

# ETHIOPIA

## Community Codebook

### 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](mailto:migration-mgsog@maastrichtuniversity.nl)



Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the  
Netherlands



**Maastricht University**



Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
------	-------	----------	-----------	---------

**2. INTERVIEWER SHEET (IS)**

IS_5	Language in which the interview was conducted	1. Amharic	4	26.67
		2. Oromifa	6	40.00
		3. Tigrinya	2	13.33
		4. Other	3	20.00
		Total	15	100.00
IS_7	Region in which the interview was conducted	1. Addis Ababa	3	20.00
		2. Amhara	3	20.00
		3. Oromiya	3	20.00
		4. SNNP	3	20.00
		5. Tigray	3	20.00
		Total	15	100.00
IS_7	Woreda in which the interview was conducted	1. Gondar	1	6.67
		2. Metemba	1	6.67
		3. Dessie Zuria	1	6.67
		4. Erob	1	6.67
		5. Mekele	1	6.67
		6. Raya Azebo	1	6.67
		7. Awassa	1	6.67
		8. Selti	1	6.67
		9. Limu	1	6.67
		10. Jimma	1	6.67
		11. Sinana	1	6.67
		12. Sigmo	1	6.67
		13. Bole	1	6.67
		14. Kirkos	1	6.67
		15. Arada	1	6.67
		Total	15	100.00
A. BASIC CHARACTERISTICS				
A.A community HISTORY, LANGUAGE AND CULTURE				
AA_1	Time of existence of the community (years)	n = 13                  Range 5 -150	M = 68.23	SD = 40.51
AA_2	Language spoken in community in daily communication	1. Amharic	7	50.00
		2. Oromifa	4	28.57
		3. Tigrinya	1	7.14
		4. Other	2	14.28
		Total	14	100.00

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
AA_3	Average age of marriage for males in this community	n = 15      Range 18 - 36	M = 26.20	SD = 5.23
AA_4	Average age of marriage for females in this community	n = 15      Range 14 - 27	M = 19.47	SD = 4.58
<b>A.B community POPULATION</b>				
AB_1	Number of people living in this community	n = 15      Range 2500 - 30000	M = 8770.47	SD = 8945.11
AB_2	Change in community population in the past five years	1. Increased 2. Decreased 3. Remained the same <b>Total</b>	13 2 0 <b>15</b>	86.67 13.33 0.00 <b>100.00</b>
AB_3	Number of people with which the community population changed in the past five years	n = 14      Range -88 - 9144	M = 1547.36	SD = 2362.88
AB_4a	Main reason (1) for increase, decrease or lack of change in community population	1. Birth rate increased 2. No family planning is used 3. Death due to diseases (HIV/AIDS) 4. Good living standards 5. Employment opportunities 6. Internal migration 7. International migration <b>Total</b>	6 1 1 1 1 2 2 <b>14</b>	42.86 7.14 7.14 7.14 7.14 14.29 14.29 <b>100.00</b>
AB_4b	Main reason (2) for increase, decrease or lack of change in community population	1. No family planning is used 2. Death rate decreased 3. Married early 4. Increase in living costs 5. Migration 6. Migrants returned 7. Lack of knowledge 8. Other <b>Total</b>	2 1 1 1 3 1 1 2 <b>12</b>	16.67 8.33 8.33 8.33 25.00 8.33 8.33 16.67 <b>100.00</b>
AB_5	Number of households run by females only	n = 15      Range 67 - 800	M = 372.93	SD = 293.97
AB_6	Number of households run by children younger than 18 only	n = 13      Range 0 - 907	M = 169.77	SD = 255.19

