	34	62.96
		A little bit	2	3.70
		Somewhat	1	1.85
		Much	4	7.41
		Very much	13	24.07
		Total	54	100.00
DE_2	Number of different ethnic groups living in this community	n = 54 R = 2 -3		
DE_3	Relative size of the ethnic groups living in this community	1. One group is significantly larger than the other(s)	31	57.41
		2. One group is a little bit larger than the other(s)	14	25.93
		3. All groups are more or less the same size	9	16.67
		4. Other	0	0.00
		Total	54	100.00
DE_4	Relationships between people from different ethnic groups in this community	1. Bad	0	0.00
		2. Neutral	16	29.63
		3. Good	12	22.22
		4. Very good	26	48.15

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		Total	54	100.00
E. SHOCKS				
Environmental/ ecological shocks				
E_1_1	Shocks in the past five years - drought	1. Yes 2. No Total	7 47 54	12.96 87.04 100.00
E_1_1_2006	Drought in 2006	1. Yes 2. No Total	0 54 54	0.00 100.00 100.00
E_1_1_2007	Drought in 2007	1. Yes 2. No Total	1 53 54	1.85 98.15 100.00
E_1_1_2008	Drought in 2008	1. Yes 2. No Total	2 52 54	3.70 96.30 100.00
E_1_1_2009	Drought in 2009	1. Yes 2. No Total	4 50 54	7.41 92.59 100.00
E_1_1_2010	Drought in 2010	1. Yes 2. No Total	5 49 54	9.26 90.74 100.00
E_1_2	Shocks in the past five years - too much rain or flood	1. Yes 2. No Total	4 50 54	7.41 92.59 100.00
E_1_2_2006	Too much rain or flood in 2006	1. Yes 2. No Total	0 54 54	0.00 100.00 100.00
E_1_2_2007	Too much rain or flood in 2007	1. Yes 2. No Total	1 53 54	1.85 98.15 100.00
E_1_2_2008	Too much rain or flood in 2008	1. Yes 2. No Total	0 54 54	0.00 100.00 100.00
E_1_2_2009	Too much rain or flood in 2009	1. Yes 2. No Total	2 52 54	3.70 96.00 100.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
E_1_2_2010	Too much rain or flood in 2010	1. Yes	3	5.56
		2. No	51	94.44
		Total	54	100.00
<hr/>				
E_1_3	Shocks in the past five years - pests or diseases that affected crops or livestock	1. Yes	2	3.70
		2. No	52	96.30
		Total	54	100.00
<hr/>				
E_1_3_2006	Pests or diseases in 2006	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	54	100.00
		Total	54	100.00
<hr/>				
E_1_3_2007	Pests or diseases in 2007	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	54	100.00
		Total	54	100.00
<hr/>				
E_1_3_2008	Pests or diseases in 2008	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	54	100.00
		Total	54	100.00
<hr/>				
E_1_3_2009	Pests or diseases in 2009	1. Yes	1	1.85
		2. No	53	98.15
		Total	54	100.00
<hr/>				
E_1_3_2010	Pests or diseases in 2010	1. Yes	1	1.85
		2. No	53	98.15
		Total	54	100.00
<hr/>				
Economic/ market shocks				
<hr/>				
E_1_4	Shocks in the past five years - very low business/ agricultural return	1. Yes	4	7.41
		2. No	50	92.59
		Total	54	100.00
<hr/>				
E_1_4_2006	Very low business/ agricultural return in 2006	1. Yes	2	3.70
		2. No	52	96.30
		Total	54	100.00
<hr/>				
E_1_4_2007	Very low business/ agricultural return in 2007	1. Yes	2	3.70
		2. No	52	96.30
		Total	54	100.00
<hr/>				
E_1_4_2008	Very low business/ agricultural return in 2008	1. Yes	2	3.70
		2. No	52	96.30
		Total	54	100.00
<hr/>				
E_1_4_2009	Very low business/ agricultural return in 2009	1. Yes	4	7.41
		2. No	50	92.59
		Total	54	100.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
E_1_4_20 10	Very low business/ agricultural return in 2010	1. Yes	4	7.41
		2. No	50	92.59
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_5	Shocks in the past five years - large increase consumption good prices	1. Yes	40	74.07
		2. No	14	25.93
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_5_20 06	Large increase consumption good prices in 2006	1. Yes	20	37.04
		2. No	34	62.96
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_5_20 07	Large increase consumption good prices in 2007	1. Yes	27	50.00
		2. No	27	50.00
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_5_20 08	Large increase consumption good prices in 2008	1. Yes	34	62.96
		2. No	20	37.04
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_5_20 09	Large increase consumption good prices in 2009	1. Yes	34	62.96
		2. No	20	37.04
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_5_20 10	Large increase consumption good prices in 2010	1. Yes	36	66.67
		2. No	18	33.33
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_6	Shocks in the past five years - land distribution	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	54	100.00
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_6_20 06	Land distribution in 2006	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	54	100.00
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_6_20 07	Land distribution in 2007	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	54	100.00
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_6_20 07	Land distribution in 2008	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	54	100.00
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_6_20 08	Land distribution in 2009	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	54	100.00
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_6_20	Land distribution in 2010	1. Yes	0	0.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
09		2. No	54	100.00
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_6_2010	Land distribution in 2010	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	54	100.00
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_7	Shocks in the past five years - confiscation of assets	1. Yes	1	1.85
		2. No	53	98.15
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_7_2006	Confiscation of assets in 2006	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	54	100.00
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_7_2007	Confiscation of assets in 2007	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	54	100.00
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_7_2008	Confiscation of assets in 2008	1. Yes	1	1.85
		2. No	53	98.15
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_7_2009	Confiscation of assets in 2009	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	54	100.00
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_8_2010	Confiscation of assets in 2010	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	54	100.00
		Total	54	100.00
Theft/ crime				
E_1_8	Shocks in the past five years - large scale theft of crops or livestock	1. Yes	3	5.56
		2. No	51	94.44
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_8_2006	Large-scale theft of crops or livestock in 2006	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	54	100.00
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_8_2007	Large-scale theft of crops or livestock in 2007	1. Yes	1	1.85
		2. No	53	98.15
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_8_2008	Large-scale theft of crops or livestock in 2008	1. Yes	2	3.70
		2. No	52	96.30
		Total	54	100.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
E_1_8_2009	Large-scale theft of crops or livestock in 2009	1. Yes	3	5.56
		2. No	51	94.44
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_8_2010	Large-scale theft of crops or livestock in 2010	1. Yes	2	3.70
		2. No	52	96.30
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_9	Shocks in the past five years - large scale theft or destruction of housing	1. Yes	3	5.56
		2. No	51	94.44
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_9_2006	Large-scale theft or destruction of housing in 2006	1. Yes	1	1.85
		2. No	53	98.15
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_9_2007	Large-scale theft or destruction of housing in 2007	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	54	100.00
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_9_2008	Large-scale theft or destruction of housing in 2008	1. Yes	2	3.70
		2. No	52	96.30
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_9_2009	Large-scale theft or destruction of housing in 2009	1. Yes	2	3.70
		2. No	52	96.30
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_9_2010	Large-scale theft or destruction of housing in 2010	1. Yes	1	1.85
		2. No	53	98.15
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_10	Shocks in the past five years - large scale theft or destruction of other assets	1. Yes	12	22.22
		2. No	42	77.78
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_10_2006	Large-scale theft or destruction of other assets in 2006	1. Yes	2	3.70
		2. No	52	96.30
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_10_2007	Large-scale theft or destruction of other assets in 2007	1. Yes	5	9.26
		2. No	49	90.74
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_10_2008	Large-scale theft or destruction of other assets in 2008	1. Yes	4	7.41
		2. No	50	92.59
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_10_2009	Large-scale theft or destruction of other assets in 2009	1. Yes	7	12.96
		2. No	47	87.04

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		Total	54	100.00
E_1_10_2010	Large-scale theft or destruction of other assets in 2010	1. Yes 2. No Total	8 46 54	14.81 85.19 100.00
E_1_11	Shocks in the past five years - large scale land disputes	1. Yes 2. No Total	6 48 54	11.11 88.89 100.00
E_1_11_2006	Large-scale land disputes in 2006	1. Yes 2. No Total	3 51 54	5.56 94.44 100.00
E_1_11_2007	Large-scale land disputes in 2007	1. Yes 2. No Total	3 51 54	5.56 94.44 100.00
E_1_11_2008	Large-scale land disputes in 2008	1. Yes 2. No Total	2 52 54	3.70 96.30 100.00
E_1_11_2009	Large-scale land disputes in 2009	1. Yes 2. No Total	4 50 54	7.41 92.59 100.00
E_1_11_2010	large-scale land disputes in 2010	1. Yes 2. No Total	4 50 54	7.41 92.59 100.00
E.2. CONFLICT EXPERIENCES				
Death of colline members				
E_2_1	During the last period of conflict - prevalence of death of at least 10 % of community members due to disease	n = 54	R = 0 - 1	M = 0.11 SD = 0.32
E_2_2	During the last period of conflict - prevalence of death of at least 10 % of community members due to crime/ conflict	n = 54	R = 0 - 5	M = 0.72 SD = 1.00
Migration				
E_2_3	During the last period of conflict - prevalence of forced-out migration of at least 10 % of community	n = 54	R = 0 - 40	M = 2.56 SD = 5.52