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
B. community ISSUES				
B_1a	Most important problem affecting this community	1. Crime/ theft	2	13.33
		2. Lack of water	3	20.00
		3. Lack of electricity	1	6.67
		4. Poor access to health care	0	0.00
		5. Poor access to education	0	0.00
		6. Bad transportation	0	0.00
		7. Traffic accidents	0	0.00
		8. Poor environment	1	6.67
		9. lack of employment opportunities	5	33.33
		10. Lack of available land	1	6.67
		11. Security/ conflict	0	0
		12. Corruption	0	0
		13. Waste disposal	0	0
		14. Other	2	13.33
			Total	15
B_1b	Second most important problem affecting this community	1. Crime/ theft	0	0.00
		2. Lack of water	2	13.33
		3. Lack of electricity	2	13.33
		4. Poor access to health care	1	6.67
		5. Poor access to education	0	0.00
		6. Bad transportation	1	6.67
		7. Traffic accidents	0	0.00
		8. Poor environment	1	6.67
		9. Lack of employment opportunities	3	20.00
		10. Lack of available land	2	13.33
		11. Security/ conflict	1	6.67
		12. Corruption	1	6.67
		13. Waste disposal	1	6.67
		14. Other	0	0
	Total	15	100.00	

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
<b>B_1c</b>	Third most important problem affecting this community	1. Crime/ theft 2. Lack of water 3. Lack of electricity 4. Poor access to health care 5. Poor access to education 6. Bad transportation 7. Traffic accidents 8. Poor environment 9. Lack of employment opportunities  10. Lack of available land 11. Security/ conflict 12. Corruption 13. Waste disposal 14. Other <b>Total</b>	1 0 2 1 0 2 0 1 0  2 2 0 1 3 <b>15</b>	6.667 0.00 13.33 6.67 0.00 13.33 0.00 6.67 0.00  13.33 13.33 0.00 6.67 20.00 <b>100.00</b>
<b>C. INFRASTRUCTURE</b>				
<b>C.A. ROADS AND TRANSPORTATION</b>				
<b>CA_1b</b>	Main route that people take to reach this community during rainy season	1. Paved road 2. Dirt road 3. Mixed paved and dirt road 4. Footpath 5. Horse trail	8 0 5 2 0	53.33 0.00 33.33 13.33 0.00

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		6. River/ sea	0	0.00
		7. Other	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>CA_1</b> <b>c</b>	Main route that people take to reach this community during dry season	1. Paved road	8	53.33
		2. Dirt road	0	0.00
		3. Mixed paved and dirt road	5	33.33
		4. Footpath	2	13.33
		5. Horse trail	0	0.00
		6. River/ sea	0	0.00
		7. Other	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>CA_2</b> <b>b</b>	Rating roads to reach this community during rainy season	1. Very bad	2	13.33
		2. Bad	3	20.00
		3. Medium	3	20.00
		4. Good	5	33.33
		5. Very good	2	13.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>CA_2</b> <b>c</b>	Rating of roads to reach this community during dry season	1. Very bad	0	0.00
		2. Bad	2	13.33
		3. Medium	6	40.00
		4. Good	5	33.33
		5. Very good	2	13.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>CA_3</b>	Change of roads to this community in the past five years	1. Worsened a lot	0	0.00
		2. Worsened	1	6.67
		3. Stayed the same	1	6.67
		4. Improved	9	60.00
		5. Improved a lot	4	26.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>C.B WATER, SANITATION, ELECTRICITY</b>				
<b>CB_1</b> <b>_1</b>	Availability of electricity in the community	1. Yes, functional	9	60.00
		2. Yes, but not functional	2	13.33
		3. No	4	26.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>CB_1</b> <b>_2</b>	Availability of public lighting in the community	1. Yes, functional	6	40.00
		2. Yes, but not functional	2	13.33
		3. No	7	46.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
CB_1_3	Availability of piped water in the community	1. Yes, functional	9	64.29
		2. Yes, but not functional	2	14.29
		3. No	3	21.43
		Total	14	100.00
CB_1_4	Availability of sewage/ drains in the community	1. Yes, functional	5	33.33
		2. Yes, but not functional	1	6.67
		3. No	9	60.00
		Total	15	100.00
CB_1_5	Availability of garbage collection in the community	1. Yes, functional	7	53.85
		2. Yes, but not functional	1	7.69
		3. No	5	38.46
		Total	13	100.00
CB_2_1	Quality of electricity in the community	1. Very poor	2	20.00
		2. Poor	0	0.00
		3. Medium	1	10.00
		4. Good	5	50.00
		5. Very good	2	20.00
		Total	10	100.00
CB_2_2	Quality of public lighting in the community	1. Very poor	2	28.57
		2. Poor	1	14.29
		3. Medium	1	14.29
		4. Good	2	28.57
		5. Very good	1	14.29
		Total	7	100.00
CB_2_3	Quality of piped water in the community	1. Very poor	2	18.18
		2. Poor	1	9.09
		3. Medium	2	18.18
		4. Good	5	45.45
		5. Very good	1	9.09
		Total	11	100.00
CB_2_4	Quality of sewage/ drains in the community	1. Very poor	1	20.00
		2. Poor	0	0.00
		3. Medium	2	40.00
		4. Good	2	40.00
		5. Very good	0	0.00
		Total	5	100.00
CB_2_5	Quality of garbage collection in the community	1. Very poor	0	0.00
		2. Poor	1	14.29
		3. Medium	3	42.86
		4. Good	1	14.29
		5. Very good	2	28.57
		Total	5	100.00

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
CB_3_1	Portion of the community covered by electricity	1. Almost no community members	1	10.00
		2. Less than half of the community	1	10.00
		3. Around half of the community members	0	0.00
		4. More than half of the community members	3	30.00
		5. Almost all community members	5	50.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100.00</b>
CB_3_2	Portion of the community covered by public lighting	1. Almost no community members	0	0.00
		2. Less than half of the community	4	57.14
		3. Around half of the community members	0	0.00
		4. More than half of the community members	0	0.00
		5. Almost all community members	3	42.86
		<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100.00</b>
CB_3_3	Portion of the community covered by piped water	1. Almost no community members	1	9.09
		2. Less than half of the community	4	36.36
		3. Around half of the community members	1	9.09
		4. More than half of the community members	2	18.18
		5. Almost all community members	3	27.27
		<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100.00</b>
CB_3_4	Portion of the community covered by sewage/ drains	1. Almost no community members	0	0.00
		2. Less than half of the community members	2	40.00
		3. Around half of the community members	1	20.00
		4. More than half of the community members	0	0.00
		5. Almost all community members	2	40.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100.00</b>
CB_3_5	Portion of the community covered by garbage collection	1. Almost no community members	0	0.00
		2. Less than half of the community members	2	28.57
		3. Around half of the community members	1	14.29
		4. More than half of the community members	1	14.29
		5. Almost all community members	3	42.86
		<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100.00</b>



Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
CB_4_1	Change in electricity in the past five years	1. Worsened a lot	1	6.67
		2. Worsened	0	0.00
		3. Stayed the same	7	46.67
		4. Improved	6	40.00
		5. Improved a lot	1	6.67
		Total	15	100.00
CB_4_2	Change in public lighting in the past five years	1. Worsened a lot	0	0.00
		2. Worsened	0	0.00
		3. Stayed the same	7	53.85
		4. Improved	5	38.46
		5. Improved a lot	1	7.69
		Total	13	100.00
CB_4_3	Change in piped water in the past five years	1. Worsened a lot	1	7.69
		2. Worsened	2	15.38
		3. Stayed the same	3	23.08
		4. Improved	6	46.15
		5. Improved a lot	1	7.69
		Total	13	100.00
CB_4_4	Change in sewage/ drains in the past five years	1. Worsened a lot	1	7.69
		2. Worsened	1	7.69
		3. Stayed the same	5	38.46
		4. Improved	6	46.15
		5. Improved a lot	0	0.00
		Total	13	100.00
CB_4_5	Change in garbage collection in the past five years	1. Worsened a lot	1	8.33
		2. Worsened	0	0.00
		3. Stayed the same	5	41.67
		4. Improved	5	41.67
		5. Improved a lot	1	8.33
		Total	12	100.00
C.C HOUSING AND LAND				
CC_1	Rating of availability of housing in this community	1. Very poor	5	33.33
		2. Poor	6	40.00
		3. Medium	2	13.33
		4. Good	2	13.33
		5. Very good	0	0.00
		Total	15	100.00
CC_2	Change in availability of housing in the past five years	1. Worsened a lot	6	40.00
		2. Worsened	0	0.00
		3. Stayed the same	2	13.33
		4. Improved	7	46.67