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
	members			
E_2_4	During the last period of conflict - prevalence of large inflows of refugees	n = 54 R = 0 - 39	M = 2.06	SD = 5.40
Conflict				
E_2_5	During the last period of conflict - prevalence of attacks by rebel groups	n = 54 R = 0 - 20	M = 2.19	SD = 3.92
E_2_6	During the last period of conflict - prevalence of confrontations between rebels and the army	n = 54 R = 0 - 35	M = 3.43	SD = 6.16
E_2_7	During the last period of conflict - prevalence of large scale internal conflict	n = 54 R = 0 - 15	M = 3.06	SD = 4.12
F. SAFETY AND SECURITY				
F_1_1	Problems of gang/ rebel groups in the community	1. Yes 2. No Total	7 47 54	12.96 87.04 100.00
F_1_2	Problems of drug abuse in the community	1. Yes 2. No Total	38 16 54	70.37 29.63 100.00
F_1_3	Problems of alcohol abuse in the community	1. Yes 2. No Total	35 19 54	64.81 35.19 100.00
F_1_4	Problems of prostitution in the community	1. Yes 2. No Total	32 22 54	59.26 40.74 100.00
F_1_5	Problems of land disputes in the community	1. Yes 2. No Total	11 43 54	20.37 79.63 100.00
F_1_6	Problems of water disputes in the community	1. Yes 2. No Total	11 43 54	20.37 79.63 100.00
F_1_7	Problems of disputes on housing in the community	1. Yes 2. No	17 37	31.48 68.52

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		Total	54	100.00
F_1_8	Problems of thefts/ assaults in the community	1. Yes 2. No Total	33 21 54	61.11 38.89 100.00
F_1_9	Problems of child abuse in the community	1. Yes 2. No Total	9 45 54	16.67 83.33 100.00
F_1_10	Problems of sexual assaults/ rape in the community	1. Yes 2. No Total	12 42 54	22.22 77.78 100.00
F_2	Rating of overall level of security of this community	1. Very bad 2. Bad 3. Medium 4. Good 5. Very Good Total	0 12 28 14 0 54	0.00 22.22 51.85 25.93 0.00 100.00
F_3	Overall level of security of this community compared to neighbouring communitys	1. Much worse than in other communities 2. Worse than in other communities 3. The same as in other communities 4. Better than in other communities 5. Much better than on other communities Total	0 11 30 10 3 54	0.00 20.37 55.56 18.52 5.56 100.00
F_4	Overall level of security in this community compared to five years ago	1. Worsened a lot 2. Worsened 3. Stayed the same 4. Improved 5. Improved a lot Total	4 8 16 22 4 54	7.41 14.81 29.63 40.74 7.41 100.00
G. SOCIAL TIES				
G. A. TRUST AND PARTICIPATION				
GA_1	Level of trust between community members in this community	1. Very low 2. Low 3. Average 4. High 5. Very high Total	1 6 18 24 5 54	1.85 11.11 33.33 44.44 9.26 100.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
GA_2	Change in the level of trust between community in the last five years	1. Much worse	3	5.56
		2. Worse	11	20.37
		3. The same	17	31.48
		4. Better	19	35.19
		5. Much better	4	7.41
		Total	54	100.00
GA_3	Level of trust between community members compared to neighbouring communitys	1. Much lower than in other communities	0	0.00
		2. Lower than in other communities	6	11.11
		3. The same as in other communities	33	61.11
		4. Higher than in other communities	15	27.78
		5. Much higher than in other communities	0	0.00
		Total	54	100.00
GA_4	Spirit of participation in this community	1. Very low	12	22.22
		2. Low	14	25.93
		3. Average	15	27.78
		4.High	12	22.22
		5. Very high	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
GA_5	Change in spirit of participation in the past five years	1. Much worse	7	12.96
		2. Worse	16	29.63
		3. the same	11	20.37
		4. Better	16	29.63
		5. Much better	4	7.41
		Total	54	100.00
GA_6	Spirit of participation compared to neighbouring communitys	1. Much lower than in other communities	1	1.85
		2. Lower than in other communities	9	16.67
		3. The same as in other communities	33	61.11
		4. Higher than in other communities	11	20.37
		5. Much higher than in other communities	0	0.00
		Total	54	100.00
GA_7	Trust between people in this community in matters of lending and borrowing	1. No trust at all	18	33.33
		2. Little trust	9	16.67
		3. Neutral	7	12.96

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		4. Some trust	17	31.48
		5. A lot of trust	3	5.56
		Total	54	100.00
G.B ASSOCIATIONS				
GB_1_1	Currently present in the community	1. Yes	3	5.56
	- water/waste or fishermen's group	2. No	51	94.44
		Total	54	100.00
GB_1_2	Currently present in the community	1. Yes	6	11.11
	- agricultural cooperative	2. No	48	88.89
		Total	54	100.00
GB_1_3	Currently present in the community	1. Yes	3	5.56
	- trader's association or business group	2. No	51	94.44
		Total	54	100.00
GB_1_4	Currently present in the community	1. Yes	22	40.74
	- credit or savings association	2. No	32	59.26
		Total	54	100.00
GB_1_5	Currently present in the community	1. Yes	2	3.70
	- burial/funeral association	2. No	52	96.30
		Total	54	100.00
GB_1_6	Currently present in the community	1. Yes	43	79.63
	- religious group of organization (church/ mosque)	2. No	11	20.37
		Total	54	100.00
GB_1_7	Currently present in the community	1. yes	39	72.22
	- political party or group	2. No	15	27.78
		Total	54	100.00
GB_1_8	Currently present in the community	1. Yes	20	37.04
	- sport, recreational, art, or music group	2. No	34	62.96
		Total	54	100.00
GB_1_9	Currently present in the community	1. Yes	21	38.89
	- women's group or youth group	2. No	33	61.11
		Total	54	100.00
GB_1_10	Currently present in the community	1. Yes	31	57.41
	- school or health committee	2. No	23	42.59
		Total	54	100.00
GB_1_11	Currently present in the community	1. Yes	7	12.96
	- labour union	2. No	47	87.04
		Total	54	100.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
GB_1_12	Currently present in the community - humanitarian or charitable organization/ NGO	1. Yes	20	37.04
		2. No	34	62.96
		Total	54	100.00
GB_1_13	Currently present in the community - justice or reconciliation association	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	54	100.00
		Total	54	100.00
GB_2_1	Number of people engaged in water, waste or fishermen's group	1. Almost all of the community members	0	0.00
		2. More than half of the community members	0	0.00
		3. Around half of the community members	0	0.00
		4. Less than half of the community members	1	33.33
		5. Almost no community members	2	66.67
		Total	3	100.00
GB_2_2	Number of people engaged in agricultural cooperative	1. Almost all of the community members	0	0.00
		2. More than half of the community members	0	0.00
		3. Around half of the community members	1	16.67
		4. Less than half of the community members	3	50.00
		5. Almost no community members	2	33.33
		Total	6	100.00
GB_2_3	Number of people engaged in trader's association or business group	1. Almost all of the community members	0	0.00
		2. More than half of the community members	0	0.00
		3. Around half of the community members	0	0.00
		4. Less than half of the community members	3	100.00
		5. Almost no community members	0	0.00
		Total	3	100.00
GB_2_4	Number of people engaged in credit or savings association	1. Almost all of the community members	1	4.55
		2. More than half of the community members	4	18.18
		3. Around half of the	5	22.73

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		community members		
		4. Less than half of the community members	10	45.45
		5. Almost no community members	2	9.09
		Total	22	100.00
GB_2_5	Number of people engaged in burial/funeral association	1. Almost all of the community members	2	100.00
		2. More than half of the community members	0	0.00
		3. Around half of the community members	0	0.00
		4. Less than half of the community members	0	0.00
		5. Almost no community members	0	0.00
		Total	2	100.00
GB_2_6	Number of people engaged in religious group or organization (church, mosque)	1. Almost all of the community members	3	6.98
		2. More than half of the community members	6	13.95
		3. Around half of the community members	4	9.30
		4. Less than half of the community members	26	60.47
		5. Almost no community members	4	9.30
		Total	43	100.00
GB_2_7	Number of people engaged in political party or group	1. Almost all of the community members	9	23.08
		2. More than half of the community members	21	53.85
		3. Around half of the community members	4	10.26
		4. Less than half of the community members	5	12.82
		5. Almost no community members	0	0.00
		Total	39	100.00
GB_2_8	Number of people engaged in sport, recreational, art, or music group	1. Almost all of the community members	1	5.00
		2. More than half of the community members	0	0.00
		3. Around half of the community members	3	15.00
		4. Less than half of the	11	55.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		community members		
		5. Almost no community members	5	25.00
		Total	20	100.00
GB_2_9	Number of people engaged in women's group or youth group	1. Almost all of the community members	0	0.00
		2. More than half of the community members	0	0.00
		3. Around half of the community members	6	28.57
		4. Less than half of the community members	14	66.67
		5. Almost no community members	1	4.76
		Total	21	100.00
GB_2_10	Number of people engaged in school or health committee	1. Almost all of the community members	0	0.00
		2. More than half of the community members	0	0.00
		3. Around half of the community members	2	6.45
		4. Less than half of the community members	10	32.26
		5. Almost no community members	19	61.29
		Total	31	100.00
GB_2_11	Number of people engaged in labour union	1. Almost all of the community members	0	0.00
		2. More than half of the community members	0	0.00
		3. Around half of the community members	2	28.57
		4. Less than half of the community members	4	57.14
		5. Almost no community members	1	14.29
		Total	7	100.00
GB_2_12	Number of people engaged in humanitarian or charitable organization	1. Almost all of the community members	0	0.00
		2. More than half of the community members	1	5.00
		3. Around half of the community members	0	0.00
		4. Less than half of the community members	16	80.00
		5. Almost no community members	3	15.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		Total	20	100.00
GB_2_13	Number of people engaged in justice or reconciliation association	<i>No observations</i>		
H. CHILDREN				
H_1a	Number of schools (public and private) that are currently in this community	n = 54 R = 0 - 8	M = 1.63	SD = 1.97
H_2a	Availability of the schools in this community for girls	1. Yes, all are available for girls 2. Yes, but only partially available for girls 3. No, not available for girls Total	31 0 0 31	100.00 0.00 0.00 100.00
H_3a	Number of days the children received classes in school during the last months	n = 31 R = 5 - 5	M = 5.00	SD = 0.00
H_4a	Main problem for schools in this community	1. Lack of teacher(s) 2. lack of teaching materials (books, paper, etc.) 3. Lack of health and hygiene facilities (e.g. toilets) 4. Lack of water 5. Lack of electricity 6. Other Total	0 15 6 4 2 4 31	0.00 48.39 19.35 12.90 6.45 12.90 100.00
H_13_1	Number of weeks that the primary school(s) in the past academic year in this community was/were closed	n = 29 R = 0 - 8	M = 2.76	SD = 3.30
H_13_2	Number of weeks that the secondary school(s) in the past academic year in this community was/were closed	n = 30 R = 0 - 6	M = 0.6	SD = 1.59
H_14_1	Main reason primary school(s) were closed	1. Due to agricultural work 2. Due to bad weather/natural disaster 3. Due to lack of teacher(s) 4. Due to security concerns 5. Other	0 0 0 0 2	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 50.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		Don't know	2	50.00
		Total	4	100.00
H_14_2	Main reason secondary school(s) were closed	1. Due to agricultural work	0	0.00
		2. Due to bad weather/natural disaster	0	0.00
		3. Due to lack of teacher(s)	0	0.00
		4. Due to security concerns	0	0.00
		5. Other	2	50.00
		Don't know	2	50.00
		Total	4	100.00
I. HEALTH				
I_1a	Most important health problem that currently affects adult women in this community	AIDS	1	1.85
		Diabetes	4	7.41
		Diabetes, hypertension	2	3.70
		Diabetes, hypertension, cancer,	1	1.85
		Lack of public health center	1	1.85
		Lack of public hospitals	4	7.41
		Limited access to health service	2	3.70
		Malaria	28	51.85
		Malnutrition	2	3.70
		Poverty	8	14.81
		Typhoid	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
I_1b	Second most important health problem that currently affects adult women in this community	AIDS	5	9.26
		Amoeba	1	1.85
		Appendicitis	1	1.85
		Diabetes	1	1.85
		Diabetes, rheumatism	1	1.85
		Disease because of pregnancy	1	1.85
		HIV/AIDS	7	12.96
		HIV/AIDS, hepatitis A, B, C	1	1.85
		Hypertension	2	3.70
		Lack of public hospitals	1	1.85
		Limited access to health service	2	3.70
		Malaria	2	3.70
		Malaria, rheumatism	1	1.85
		Malnutrition	3	5.56
		Missing	3	5.56
		N.A.	6	11.11
		Poverty	4	7.41
		Rheumatism	1	1.85
		Rheumatism, cancer (breast, cer	1	1.85
		Rheumatism, diabetes, hyperten	2	3.70
		Rheumatism, eye problems	1	1.85
		Sexually transmitted disease	1	1.85

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		Typhoid	5	9.26
		Unwanted pregnancy	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
I_1c	Third most important health problem that currently affects adult women in this community	AIDS	2	3.70
		Amoeba	1	1.85
		Anemia, HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis	1	1.85
		Bad transportation	1	1.85
		Cancer (breast and cervix of the	1	1.85
		Diabetes	5	9.26
		Diabetes, hypertension	1	1.85
		Expensive health care	1	1.85
		Flu	3	5.56
		HIV/AIDS	1	1.85
		HIV/AIDS, hepatitis A, B, C	4	7.41
		Hepatitis A, B, C	1	1.85
		Lack of public health services	1	1.85
		Limited access to health service	1	1.85
		Malaria	3	5.56
		Missing	12	22.22
		N.A.	12	22.22
		Poverty	1	1.85
		Short-sighting	1	1.85
		Typhoid	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
I_2a	Most important health problem that currently affects adult men in this community	AIDS	4	7.41
		Diabetes	3	5.56
		Diabetes, hypertension, cancer	1	1.85
		Diabetes, hypertension, gout	2	3.70
		Lack of public hospitals	4	7.41
		Limited access to health service	2	3.70
		Malaria	25	46.30
		Missing	1	1.85
		Poverty	11	20.37
		Tuberculosis	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
I_2b	Second most important problem that currently affects adult men in this community	AIDS	4	7.41
		Diabetes	4	7.41
		Diabetes, hypertension	1	1.85
		Diabetes, hypertension, cancer	1	1.85
		Diabetes, hypertension, gout	3	5.56
		Diabetes, hypertension, gout, ca	1	1.85
		Diabetes, hypertension, rheumat	1	1.85
		Expensive health services	1	1.85
		Gout, eye problems	1	1.85
		HIV/AIDS	6	11.11
		HIV/AIDS, hepatitis A, B, C	2	3.70
		Hypertension	4	7.41

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		Lack of public health services	2	3.70
		Lack of public hospitals	2	3.70
		Limited access to health service	3	5.56
		Malaria	3	5.56
		Missing	2	3.70
		N.A.	7	12.96
		Poverty	2	3.70
		Typhoid	4	7.41
		Total	54	100.00
I_2c	Third most important problem that currently affects adult men in this community	AIDS	2	3.70
		Cancer	2	3.70
		Diabetes	2	3.70
		Diabetes, hypertension	2	3.70
		Diabetes, hypertension, cancer	1	1.85
		Diabetes, hypertension, gout	1	1.85
		Flu	2	3.70
		Gout	3	5.56
		HIV/AIDS	2	3.70
		HIV/AIDS, hepatitis A, B, C	1	1.85
		HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis	1	1.85
		Hypertension	1	1.85
		Malaria	2	3.70
		Missing	9	16.67
		N.A.	18	33.33
		Rheumatism	1	1.85
		Sexually transmitted disease	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
I_3a	Most important health problem that currently affects children under 18 in this community	Amoeba	2	3.70
		Appendicitis	3	5.56
		Bronchitis	1	1.85
		Diarrhea	2	3.70
		Diphtheria	1	1.85
		Flu	3	5.56
		Lack of public hospitals	1	1.85
		Limited access to health service	1	1.85
		Malaria	23	42.59
		Malnutrition	1	1.85
		Measles	1	1.85
		Missing	1	1.85
		N.A.	3	5.56
		Poverty	9	16.67
		Respiratory diseases (bronchitis)	1	1.85
		Short-sighting	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
I_3b	Second most important health problem that currently affects children under 18 in this	Amoeba	2	3.70
		Angina	1	1.85
		Appendicitis	5	9.26

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
	community	Appendicitis (amoeba and other	1	1.85
		Appendicitis, amoeba	1	1.85
		Bronchitis	1	1.85
		Cough, fever	1	1.85
		Cough, fever, angina	2	3.70
		Cough, fever, headache	2	3.70
		Diarrhea	5	9.26
		Flu	1	1.85
		Lack of public health services	1	1.85
		Limited access to health service	2	3.70
		Long distances to health service	1	1.85
		Malaria	6	11.11
		Malnutrition	3	5.56
		Measles	1	1.85
		Missing	2	3.70
		N.A.	8	14.81
		Onchocerciasis	1	1.85
		Poverty	4	7.41
		Short sighting	1	1.85
		Typhoid	1	1.85
	Vomit	1	1.85	
	Total		54	100.00
I_3c	Third most important health problem that currently affects children under 18 in this community	Amoeba	1	1.85
		Appendicitis	4	7.41
		Bronchitis	1	1.85
		Cough, fever	4	7.41
		Cough, fever, headache	1	1.85
		Cough, headache	1	1.85
		Diarrhea, amoeba	1	1.85
		Flu	2	3.70
		Limited access to health service	1	1.85
		Malaria	4	7.41
		Missing	12	22.22
		N.A.	17	31.48
		Short sighting	1	1.85
		Typhoid	4	7.41
	Total		54	100.00
I_4	Quality of health care services in this community	1. Very bad	8	14.81
		2. Bad	16	29.63
		3. Medium	10	18.52
		4. Good	15	27.78
		5. Very good	5	9.26
		Total		54
I_5	Main issue influencing the quality of health care services in this community	1. Lack of medication	22	40.74
		2. Lack of staff	19	35.19
		3. Lack of other resources such	13	24.07