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		5. Improved a lot	0	0.00
		Total	15	100.00
CC_3	Rating of availability of land in this community	1. Very poor	11	73.33
		2. Poor	3	20.00
		3. Medium	0	0.00
		4. Good	1	6.67
		5. Very good	0	0.00
		Total	15	100.00
CC_4	Change in availability of land in the past five years	1. Worsened a lot	9	60.00
		2. Worsened	1	6.67
		3. Stayed the same	3	20.00
		4. Improved	2	13.33
		5. Improved a lot	0	0.00
		Total	15	100.00
C. D FACILITIES				
CD_1_1	Presence of a health centre/ clinic in this community	1. Yes	11	73.33
		3. No	4	26.67
		Total	15	100.00
CD_2_1	Number of households having access to a health centre/ clinic	1. Almost no households	2	18.18
		2. Less than half of the households	4	36.36
		3. Around half of the households	0	0.00
		4. More than half of the households	2	18.18
		5. Almost all households	3	27.27
		Total	11	100.00
CD_3_1	Reason why some people do not have access to health centre/ clinic	1.Income level	1	11.11
		2. Occupation	0	0.00
		3. Social status (class)	0	0.00
		4. Age	0	0.00
		5. Gender	1	11.11
		6. Race/ ethnicity	0	0.00
		7. Language	0	0.00
		8. Religious beliefs	0	0.00
		9. This service does not have enough	2	22.22
		10. Other	1	11.11
		Not applicable	4	44.44
		Total	9	100.00
CD_4a_1	Time (hours) to reach a health centre/clinic if it is not available in this community	n = 5                      Range 0 - 3	M =1.60	SD = 1.34
CD_4b_1	Time (minutes) to reach a health centre/ clinic if it not available in this community	n = 5                      Range 0 - 30	M = 18.00	SD = 16.43

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
<b>CD_5_1</b>	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	7 0 0 0	100.00 0.00 0.00 0.00
		5. By bus 6. By taxi 7. By boat 8 Other <b>Total</b>	0 0 0 0 <b>7</b>	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 <b>100.00</b>
<b>CD_1_2</b>	Presence of a hospital in this community	1. Yes 2. No <b>Total</b>	4 10 <b>14</b>	28.57 71.43 <b>100.00</b>
<b>CD_2_2</b>	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 <b>Total</b>	1 1 0 1 3 <b>6</b>	16.67 16.67 0.00 16.67 50.00 <b>100.00</b>
<b>CD_3_2</b>	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 Not applicable <b>Total</b>	1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 <b>5</b>	20.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 20.00 60.00 <b>100.00</b>
<b>CD_4a_2</b>	Time (hours) to reach a hospital if it is not available in this community	n = 8      Range 0 - 82	M = 11.88	SD = 28.35
<b>CD_4b_2</b>	Time (minutes) to reach a hospital if it is not available in this community	n= 9      Range 0 - 30	M = 23.89	SD = 12.19
<b>CD_5_2</b>	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	9 1 0 0 0	81.82 9.09 0.00 0.00 0.00