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		as beds		
		4. Other	0	0.00
		Total	54	100.00
I_6	Change in the quality of health care services in this community in the past five years	1. Much worse	1	1.85
		2. Worse	7	12.96
		3. The same	19	35.19
		4. Better	26	48.15
		5. Much better	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
J. MIGRATION				
J.A CURRENT MIGRATION STOCKS				
JA_1	Number of households in this community that currently have a migrant abroad	1. Less than 25 households	44	81.48
		2. Between 25 and 50 households	6	11.11
		3. Between 50 and 75 households	2	3.70
		4. Between 75 and 100 households	0	0.00
		5. More than 100 households	2	3.70
		Total	54	100.00
JA_2	Number of households in this community that currently have a household member living in another city or village in Burundi	1. Less than 25 households	35	64.81
		2. Between 25 and 50 households	10	18.52
		3. Between 50 and 75 households	3	5.56
		4. Between 75 and 100 households	5	9.26
		5. More than 100 households	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
JA_3	Number of households in this community that currently have a return migrant	1. Less than 25 households	35	64.81
		2. Between 25 and 50 households	6	11.11
		3. Between 50 and 75 households	3	5.56
		4. Between 75 and 100 households	4	7.41
		5. More than 100 households	6	11.11
		Total	54	100.00
J. B MIGRATION HISTORY: FORCED MIGRATION				
JB_1	Large groups of community members that were forced to leave in the history of the this	1. Yes	46	85.19
		2. No	8	14.81
		Total	54	100.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
	community			
JB_2_1a	Start year of forced migration 1	1972	2	4.35
		1993	21	45.65
		1994	14	30.43
		1995	3	6.52
		1999	1	2.17
		2000	2	4.35
		2003	3	6.52
		Total	46	100.00
JB_2_1b	End Year of forced migration 1	1973	1	2.17
		1987	1	2.17
		1994	16	34.78
		1995	7	15.22
		1996	3	6.52
		1997	4	8.70
		1998	4	8.70
		1999	3	6.52
		2000	2	4.35
		2001	1	2.17
		2003	2	4.35
		2004	1	2.17
		2006	1	2.17
		Total	46	100.00
JB_2_2a	Start year of forced migration 2	1991	1	4.55
		1994	3	13.64
		1995	3	13.64
		1996	1	4.55
		1997	3	13.64
		1998	1	4.55
		1999	2	9.09
		2001	2	9.09
		2002	4	18.18
		2003	2	9.09
		Total	22	100.00
JB_2_2b	End year of forced migration 2	1992	1	4.55
		1995	4	18.18
		1996	1	4.55
		1997	2	9.09
		1998	2	9.09
		1999	2	9.09
		2000	1	4.55
		2001	1	4.55
		2002	2	9.09
		2003	4	18.18
		2005	2	9.09
		Total	22	100.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
JB_2_3a	Start year of forced migration 3	1995	3	50.00
		1996	1	16.67
		2001	2	33.33
		Total	6	100.00
JB_2_3b	End year of forced migration 3	1995	1	16.67
		1996	2	33.33
		2001	2	33.33
		2005	1	16.67
		Total	6	100.00
JB_2_4a	Start year of forced migration 4	2002	1	50.00
		2003	1	50.00
		Total	2	100.00
JB_2_4b	End year of forced migration 4	2003	1	50.00
		2005	1	50.00
		Total	2	100.00
JB_3_1	Number of community members involved in forced migration 1	n = 31 R = 30 - 2500	M = 547.19	SD = 548.51
JB_3_2	Number of community members involved in forced migration 2	n = 14 R = 40 - 1600	M = 561.43	SD = 516.72
JB_3_3	Number of community members involved in forced migration 3	n = 5 R = 50 - 600	M = 236.00	SD = 230.50
JB_3_4	Number of community members involved in forced migration 4	n = 2 R = 650 - 800	M = 725.00	SD = 106.07
JB_4_1	Gender distribution of community members involved in forced migration 1	1. Mostly men	1	2.17
		2. Mostly women and children	0	0.00
		3. Both men and women equally	45	97.83
		Total	46	100.00
JB_4_2	Gender distribution of community members involved in forced migration 2	1. Mostly men	1	4.55
		2. Mostly women and children	0	0.00
		3. Both men and women equally	21	95.45
		Total	22	100.00
JB_4_3	Gender distribution of community members involved in forced migration 3	1. Mostly men	0	0.00
		2. Mostly women and children	0	0.00
		3. Both men and women equally	6	100.00
		Total	6	100.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
JB_4_4	Gender distribution of community members involved in forced migration 4	1. Mostly men	0	0.00
		2. Mostly women and children	0	0.00
		3. Both men and women equally	2	100.00
		Total	2	100.00
J. C MIGRATION HISTORY: LABOUR MIGRATION				
JC_1	Large flows of labour out-migration in the history of this community	1. Yes	4	7.41
		2 No	39	72.22
		Don't know	11	20.37
		Total	54	100.00
JC_2a	Start year of labour migration out of community 1	1995	1	33.33
		2000	2	66.67
		Total	3	100.00
JC_3	Number of community members involved in labour migration 1	n = 1 Range 300 - 300	M = 300.00	SD = 0.00
JC_4	Gender distribution of labour migration 1	1. Mostly men	3	75.00
		2. Mostly women and children	0	0.00
		3. Both men and women equally	1	25.00
		Total	4	100.00
J. D MIGRATION HISTORY: RETURN MIGRATION				
JD_1	Large flows of return migration in the history of this community	1. Yes	32	59.26
		2. No	22	40.74
		Total	54	100.00
JD_2_1a	Start year large flow of return migration into community 1	1994	9	28.13
		1995	2	6.25
		1996	4	12.50
		1997	3	9.38
		1998	1	3.13
		1999	4	12.50
		2000	1	3.13
		2002	1	3.13
		2004	2	6.25
		2005	5	15.63
		Total	32	100.00
JD_2_1b	End year large flow of return migration into community 1	1996	2	6.25
		1997	2	6.25
		1998	4	12.50
		1999	1	3.13
		2000	7	21.88

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		2002	2	6.25
		2003	2	6.25
		2005	4	12.50
		2006	7	21.88
		2007	1	3.13
		Total	32	100.00
JD_2_2a	Start year large flow of return migration into community 2	1995	1	25.00
		2001	1	25.00
		2003	1	25.00
		2005	1	25.00
		Total	4	100.00
JD_2_2b	End year large flow of return migration into community 2	2001	1	25.00
		2005	1	25.00
		2006	1	25.00
		2007	1	25.00
		Total	4	100.00
JD_3_1	Number of community members involved in return migration 1	n = 23 R = 25 - 3000	M = 561.09	SD = 685.61
JD_3_2	Number of community members involved in return migration 2	n = 2 R = 20 - 1300	M = 660.00	SD = 905.10
JD_4_1	Gender distribution of return migration 1	1. Mostly men	0	0.00
		2. Mostly women and children	0	0.00
		3. Both men and women equally	32	100.00
		Total	32	100.00
JD_4_2	Gender distribution of return migration 2	1. Mostly men	0	0.00
		2. Mostly women and children	0	0.00
		3. Both men and women equally	4	100.00
		Total	4	100.00
J. E VIEWS OF MIGRATION				
JE_1	Perceptions of community members that leave this community to live elsewhere	1. Very negatively	0	0.00
		2. Negatively	3	5.56
		3. Neutral	26	48.15
		4. Positively	17	31.48
		5. Very positively	8	14.81
		6. This is mixed	0	0.00
		Total	54	100.00
JE_2	Explanation perceptions on community members that leave this	Chance to find a job	1	1.85
		Development of the community	1	1.85

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
	community to live else where	Everyone wants	1	1.85
		For research of a better life	1	1.85
		For a research of their life	2	3.70
		Improvement of life standards	4	7.41
		Improvement of life, technology	1	1.85
		It depends on the person and its motivations	1	1.85
		It depends on where they go	2	3.70
		It is an evolution of their families	1	1.85
		It is wealth that enters in the family	1	1.85
		Life is better than here	1	1.85
		No problems with the rest	7	12.96
		No reaction	1	1.85
		No visible reaction	1	1.85
		Nothing	1	1.85
		Nothing special	1	1.85
		Promotion	1	1.85
		There is no problem	1	1.85
		They abandon them	1	1.85
		They allow more work to others	1	1.85
		They are like others	1	1.85
		They are not aware	1	1.85
		They avoid a bad situation	1	1.85
		They don't quit	2	3.70
		They escape from misery	1	1.85
		They exchange	1	1.85
		They find a job	1	1.85
		They find a job elsewhere	2	3.70
		They find other better places	1	1.85
		They have the chance to search a job	1	1.85
		They leave space available	1	1.85
		They leave to find a job	1	1.85
		They leave us	1	1.85
		They never quit	2	3.70
		They never quit, they come over	1	1.85
	They search a better life	1	1.85	
	They will easily earn the living	1	1.85	
	This is development	1	1.85	
	This is only one who leaves	1	1.85	
		Total	54	100.00
JE_3	Perceptions on return migrants in this community	1. Very negatively	2	3.70
		2. Negatively	1	1.85
		3. Neutral	29	53.70
		4. Positively	19	35.19
		5. Very positively	3	5.56
		6. This is mixed	0	0.00
		Total	54	100.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
JE_4	Explanation perceptions on return migrants	A lot of fails	1	1.85
		If they accommodate	1	1.85
		It depends on noone	1	1.85
		It depends on the location	3	5.56
		It depends on where they go	2	3.70
		It is a big sign of peace	1	1.85
		It is a good sign of peace	1	1.85
		It is nice to welcome them	1	1.85
		It is the consolidation of peace	1	1.85
		It is the peace	1	1.85
		It's very little coming	1	1.85
		No concern to others	4	7.41
		No explanation	1	1.85
		No people here	1	1.85
		No problems for the rest	2	3.70
		No problems with the communi	1	1.85
		No such households	2	3.70
		Nothing to remark	1	1.85
		Reunion	4	7.41
		Reunion (development of the community)	1	1.85
		Reunion (home coming)	1	1.85
		Sign of peace	1	1.85
		The district has been developed	1	1.85
		The neighbors strengthen the community	1	1.85
		These who return are rich	1	1.85
		They are developed in the relation to others	1	1.85
		They are estimated	1	1.85
		They are rich	1	1.85
		They are too few	1	1.85
		They bring the development	1	1.85
		They come individually	1	1.85
		They consolidate peace	1	1.85
		They don't seek life	1	1.85
They go to Tanzania	1	1.85		
They have evolved	1	1.85		
They haven't succeeded in their	1	1.85		
They return rich	1	1.85		
They return to their households	2	3.70		
They symbolize peace	1	1.85		
They take space that was already taken	1	1.85		
	Total	54	100.00	
JE_5	Perceptions on households with a current migrant in this community	1. Very negatively	0	0.00
		2. Negatively	2	3.70
		3. Neutral	10	18.52

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		4. Positively	31	57.41
		5. Very positively	11	20.37
		6. This is mixed	0	0.00
		Total	54	100.00
JE_6	Explanation perceptions on households with a current migrant in this community	A source more	1	1.85
		Abandon	1	1.85
		Anxiety for the return of war	1	1.85
		Better situation (life and security)	1	1.85
		Development of the community (hope)	1	1.85
		Envy (better life)	1	1.85
		Everyone wants that	1	1.85
		Improvement of life standards	1	1.85
		Improvement of security and life	1	1.85
		Increased opportunities	1	1.85
		It is a great opportunity	1	1.85
		It is the hope of receiving the transfers	1	1.85
		It's little the family reaches	1	1.85
		More opportunities than others	1	1.85
		New technologies, knowledge	1	1.85
		No concern for others	1	1.85
		No gender households	1	1.85
		No problems with others	1	1.85
		No problems with the rest	2	3.70
		No reaction	1	1.85
		Not these households	1	1.85
		One day they will help	1	1.85
		The family benefits from the transfers	1	1.85
		There are some advantages	1	1.85
		There are some who are rich and others	1	1.85
		These households have opportunities as well	1	1.85
		They are different from others	1	1.85
		They are glad	1	1.85
		They are like others	1	1.85
		They are rich	2	3.70
		They are rich compared to others	1	1.85
		They aren't interested in others	1	1.85
		They benefit some advantages	1	1.85
		They depend on their help	1	1.85
		They evolved	1	1.85
		They have the chance	1	1.85
		They help	1	1.85
		They help financially	2	3.70
		They invested in people	1	1.85
		They live easily	1	1.85

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		They organize the rest of the far	1	1.85
		They receive a lot of adantages	1	1.85
		They receive goods	1	1.85
		They receive money	2	3.70
		They send money	1	1.85
		They want them to have some	1	1.85
		They will contribute on their de	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
JE_7	Thoughts on how international migration affects this community	1. Very negatively	0	0.00
		2. Negatively	2	3.70
		3. Neutral	34	62.96
		4. Positively	15	27.78
		5. Very positively	3	5.56
		Total	54	100.00
JE_8	Explanation on thoughts on affect of international migration in this community	Advance of the community	1	1.85
		All young people want to leave	1	1.85
		For the moment there is no impa	1	1.85
		For the moment they help only their families	1	1.85
		Increase of new ideas	1	1.85
		It is very good when they find the way	1	1.85
		Job creation (aid to community)	1	1.85
		Many of them are shocked and return poor	1	1.85
		No change	1	1.85
		No change for the community	3	5.56
		No change for the rest	1	1.85
		No general migration	1	1.85
		No impact	1	1.85
		No improvement for the commu	1	1.85
		No means to help us	1	1.85
		No person from the community is abroad	1	1.85
		No remarkable change	1	1.85
		No visible results	1	1.85
		Nothing for the community	2	3.70
		Nothing for the community, but for their families	1	1.85
		Nothing for the community so f	1	1.85
		Nothing special for the commur	2	3.70
		Only their families	3	5.56
		She contributes to the developm	1	1.85
		Some benefit indirectly	1	1.85
		The community benefits indirec	1	1.85
		The community is developped	1	1.85
		The generations change a lot	1	1.85
		The migration is not strong	1	1.85

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		There are few people abroad	1	1.85
		There is no profit	1	1.85
		They are not many	1	1.85
		They are still few	1	1.85
		They bring other way to live	1	1.85
		They build nice houses	1	1.85
		They develop other quarters	1	1.85
		They do nice studies	1	1.85
		They don't live with us	1	1.85
		They haven't begun the develop	1	1.85
		They help the country	1	1.85
		They help their families	2	3.70
		They help their respective famil	1	1.85
		They only help their families	1	1.85
		We don't have much	1	1.85
		We have some who made progr	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
JE_9	Thoughts on how internal migration affects this community	1. Very negatively	0	0.00
		2. Negatively	4	7.41
		3. Neutral	37	68.52
		4. Positively	11	20.37
		5. Very positively	2	3.70
		Total	54	100.00
JE_10	Explanation on thoughts on affect internal migration on this community	Help between friends and famil	1	1.85
		Help only their families	2	3.70
		It depends	1	1.85
		It is a great opportunity for development	1	1.85
		It is always the opening	1	1.85
		It is not frequent	1	1.85
		It is overpopulation	1	1.85
		No change for the community	2	3.70
		No impact	1	1.85
		No migration in this direction	1	1.85
		No such people	1	1.85
		Not life	1	1.85
		Not many	1	1.85
		Not these households	1	1.85
		Nothing for the community	2	3.70
		Nothing remarkable	1	1.85
		Nothing special	2	3.70
		Nothing special for the community	1	1.85
		Only their families	10	18.52
		Only their families benefit	1	1.85
		Only their homes	1	1.85
		Participation in development community	1	1.85

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		She is not strong	1	1.85
		The changes are very necessary	1	1.85
		The community needs these migrations	1	1.85
		The district is now	1	1.85
		The internal migration is not frequent	1	1.85
		The overpopulation of the urban district	1	1.85
		There are few	1	1.85
		There are not many	1	1.85
		They are not many	1	1.85
		They don't come back	1	1.85
		They find job	1	1.85
		They gain nothing	1	1.85
		They go for work	1	1.85
		They are interested only in their families	1	1.85
		They live internal production	1	1.85
		We change our ideas	1	1.85
		We exchange goods	1	1.85
		We exchange the goods	1	1.85
		We help each other	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
JE_11	Thoughts on how international migration affects this country in general	1. Very negatively	1	1.85
		2. Negatively	4	7.41
		3. Neutral	9	16.67
		4. Positively	30	55.56
		5. Very positively	10	18.52
		Total	54	100.00
JE_12	Explanation on thoughts on how international migration affects this country in general	who leave	1	1.85
		Decrease of unemployment	1	1.85
		Development of the families with migrant	1	1.85
		Don't know	4	7.41
		Don't know (nothing about the c	1	1.85
		Entry of foreign currency	1	1.85
		Entry of foreign currency, job c	1	1.85
		Great desire to go there	1	1.85
		If they develop, the country dev	1	1.85
		If they help their families, it is t	1	1.85
		Increase of currency traffic	1	1.85
		Investment on personal profits	1	1.85
		It contributes to development	1	1.85
		It is few who develop the count	1	1.85
		It is the brain drain	1	1.85
		It is the communication that is developed	1	1.85

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		It is the intellectuals who leave	1	1.85
		Many go to study	1	1.85
		Nothing for the country only for their families	1	1.85
		Only a small group of the popul	1	1.85
		Our country is protected	1	1.85
		Participation in development co	1	1.85
		Reduction of unemployment rat	1	1.85
		Request aid for the country	1	1.85
		Resource of foreign currency	1	1.85
		Source of foreign currency	1	1.85
		The country imports a lot	1	1.85
		The country is developped	1	1.85
		The country makes a lot of prof	1	1.85
		The country really needs the ext	2	3.70
		The country receives foreign cu	2	3.70
		The population does not see any	1	1.85
		There are those who develop the	1	1.85
		They bring development	1	1.85
		They bring other knowlegde	1	1.85
		They bring the development	1	1.85
		They bring wealth to the country	1	1.85
		They can contribute to the deve	1	1.85
		They contribute to the developm	1	1.85
		They discover the world	1	1.85
		They do good things generally	1	1.85
		They represent our country	1	1.85
		This is a landlocked country	1	1.85
		Time passed for those who got r	1	1.85
		Voice without voice, search for	1	1.85
		We acquire new techniques	1	1.85
		We have many needs	1	1.85
		We import more than we export	1	1.85
		We really need the external	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
JE_13	Perception on return migrants being different from other community members	1. Yes, very different	22	40.74
		2. Yes, a little bit different	11	20.37
		3. No	21	38.89
		Total	54	100.00
JE_14	Explanation of return migrants being different from other community members	But there are no such people	1	1.85
		Deception from abroad	1	1.85
		Different life style than others	1	1.85
		High standard of living	1	1.85
		I don't know them	2	3.70
		Increase the life standards	1	1.85
		Low living standard	1	1.85
		Misbehavior	1	1.85
		More vision and courage than o	1	1.85

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		Most of them are glad	1	1.85
		No change	2	3.70
		No differences	2	3.70
		No migrants	1	1.85
		Poor compared to others	1	1.85
		Same level as others	1	1.85
		Same life as others	4	7.41
		Same life standards	1	1.85
		Same life style	1	1.85
		Same life style as others	1	1.85
		They are good physically, mora	1	1.85
		They are like the others	1	1.85
		They are like the others who left behind	1	1.85
		They are rich	6	11.11
		They are rich and evolved	1	1.85
		They are richer than us	1	1.85
		They are simple like the others	1	1.85
		They are the same	2	3.70
		They bring new things	2	3.70
		They do not change	1	1.85
		They evolved	1	1.85
		They have good manners	1	1.85
		They have grown	2	3.70
		They have means	3	5.56
		They have other customs	2	3.70
		They receive extensive educatio	1	1.85
		They return with new things	1	1.85
		They were influenced by the other societies	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
JE_15	Effect on community of return migrants being different from other community members	1. Very negatively	2	3.70
		2. Negatively	4	7.41
		3. Neutral	31	57.41
		4. Positively	13	24.07
		5. Very positively	4	7.41
		Total	54	100.00
JE_16	Explanation of effect on community of return migrants being different from other	Bad cohabitation	1	1.85
		Bad influence	1	1.85
		Everyone envies the stranger	1	1.85
		Everyone for their family	1	1.85
		Everyone looks	1	1.85
		Everyone wants to leave	2	3.70
		Everyone wants to send their ch	1	1.85
		Good cohabitation and relation	1	1.85
		Good neighborly	3	5.56
		Good relation	1	1.85
		It depends on the individual	1	1.85