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		6. By taxi	1	9.09
		7. By boat	0	0.00
		8 Other	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>CD_1_3</b>	Presence of a pharmacy in this community	1. Yes	7	46.67
		2. No	8	53.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>CD_2_3</b>	Number of households having access to a pharmacy	1. Almost no households	2	28.57
		2. Less than half of the households	1	14.29
		3. Around half of the households	0	0.00
		4. More than half of the households	1	14.29
		5. Almost all households	3	42.86
		<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>CD_3_3</b>	Reasons why some people do not have access to a pharmacy	1. Income level	1	20.00
		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
		Not applicable	4	80.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>CD_4a_3</b>	Time (hours) to reach a pharmacy if it is not available in this community	n = 8      Range 0 - 82	M = 11.88	SD = 28.37
<b>CD_4b_3</b>	Time (minutes) to reach a pharmacy if it is not available in this community	n = 7      Range 0 - 30	M = 22.14	SD = 13.50
<b>CD_5_3</b>	Type of transportation to reach a pharmacy if it is not available in this community	1. On foot	9	90.00
		2. By horse/ mule/ donkey	1	10.00
		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
		<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
CD_1	Presence of a pre-school in this community	1. Yes	8	57.14
		2. No	6	42.86
		Total	14	100.00
CD_2	Number of households having access to a pre-school	1. Almost no households	1	12.50
		2. Less than half of the households	3	37.50
		3. Around half of the households	0	0.00
		4. More than half of the households	1	12.50
		5. Almost all households	3	37.50
		Total	8	100.00
CD_3_4	Reasons why some people do not have access to a pre-school	1.Income level	1	14.29
		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	1	14.29
		7. Language	0	0.00
		8. Religious beliefs	0	0.00
		9. This service does not have enough	2	28.57
		10. Other	0	0.00
		Not applicable	3	42.86
		Total	7	100.00
CD_4a_4	Time (hours) to reach a pre-school if it is not available in this community	n = 6      Range 0 - 82	M = 14.67	SD = 32.99
CD_4b_4	Time (minutes) to reach a pre-school if it not available in this community	n = 6      Range 5 - 30	M = 20.00	SD = 11.40
CD_5_4	Type of transportation to reach a pre-school if it is not available in this community	1. On foot	7	87.50
		2. By horse/ mule/ donkey	1	12.50
		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	8	100.00
CD_1_5	Presence of a primary school in this community	1. Yes	12	85.71
		2. No	2	14.29
		Total	14	100.00

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
CD_2	Number of households having access to a primary school	1. Almost no households	1	7.69
		2. Less than half of the households	2	15.38
		3. Around half of the households	0	0.00
		4. More than half of the households	0	0.00
		5. Almost all households	10	76.92
		<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100.00</b>
CD_3	Reasons why some people do not have access to a primary school	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	1	10.00
		10. Other	2	20.00
		Not applicable	7	70.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100.00</b>
CD_4a_5	Time (hours) to reach a primary school if it is not available in this community	n = 1      Range 0 - 0	M = 0	SD = 0
CD_4b_5	Time (minutes) to reach a primary school if it is not available in this community	n = 3      Range 10 - 15	M = 13.33	SD = 2.89
CD_5_5	Type of transportation to reach a primary school if it is not available in this community	1. On foot	5	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
		<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100.00</b>
CD_1_6	Presence of a secondary school in this community	1. Yes	4	30.77
		2. No	9	69.23
		<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
CD_2_6	Number of households having access to a secondary school	1. Almost no households	0	0.00
		2. Less than half of the households	2	40.00
		3. Around half of the households	0	0.00
		4. More than half of the households	0	0.00
		5. Almost all households	3	60.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100.00</b>
CD_3_6	Reasons why some people do not have access to a secondary school	1. Income level	1	20.00
		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	2	40.00
		Not applicable	2	40.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100.00</b>
CD_4a_6	Time (hours) to reach a secondary school if it is not available in this community	n = 7      Range 1 - 3	M = 1.43	SD = 0.79
CD_4b_6	Time (minutes) to reach a secondary school if it is not available in this community	n = 10      Range 0 - 30	M = 15.00	SD = 14.14
CD_5_6	Type of transportation to reach a secondary school if it is not available in this community	1. On foot	10	90.91
		2. By horse/ mule/ donkey	1	9.09
		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
		<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100.00</b>
CD_1_7	Presence of water distribution in this community	1. Yes	10	66.67
		2. No	5	33.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
CD_2_7	Number of households having access to water distribution	1. Almost no households	2	20.00
		2. Less than half of the households	3	30.00
		3. Around half of the households	0	0.00
		4. More than half of the households	0	0.00
		5. Almost all households	5	50.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100.00</b>
CD_3_7	Reasons why some people do not have access to water distribution	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	1	14.29
		7. Language	0	0.00
		8. Religious beliefs	0	0.00
		9. This service does not have enough capacity	1	14.29
		10. Other	1	14.29
		Not applicable	4	57.14
		<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100.00</b>
CD_4a_7	Time (hours) to reach water distribution if it is not available in this community	n = 3      Range 0 - 1	M = 0.67	SD = 0.58
CD_4b_7	Time (minutes) to reach water distribution if it is not available in this community	n = 4      Range 10 - 30	M = 25.00	SD = 10.00
CD_5_7	Type of transportation to reach water distribution if it is not available in this community	1. On foot	6	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
		<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100.00</b>
CD_1_8	Presence of a market on this community	1. Yes	6	50.00
		2. No	6	50.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100.00</b>
CD_2_8	Number of households having access to a market	1. Almost no households	2	33.33
		2. Less than half of the households	0	0.00
		3. Around half of the households	0	0.00
		4. More than half of the households	0	0.00
		5. Almost all households	4	66.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100.00</b>



Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
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	0	0.00
		10. Other	0	0.00
		Not applicable	4	100.00
	Total	4	100.00	
CD_4a_8	Time (hours) to reach a market if it is not available in this community	n = 5      Range 1 - 2	M = 1.40	SD = 0.55
CD_4b_8	Time (minutes) to reach a market if it is not available in this community	n = 5      Range 0 - 30	M = 15.00	SD = 15.00
CD_5_8	Type of transportation to reach a market if it is not available in this community	1. On foot	7	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	7	100.00	
CD_1_9	Presence of public transportation in this community	1. Yes	10	71.43
		2. No	4	28.57
		Total	14	100.00
CD_2_9	Number of households having access to public transportation	1. Almost no households	2	20.00
		2. Less than half of the households	2	20.00
		3. Around half of the households	1	10.00
		4. More than half of the households	1	10.00
		5. Almost all households	4	40.00
		Total	10	100.00
CD_3_9	Reasons why some people do not have access to public transportation	1.Income level	2	25.00
		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	1	12.50
		7. Language	0	0.00
		8. Religious beliefs	0	0.00
		9. This service does not have enough capacity	1	12.50

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		10. Other	0	0.00
		Not applicable	4	50.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>CD_4a_9</b>	Time (hours) to reach public transportation if it is not available in this community	n = 5      Range 1 - 10	M = 3.4	SD = 3.91
<b>CD_4b_9</b>	Time (minutes) to reach public transportation if it is not available in this community	n = 6      Range 0 - 45	M = 19.17	SD = 18.55
<b>CD_5_9</b>	Type of transportation to reach public transportation 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 <b>Total</b>	6 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 <b>7</b>	85.71 14.29 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 <b>100.00</b>
<b>CD_1_10</b>	Presence of a public phone in this community	1. Yes 2. No <b>Total</b>	9 5 <b>14</b>	64.29 35.71 <b>100.00</b>
<b>CD_2_10</b>	Number of households having access to a public phone	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 <b>Total</b>	2 2 0 1 4 <b>9</b>	22.22 22.22 0.00 11.11 44.44 <b>100.00</b>
<b>CD_3_10</b>	Reasons why some people do not have access to a public phone	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 Not applicable <b>Total</b>	0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 2 3 <b>6</b>	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 16.67 0.00 0.00 0.00 33.33 50.00 <b>100.00</b>

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
CD_4a_10	Time (hours) to reach a public phone if it is not available in this community	n = 6      Range 0 - 2	M = 1.17	SD = 0.75
CD_4b_10	Time (minutes) to reach a public phone if it is not available in this community	n = 7      Range 0 - 30	M = 19.29	SD = 13.67
CD_5_10	Type of transportation to reach a public phone 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 <b>Total</b>	7 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 <b>8</b>	87.50 12.50 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 <b>100.00</b>
CD_1_11	Presence of an internet café/ connection in this community	1. Yes 2. No <b>Total</b>	5 8 <b>13</b>	38.46 61.54 <b>100.00</b>
CD_2_11	Number of households having access to an internet café/ connection	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 <b>Total</b>	2 0 0 1 3 <b>6</b>	33.33 0.00 0.00 16.67 50.00 <b>100.00</b>
CD_3_11	Reasons why some people do not have access to an internet café/ connection	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 Not applicable <b>Total</b>	0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 3 <b>5</b>	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 20.00 0.00 0.00 40.00 20.00 60.00 <b>100.00</b>
CD_4a_11	Time (hours) to reach an internet café/connection if it is not available in this community	n = 7      Range 0 - 3	M = 1.57	SD = 0.98
CD_4b_11	Time (minutes) to reach an internet café/connection if it is not available in this community	n = 8      Range 0 - 30	M = 21.88	SD = 12.52