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		It doesn't affect	1	1.85
		Learning from certain realities	1	1.85
		Learning from others	1	1.85
		Motivation to live abroad	1	1.85
		No concern for the others	1	1.85
		No impact	2	3.70
		No influence	1	1.85
		No migrants	1	1.85
		No problems for the rest	6	11.11
		No worries for the others	1	1.85
		Noone	3	5.56
		Nothing for the community	1	1.85
		Nothing special for the community	2	3.70
		Nothing to the community but everything to their families	1	1.85
		Others learn from his life	1	1.85
		Others want to leave	1	1.85
		People are hopeless	1	1.85
		The advantage is only for their close ones	1	1.85
		The community doesn't win anything	1	1.85
		The community remains the same	1	1.85
		The people do not notice	1	1.85
		There is no impact	1	1.85
		They bring new things	1	1.85
		They bring other bad customs	1	1.85
		They didn't bring anything special	1	1.85
		They didn't do anything great here	1	1.85
		They help the others	1	1.85
		They imitate and copy innovations	1	1.85
		They influence	1	1.85
		They inspire the community	1	1.85
		This is development	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
JE_17	Perception of return migrants having different values and norms than other community members	1. Yes, very different	19	35.19
		2. Yes, a little bit different	17	31.48
		3. No	18	33.33
		Total	54	100.00
JE_18	Explanation on perception of return migrants having different values and norms than other community	A lot of vision and determination	1	1.85
		Big deception	1	1.85
		Disappointment and dissatisfaction	1	1.85
		I don't know them	1	1.85
		I never had any contact with them	1	1.85
		If they are long	1	1.85
		Many illusions	1	1.85
		Many illusions and hope	1	1.85

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		Misbehavior (after deception)	1	1.85
		Mixture of customs	1	1.85
		N.A.	1	1.85
		No change	1	1.85
		Nothing	1	1.85
		Nothing remarkable	1	1.85
		Notion of time and importance of	1	1.85
		People have good manners	1	1.85
		Same principles	4	7.41
		Same principles and norms	6	11.11
		Some illusions	1	1.85
		There are not many	1	1.85
		There are those countries which	1	1.85
		They adopted good manners	1	1.85
		They are more intelligent than b	1	1.85
		They are very courageous	2	3.70
		They are very courageous and h	1	1.85
		They are very discipline	1	1.85
		They are very sociable	1	1.85
		They changed mentality	1	1.85
		They didn't change	1	1.85
		They don't really change	1	1.85
		They have learned a lot	2	3.70
		They have new behavior	1	1.85
		They have other behavior	1	1.85
		They have other customs	1	1.85
		They know a lot about travel	1	1.85
		They know a lot of things	1	1.85
		They learned a lot of things	2	3.70
		They learned many other custom	1	1.85
		They live in not simple neighbo	1	1.85
		They return with different educa	1	1.85
		Values from overseas	1	1.85
		Very good manners	1	1.85
		When you are rich you have dif	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
JE_19	Effect on community of return migrants having different norms and values compared to other community members	1. Very negatively	5	9.26
		2. Negatively	5	9.26
		3. Neutral	23	42.59
		4. Positively	18	33.33
		5. Very positively	3	5.56
		Total	54	100.00
JE_20	Explanation of effect on community of return migrants having different norms and values	A lot of influence on young peo	1	1.85
		Bad cohabitation (conflicts)	1	1.85
		Bad influence for young people	1	1.85
		Bad relation	2	3.70
		Everyone wants to leave	2	3.70
		Good cohabitation	2	3.70

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		Good cohabitation, relation	1	1.85
		Good neighborly	1	1.85
		Good relation	2	3.70
		Good relation and good cohabitatio	1	1.85
		Good relation, good cohabitation	1	1.85
		It depends on the people	1	1.85
		Learning from others	1	1.85
		Many customs many means	1	1.85
		N.A.	1	1.85
		No impact	2	3.70
		No influence	1	1.85
		No problems with the communi	1	1.85
		No problems with the rest	1	1.85
		Not at all	1	1.85
		Nothing	5	9.26
		Nothing special for the commu	1	1.85
		Others learn from them	1	1.85
		There are those who help the ot	1	1.85
		There is desire to go abroad	1	1.85
		They adapt	1	1.85
		They are animated by a spirit co	1	1.85
		They are crossing	1	1.85
		They are few	1	1.85
		They are not many	1	1.85
		They encourage and motivate o	1	1.85
		They have bad influence	2	3.70
		They have no weight in the com	1	1.85
		They influence others	1	1.85
		They teach life to others	1	1.85
		They want to imitate	1	1.85
		They want to imitate the locals	1	1.85
		They will live elsewhere	1	1.85
		They work a lot	1	1.85
		This encourages others	2	3.70
		This is development	1	1.85
		This is due to insecurity	1	1.85
		This pleases the other a lot	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
K. CHILDREN LEFT BEHIND				
K_1	Number of households in this community that have children of which at least one parent currently lives abroad	1. Less than 25 households	53	98.15
		2. Between 25and 50 households	1	1.85
		3. Between 50 and 75 households	0	0.00
		4. Between 75 and 100 households	0	0.00
		5. More than 100 households	0	0.00
		Total	54	100.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
K_2	Main reasons why the parent(s) of these children left this community	1. They were forced to leave due to security issues or conflicts	3	5.56
		2. They left to seek for better economic opportunities	17	31.48
		3. Other	2	3.70
		N.A.	32	59.26
		Total	54	100.00
K_3	Type of available support for children of which at least one parent lives abroad	1. Emotional or psychological support	5	9.26
		2. Material support (e.g., clothing, food, etc.)	8	14.81
		3. Financial support	2	3.70
		4. Social support (e.g., help in household work or family business/farm)	1	1.85
		5. Support for schooling (e.g., allowance, free or reduced admission/books/supplies, etc.)	0	0.00
		6. Other	38	70.37
		Total	54	100.00
K_4	Perception on children left behind by other community members	1. Very negatively	0	0.00
		2. Negatively	1	1.85
		3. Neutral	38	70.37
		4. Positively	9	16.67
		5. Very positively	4	7.41
		6. This is mixed	2	3.70
		Total	54	100.00
L. MONETARY REMITTANCES - MONEY OR GOODS				
L. A RECEIVING INTERNATIONAL MONEY REMITTANCES				
LA_1	Number of households in this community that receive international remittances on a regular basis	1. Almost all of the households	0	0.00
		2. More than half of the households	0	0.00
		3. Around half of the households	2	3.70
		4. Less than half of the households	18	33.33
		5. Almost no households	34	62.96
		Total	54	100.00
LA_2a	Most important way of households receiving international remittances	1. The household members bring it themselves	0	0.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
	in this community	2. Friends or relatives bring it for the household members	3	5.56
		3. Through a money transfer operator (formal)	42	77.78
		4. Through a shop keeper/call house/ hawala (informal)	0	0.00
		5. Through a bank	2	3.70
		6. Through the mail	1	1.85
		7. Via stored value card (bank/phone)	0	0.00
		8. Other	0	0.00
		Don't know	1	1.85
		N.A.	5	9.26
		Total	54	100.00
LA_2b	Second most important way of households receiving international remittances in this community	1. The household members bring it themselves	13	24.07
		2. Friends or relatives bring it for the household members	10	18.52
		3. Through a money transfer operator (formal)	3	5.56
		4. Through a shop keeper/call house/ hawala (informal)	0	0.00
		5. Through a bank	3	5.56
		6. Through the mail	0	0.00
		7. Via stored value card (bank/phone)	0	0.00
		8. Other	0	0.00
		Don't know	2	3.70
		N.A.	23	42.59
		Total	54	100.00
LA_2c	Third most important way of households receiving international remittances in this community	1. The household members bring it themselves	2	6.25
		2. Friends or relatives bring it for the household members	7	21.88
		3. Through a money transfer operator (formal)	0	0.00
		4. Through a shop keeper/call house/ hawala (informal)	0	0.00
		5. Through a bank	0	0.00
		6. Through the mail	0	0.00
		7. Via stored value card (bank/phone)	0	0.00
		8. Other	0	0.00
		Don't know	2	6.25
		N.A.	21	65.63
		Total	32	100.00
LA_3a	Most important problem	1. The costs are too high	21	38.89

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
	households encounter when receiving international remittances	2. There are limited possibilities to send money or goods	4	7.41
		3. The money travels too slowly	0	0.00
		4. The system is insecure	0	0.00
		5. There are legal restrictions in sending money	0	0.00
		6. Other	0	0.00
		Don't know	7	12.96
		N.A.	22	40.74
		Total	54	100.00
LA_3b	Second most important problem households encounter when receiving international remittances	1. The costs are too high	12	22.22
		2. There are limited possibilities to send money or goods	2	3.70
		3. The money travels too slowly	5	9.26
		4. The system is insecure	0	0.00
		5. There are legal restrictions in sending money	0	0.00
		6. Other	0	0.00
		Don't know	5	9.26
	N.A.	30	55.56	
		Total	54	100.00
LA_3c	Third most important problem households encounter when receiving international remittances	1. The costs are too high	0	0.00
		2. There are limited possibilities to send money or goods	0	0.00
		3. The money travels too slowly	1	4.17
		4. The system is insecure	1	4.17
		5. There are legal restrictions in sending money	0	0.00
		6. Other	0	0.00
		Don't know	5	20.83
	N.A.	17	70.83	
		Total	24	100.00
LA_4	Extent to which households in this community are dependent on international remittances	1. Very dependent	3	5.56
		2. Dependent	6	11.11
		3. Neutral	13	24.07
		4. Not dependent	10	18.52
		5. Not dependent at all	22	40.74
		Total	54	100.00
L.B RECEIVING INTERNAL MONETARY REMITTANCES				