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
CD_5_11	Type of transportation to reach an internet café/connection if it is not available in this community	1. On foot	8	88.89
		2. By horse/ mule/ donkey	1	11.11
		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
		<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100.00</b>
CD_1_12	Presence of a post office in this community	1. Yes	4	30.77
		2. No	9	69.23
		<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100.00</b>
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	0	0.00
		4. More than half of the households	1	20.00
		5. Almost all households	4	80.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100.00</b>
CD_3_12	Reasons why some people do not have access to a post office	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	0	0.00
		10. Other	2	50.00
		Not applicable	2	50.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.00</b>
CD_4a_12	Time (hours) to reach a post office if it is not available in this community	n = 8      Range 0 - 4	M = 1.88	1.36
CD_4b_12	Time (minutes) to reach a post office if it is not available in this community	n = 9      Range 0 - 30	M = 14.11	SD = 13.86
CD_5_12	Type of transportation to reach a post office if it is not available in this community	1. On foot	10	90.91
		2. By horse/ mule/ donkey	1	9.09
		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

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		8 Other	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100.00</b>
CD_1_13	Presence of a bank in this community	1. Yes	4	26.67
		2. No	11	73.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
CD_2_13	Number of households having access to a bank	1. Almost no households	1	16.67
		2. Less than half of the households	0	0.00
		3. Around half of the households	1	16.67
		4. More than half of the households	1	16.67
		5. Almost all households	3	50.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100.00</b>
CD_3_13	Reasons why some people do not have access to a bank	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	0	0.00
		10. Other	2	40.00
		Not applicable	3	60.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100.00</b>
CD_4a_13	Time (hours) to reach a bank if it is not available in this community	n = 9      Range 0 - 4	M = 1.56	SD = 1.33
CD_4b_13	Time (minutes) to reach a bank if it is not available in this community	n = 10      Range 2 - 38	M = 26.50	SD = 10.28
CD_5_13	Type of transportation to reach a bank if it is not available in this community	1. On foot	10	90.91
		2. By horse/ mule/ donkey	1	9.09
		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
		<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100.00</b>
CD_1_14	Presence of a mto in this community	1. Yes	3	21.43
		2. No	11	78.57
		<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100.00</b>
CD_2_14	Number of households having access to a money transfer operator	1. Almost no households	0	0.00
		2. Less than half of the households	1	20.00

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		3. Around half of the households	0	0.00
		4. More than half of the households	1	20.00
		5. Almost all households	3	60.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>CD_3_14</b>	Reasons why some people do not have access to a mto	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	0	0.00
		10. Other	2	40.00
		Not applicable	3	60.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>CD_4a_14</b>	Time (hours) to reach a mto if it is not available in this community	n = 9      Range 0 - 4	M = 1.67	SD = 1.32
<b>CD_4b_14</b>	Time (minutes) to reach a mto if it is not available in this community	n = 10      Range 0 - 38	M = 23.50	SD = 13.13
<b>CD_5_14</b>	Type of transportation to reach a mto if it is not available in this community	1. On foot	10	90.91
		2. By horse/ mule/ donkey	1	9.09
		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
		<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>CD_1_15</b>	presence of a mfi in this community	1. Yes	7	50.00
		2. No	7	50.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>C_2_15</b>	Number of households having access to a Micro-finance institution	1. Almost no households	0	0.00
		2. Less than half of the households	1	12.50
		3. Around half of the households	1	12.50
		4. More than half of the households	2	25.00
		5. Almost all households	4	50.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>CD_3_15</b>	Reasons why some people do not have access to a mfi	1. Income level	0	0.00
		2. Occupation	0	0.00
		3. Social status (class)	0	0.00