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
LB_1	Number of households in this community that receive internal remittances on a regular basis	1. Almost all of the households	0	0.00
		2. More than half of the households	0	0.00
		3. Around half of the households	2	3.70
		4. Less than half of the households	14	25.93
		5. Almost no households	38	70.37
		Total	54	100.00
LB_2a	Most important way of households receiving internal remittances in this community	1. The household members bring it themselves	31	57.41
		2. Friends or relatives bring it for the household members	15	27.78
		3. Through a money transfer operator (formal)	1	1.85
		4. Through a shop keeper/call house/hawala (informal)	2	3.70
		5. Through a bank	2	3.70
		6. Through the mail	1	1.85
		7. Via stored value card (bank/phone)	0	0.00
		8. Other	2	3.70
		Total	54	100.00
LB_2b	Second most important way of households receiving internal remittances in this community	1. The household members bring it themselves	28	51.85
		2. Friends or relatives bring it for the household members	12	22.22
		3. Through a money transfer operator (formal)	1	1.85
		4. Through a shop keeper/call house/hawala (informal)	3	5.56
		5. Through a bank	6	11.11
		6. Through the mail	3	5.56
		7. Via stored value card (bank/phone)	0	0.00
		8. Other	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
LB_2c	Third most important way of households receiving internal remittances in this community	1. The household members bring it themselves	35	64.81
		2. Friends or relatives bring it for the household members	3	5.56
		3. Through a money transfer operator (formal)	0	0.00
		4. Through a shop keeper/call	2	3.70

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		house/hawala (informal)		
		5. Through a bank	3	5.56
		6. Through the mail	8	14.81
		7. Via stored value card (bank/phone)	0	0.00
		8. Other	3	5.56
		Total	54	100.00
LB_3a	Most important problem households encounter when receiving internal remittances	1. The costs are too high	5	9.26
		2. There are limited possibilities to send money or goods	17	31.48
		3. The money travels too slowly	18	33.33
		4. The system is insecure	3	5.56
		5. There are legal restrictions in sending money	0	0.00
		6. Other	11	20.37
		Total	54	100.00
LB_3b	Second most important problem households encounter when receiving internal remittances	1. The costs are too high	2	3.70
		2. There are limited possibilities to send money or goods	7	12.96
		3. The money travels too slowly	21	38.89
		4. The system is insecure	6	11.11
		5. There are legal restrictions in sending money	0	0.00
		6. Other	18	33.33
		Total	54	100.00
LB_3c	Third most important problem households encounter when receiving internal remittances	1. The costs are too high	2	3.70
		2. There are limited possibilities to send money or goods	3	5.56
		3. The money travels too slowly	10	18.52
		4. The system is insecure	10	18.52
		5. There are legal restrictions in sending money	0	0.00
		6. Other	29	53.70
		Total	54	100.00
LB_4	Extent to which households in this community are dependent on internal remittances	1. Very dependent	0	0.00
		2. Dependent	5	9.26
		3. Neutral	18	33.33
		4. Not dependent	13	24.07
		5. Not dependent at all	18	33.33
		Total	54	100.00
L. C	VIEWS ON RECEIVING REMITTANCES			

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
LC_1	View on effect remittances on receiving households in this community	1. Very negatively	0	0.00
		2. Negatively	0	0.00
		3. Neutral	19	35.19
		4. Positively	29	53.70
		5. Very positively	6	11.11
		Total	54	100.00
LC_2	Explanation on view on effect remittances on receiving households in this community	Another resource for living	1	1.85
		Financial support	1	1.85
		Help in any case	1	1.85
		Improvement of life standard	1	1.85
		It contributes financially	1	1.85
		It depends	1	1.85
		It depends on the family	1	1.85
		It depends on the person	1	1.85
		It is a small profit	1	1.85
		It is a profit	1	1.85
		It is small occasional help	1	1.85
		It is support if it is occasional	1	1.85
		It is the others that find a job	1	1.85
		It is those who receive it that are	1	1.85
		It is very occasional	1	1.85
		Live thanks to the transfers	1	1.85
		Money	1	1.85
		More profit	1	1.85
		More resource	7	12.96
		No change	3	5.56
		No change for the beneficiaries	2	3.70
		No change for them	1	1.85
		Receiving is always good	1	1.85
		Some households live of that money	1	1.85
		Some live of these transfers	1	1.85
		The households are developed	1	1.85
		There are more chances	1	1.85
		There aren't many	1	1.85
		These households are too few	1	1.85
		They are like God	1	1.85
		They are occasional	3	5.56
		They are only from their	1	1.85
		They contribute to the satisfaction of their needs	1	1.85
		They don't know these transfers	1	1.85
They help a lot	1	1.85		
They hide them	1	1.85		
They make little investment	1	1.85		
They respond to some needs	3	5.56		
This money contributes little on the well-being	1	1.85		
Those who receive them are sup	1	1.85		

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		Very occasional	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
LC_3	View on effect remittances have on this community as a whole	1. Very negatively	0	0.00
		2. Negatively	0	0.00
		3. Neutral	38	70.37
		4. Positively	14	25.93
		5. Very positively	2	3.70
		Total	54	100.00
LC_4	Explanation on view on effect remittances have on this community as a whole	A resource more	1	1.85
		Benefit indirectly	2	3.70
		Benefit indirectly (friends)	1	1.85
		Don't know	1	1.85
		It decreases begging in the community	1	1.85
		It depends	1	1.85
		It diminishes begging	1	1.85
		It diminishes poverty	1	1.85
		It is not sensitive	1	1.85
		It is too little	1	1.85
		It is very little	1	1.85
		Less unemployed and there is support	1	1.85
		No change at all	1	1.85
		No change to the community	3	5.56
		No impact to the community	1	1.85
		Nothing	1	1.85
		Nothing for the community	4	7.41
		Nothing for the community only their families	1	1.85
		Nothing great to the community	1	1.85
		Nothing special	1	1.85
		Nothing special for the community	2	3.70
		Nothing to remark	1	1.85
		Nothing truly	1	1.85
		Only their families	6	11.11
		Only their families benefit	1	1.85
		Only to their family	1	1.85
		The community can be developed	1	1.85
		The community develops	3	5.56
		The community develops as well	1	1.85
		The money is too little	2	3.70
		There are few households that receive them	1	1.85
		There is mutual help among members	1	1.85
		There is small sensibility	1	1.85
		These are acts of development	1	1.85
		They affect only their families	1	1.85
		They are few	1	1.85

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		They benefit indirectly	1	1.85
		This contributes also to the development	1	1.85
		This money is too little to have	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
LC_5	View on perception of household members that receive remittances by other community members	1. Very negatively	1	1.85
		2. Negatively	4	7.41
		3. Neutral	30	55.56
		4. Positively	16	29.63
		5. Very positively	3	5.56
		Total	54	100.00
LC_6	Explanation view on perception of household members that receive remittances by other community	Everyone is for themselves	1	1.85
		It is mixed (good and bad)	1	1.85
		It is very good	1	1.85
		It is very normal	1	1.85
		Jealousy	1	1.85
		Jealousy (the others need the tra	1	1.85
		No jealousy	1	1.85
		No problems (noone knows it)	1	1.85
		No problems for the rest	2	3.70
		No reaction	1	1.85
		No worries for the others	3	5.56
		No worries for the rest	2	3.70
		Nobody knows about it	1	1.85
		Noone is aware about these tran	1	1.85
		Not these households	1	1.85
		Nothing	1	1.85
		Often noone knows it	1	1.85
		Often there is jealousy	1	1.85
		One part is jealousy other part is	1	1.85
		Other households are not aware	1	1.85
		Other households don't know it	1	1.85
		The others don't know it	2	3.70
		The others need the transfers	1	1.85
		These households are helped	1	1.85
		They also need the transfers	1	1.85
		They are helped	1	1.85
		They are not aware	1	1.85
		They are not aware about these	1	1.85
		They are not such many househ	1	1.85
		They are rich	4	7.41
		They are richer than others	1	1.85
		They are supported and this is g	1	1.85
		They are supported financially	2	3.70
		They are supported materially	1	1.85
		They are to envy	2	3.70
		They benefit indirectly	1	1.85
		They don't know	2	3.70

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		They don't know about these tra	1	1.85
		They don't know anything about	1	1.85
		They don't know it (the commu	1	1.85
		They envy them	1	1.85
		They have the chance	1	1.85
		They help in this misery	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
L. D SENDING INTERNATIONAL MONETARY REMITTANCES				
LD_1	Number of households in this community that send international remittances on a regular basis	1. Almost all of the households	0	0.00
		2. More than half of the households	0	0.00
		3. Around half of the households	0	0.00
		4. Less than half of the households	3	5.56
		5. Almost no households	51	94.44
		Total	54	100.00
LD_2a	Most important way of households in this community sending international remittances	1. The household members bring it themselves	34	62.96
		2. Friends or relatives bring it for the household members	3	5.56
		3. Through a money transfer operator (formal)	13	24.07
		4. Through a shop keeper/call house/hawala (informal)	0	0.00
		5. Through a bank	0	0.00
		6. Through the mail	0	0.00
		7. Via stored value card (bank/phone)	0	0.00
		8. Other	4	7.41
		Total	54	100.00
LD_2b	Second most important way of households in this community sending international remittances	1. The household members bring it themselves	46	85.19
		2. Friends or relatives bring it for the household members	3	5.56
		3. Through a money transfer operator (formal)	2	3.70
		4. Through a shop keeper/call house/hawala (informal)	0	0.00
		5. Through a bank	0	0.00
		6. Through the mail	0	0.00
		7. Via stored value card (bank/phone)	0	0.00
		8. Other	3	5.56
		Total	54	100.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
LD_2c	Third most important way of households in this community sending international remittances	1. The household members bring it themselves	49	90.74
		2. Friends or relatives bring it for the household members	1	1.85
		3. Through a money transfer operator (formal)	0	0.00
		4. Through a shop keeper/call house/hawala (informal)	0	0.00
		5. Through a bank	0	0.00
		6. Through the mail	0	0.00
		7. Via stored value card (bank/phone)	0	0.00
		8. Other	4	7.41
		Total	54	100.00
LD_3a	Most important problem households encounter when sending international remittances	1. The costs are too high	51	94.44
		2. There are limited possibilities to send money or goods	0	0.00
		3. The money travels too slow	0	0.00
		4. The system is insecure	0	0.00
		5. There are legal restrictions in sending money	0	0.00
		6. Other	0	0.00
		Don't know	3	5.56
Total	54	100.00		
LD_3b	Second most important problem households encounter when sending international remittances	1. The costs are too high	47	87.04
		2. There are limited possibilities to send money or goods	4	7.41
		3. The money travels too slow	0	0.00
		4. The system is insecure	0	0.00
		5. There are legal restrictions in sending money	0	0.00
		6. Other	0	0.00
		Don't know	3	5.56
Total	54	100.00		
LD_3c	Third most important problem households encounter when sending international remittances	1. The costs are too high	51	94.44
		2. There are limited possibilities to send money or goods	0	0.00
		3. The money travels too slow	0	0.00
		4. The system is insecure	0	0.00
		5. There are legal restrictions in sending money	0	0.00
		6. Other	0	0.00
		Don't know	3	5.56

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		Total	54	100.00
L.E SENDING INTERNAL MONETARY REMITTANCES				
LE_1	Number of households in this community that send internal remittances	1. Almost all of the households 2. More than half of the households 3. Around half of the households 4. Less than half of the households 5. Almost no households Total	0 0 10 12 32 54	0.00 0.00 18.52 22.22 59.26 100.00
LE_2a	Most important way of households sending internal remittances from this community	1. The household members bring it themselves 2. Friends or relatives bring it for the household members 3. Through a money transfer operator (formal) 4. Through a shop keeper/call house/hawala (informal) 5. Through a bank 6. Through the mail 7. Via stored value card (bank/phone) 8. Other Total	27 15 0 1 2 5 0 4 54	50.00 27.78 0.00 1.85 3.70 9.26 0.00 7.41 100.00
LE_2b	Second most important way of households sending internal remittances from this community	1. The household members bring it themselves 2. Friends or relatives bring it for the household members 3. Through a money transfer operator (formal) 4. Through a shop keeper/call house/hawala (informal) 5. Through a bank 6. Through the mail 7. Via stored value card (bank/phone) 8. Other Don't know Total	20 17 0 0 8 5 1 0 3 54	37.04 31.48 0.00 0.00 14.81 9.26 1.85 0.00 5.56 100.00
LE_2c	Third most important way of households sending internal remittances from this community	1. The household members bring it themselves 2. Friends or relatives bring it for the household members	31 1	57.41 1.85

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		3. Through a money transfer operator (formal)	0	0.00
		4. Through a shop keeper/call house/hawala (informal)	5	9.26
		5. Through a bank	4	7.41
		6. Through the mail	9	16.67
		7. Via stored value card (bank/phone)	0	0.00
		8. Other	0	0.00
		Don't know	4	7.41
		Total	54	100.00
LE_3a	Most important problem households encounter when sending internal remittances	1. The costs are too high	25	46.30
		2. There are limited possibilities to send money or goods	14	25.93
		3. The money travels too slow	9	16.67
		4. The system is insecure	2	3.70
		5. There are legal restrictions in sending money	0	0.00
		6. Other	0	0.00
		Don't know	4	7.41
		Total	54	100.00
LE_3b	Second most important problem households encounter when sending internal remittances	1. The costs are too high	32	59.26
		2. There are limited possibilities to send money or goods	5	9.26
		3. The money travels too slow	10	18.52
		4. The system is insecure	2	3.70
		5. There are legal restrictions in sending money	0	0.00
		6. Other	0	0.00
		Don't know	5	9.26
		Total	54	100.00
LE_3c	Third most important problem households encounter when sending internal remittances	1. The costs are too high	35	64.81
		2. There are limited possibilities to send money or goods	2	3.70
		3. The money travels too slow	4	7.41
		4. The system is insecure	7	12.96
		5. There are legal restrictions in sending money	0	0.00
		6. Other	0	0.00
		Don't know	6	11.11
		Total	54	100.00
M. MIGRANTS' INVESTMENT AND CHARITABLE ACTIVITIES				

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
M_1	Frequency of visits from community members that live abroad	1. Never	9	16.67
		2. Sometimes	39	72.22
		3. Often	6	11.11
		4. Always	0	0.00
		Total	54	100.00
M_2	Investments of community members that live abroad	1. Yes	7	12.96
		2. No	47	87.04
		Total	54	100.00
M_3a_English	Most important sector of investment of community members	Business	1	14.29
		Construction of their houses	1	14.29
		Education	1	14.29
		Sport	1	14.29
		Transport	1	14.29
		Transport (vehicle to purchase)	1	14.29
		Vehicles for selling and location	1	14.29
		Total	7	100.00
M_3b	Second most important sector of investment of community members	Construction	1	16.67
		Culture	1	16.67
		Education	1	16.67
		Immobilization (construction of a house)	1	16.67
		Immobilization (construction of houses)	1	16.67
		Purchase of vehicles for location	1	16.67
		Total	6	100.00
M_3c	Third most important sector of investment of community members	Food	1	33.33
		Health	1	33.33
		House appliances for sale	1	33.33
		Total	3	100.00
M_4	Involvement in humanitarian or charitable (NGO) activities of community members	1. Yes	1	1.85
		2. No	53	98.15
		Total	54	100.00
M_5a	Most important sector of humanitarian involvement of	Social	1	100.00
		Total	1	100.00
M_5b	Second most important sector of humanitarian involvement of	N.A.	1	100.00
		Total	1	100.00
M_5c	Third most important sector of humanitarian involvement of	N.A.	1	100.00
		Total	1	100.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
M_6	Effect of investments made by community members that live abroad in this community	1. Very negatively	0	0.00
		2. Negatively	0	0.00
		3. Neutral	2	28.57
		4. Positively	2	28.57
		5. Very positively	3	42.86
		Total	7	100.00
M_7	Explanation of effect of investments made by community	Job creation	1	14.29
		Job creation for the unemployed	1	14.29
		Job creation, help in case of emergency	1	14.29
		There are those who make benefit	1	14.29
		They are just in the beginning	1	14.29
		They are still few	1	14.29
		This helps a lot	1	14.29
		Total	7	100.00
M_8	Effect of charitable activities of community members that live abroad in this community	1. Very negatively	0	0.00
		2. Negatively	0	0.00
		3. Neutral	0	0.00
		4. Positively	1	100.00
		5. Very positively	0	0.00
		Total	1	100.00
M_9	Explanation of effect of charitable activities of community members	This helps a lot	1	100.00
		Total	1	100.00
M_10_1	When people leave their country the make live harder for those who stay	1. Strongly disagree	36	66.67
		2. Disagree	6	11.11
		3. Neutral	4	7.41
		4. Agree	2	3.70
		5. Strongly agree	6	11.11
		Total	54	100.00
M_10_2	When people leave their country they still contribute to the country of origin	1. Strongly disagree	12	22.22
		2. Disagree	7	12.96
		3. Neutral	10	18.52
		4. Agree	12	22.22
		5. Strongly agree	10	18.52
		Don't know	3	5.56
		Total	54	100.00
M_10_3	When people leave their country they are able to support families in country of origin	1. Strongly disagree	1	1.85
		2. Disagree	2	3.70
		3. Neutral	5	9.26
		4. Agree	17	31.48
		5. Strongly agree	29	53.70
		Total	54	100.00

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
M_10_4	When people leave their country they abandon their country	1. Strongly disagree	16	29.63
		2. Disagree	14	25.93
		3. Neutral	9	16.6
		4. Agree	10	18.52
		5. Strongly agree	2	3.70
		Don't know	3	5.56
		Total	54	100.00
M_10_5	When people leave their country they get rich	1. Strongly disagree	4	7.41
		2. Disagree	10	18.52
		3. Neutral	15	27.78
		4. Agree	12	22.22
		5. Strongly agree	10	18.52
		Don't know	3	5.56
		Total	54	100.00
M_10_6	When people receive money from abroad they become lazier	1. Strongly disagree	19	35.19
		2. Disagree	23	42.59
		3. Neutral	7	12.96
		4. Agree	3	5.56
		5. Strongly agree	2	3.70
		Total	54	100.00
M_10_7	When people receive money from abroad it leads to resentment from others	1. Strongly disagree	9	16.67
		2. Disagree	7	12.96
		3. Neutral	10	18.52
		4. Agree	13	24.07
		5. Strongly agree	15	27.78
		Total	54	100.00
M_10_8	When people receive money from abroad they get rich	1. Strongly disagree	9	16.67
		2. Disagree	14	25.93
		3. Neutral	14	25.93
		4. Agree	12	22.22
		5. Strongly agree	5	9.26
		Total	54	100.00
M_10_9	When people receive money from abroad it helps develop our country	1. Strongly disagree	3	5.56
		2. Disagree	4	7.41
		3. Neutral	14	25.93
		4. Agree	18	33.33
		5. Strongly agree	12	22.22
		Don't know	3	5.56
		Total	54	100.00
M_10_10	When people who have lived abroad come back they help the country	1. Strongly disagree	1	1.85
		2. Disagree	5	9.26
		3. Neutral	14	25.93

Variable	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		4. Agree	14	25.93
		5. Strongly agree	14	25.93
		Don't know	6	11.11
		Total	54	100.00
M_10_11	When people who have lived abroad come back they do not fit in	1. Strongly disagree	8	14.81
		2. Disagree	10	18.52
		3. Neutral	20	37.04
		4. Agree	11	20.37
		5. Strongly agree	4	7.41
		Don't know	1	1.85
		Total	54	100.00
M_10_12	When people who have lived abroad come back they bring new ideas, knowledge and technology	1. Strongly disagree	2	3.70
		2. Disagree	1	1.85
		3. Neutral	6	11.11
		4. Agree	18	33.33
		5. Strongly agree	21	38.89
		Don't know	6	11.11
		Total	54	100.00
M_10_13	When people who have lived abroad come back they receive preferential treatment	1. Strongly disagree	3	5.56
		2. Disagree	7	12.96
		3. Neutral	14	25.93
		4. Agree	9	16.67
		5. Strongly agree	19	35.19
		Don't know	2	3.70
		Total	54	100.00