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		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	2	33.33
		Not applicable	4	66.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>CD_4a_15</b>	Time (hours) to reach a mfi if it is not available in this community	n = 6      Range 0 - 4	M = 1.67	SD = 1.51
<b>CD_4b_15</b>	Time (minutes) to reach a mfi if it is not available in this community	n = 7      Range 0- 30	M = 20.29	SD = 13.68
<b>CD_5_15</b>	Type of transportation to reach a mfi if it is not available in this community	1. On foot	7	87.50
		2. By horse/ mule/ donkey	1	12.50
		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
		<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>CD_1_1</b>	Presence of security / police services in this community	1. Yes	11	84.62
		2. No	2	15.38
		<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>C_2_1</b>	Number of households having access to security/police services	1. Almost no households	2	18.18
		2. Less than half of the households	3	27.27
		3. Around half of the households	0	0.00
		4. More than half of the households	0	0.00
		5. Almost all households	6	54.55
		<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
CD_3_16	Reasons why some people do not have access to security/ police services	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	1	11.11
		10. Other	1	11.11
	Not applicable	7	77.78	
		Total	9	100.00
CD_4a_16	Time (hours) to reach security/police services if it is not available in this community	n = 3                  Range 1 - 1	M = 1.00	SD = 0.00
CD_4b_16	Time (minutes) to reach security/police services if not available in this community	n = 4                  Range 0 - 30	M = 18.75	SD = 14.36
CD_5_16	Type of transportation to reach security/ police services if it is not available in this community	1. On foot	5	83.33
		2. By horse/ mule/ donkey	1	16.67
		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	6	100.00	
CD_1_17	Presence of preparatory school in this community	1. Yes	3	25.00
		2. No	9	75.00
		Total	12	100.00
C_2_17	Number of households having access to a preparatory school	1. Almost no households	0	0.00
		2. Less than half of the households	1	25.00
		3. Around half of the households	0	0.00
		4. More than half of the households	0	0.00
		5. Almost all households	3	75.00
		Total	4	100.00



Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
CD_3	Reasons why some people do not have access to a preparatory school	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	1	25.00
		10. Other	1	25.00
		Not applicable	2	50.00
	Total	4	100.00	
CD_4a_17	Time (hours) to reach a preparatoy school if it is not available in this community	n = 7            Range 0 - 3	M = 1.57	SD = 1.13
CD_4b_17	Time (minutes) to reach a preparatoy school if not available in this community	n = 9            Range 0 - 30	M = 19.44	SD = 13.33
CD_5_17	Type of transportation to reach a preparatory school if it is not available in this community	1. On foot	8	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	8	100.00
D. ECONOMIC SITUATION				
D.A ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES				
DA_1a	Most important economic activity for men in this community	1. Agriculture	7	46.67
		2. Cattle rearing	0	0.00
		3. Unskilled labour	4	26.67
		4. Skilled labour (business)	1	6.67
		5. Skilled labour (government)	2	13.33
		6. Skilled labour	1	6.67
		7. House work	0	0.00
		8. Unemployed/student	0	0.00
		9. Retired	0	0.00
		Total	15	100.00

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
DA_1b	Second most important economic activity for men in this community	1. Agriculture	0	0.00
		2. Cattle rearing	0	0.00
		3. Unskilled labour	2	14.29
		4. Skilled labour (business)	5	35.71
		5. Skilled labour (government)	4	28.57
		6. Skilled labour	3	21.43
		7. House work	0	0.00
		8. Unemployed/student	0	0.00
		9. Retired	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100.00</b>
DA_1c	Third most important economic activity for men in this community	1. Agriculture	0	0.00
		2. Cattle rearing	2	15.38
		3. Unskilled labour	7	53.85
		4. Skilled labour (business)	1	7.69
		5. Skilled labour (government)	1	7.69
		6. Skilled labour	1	7.69
		7. House work	0	0.00
		8. Unemployed/student	0	0.00
		9. Retired	1	7.69
		<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100.00</b>
DA_2a	Most important economic activity for women in this community	1. Agriculture	1	6.67
		2. Cattle rearing	0	0.00
		3. Unskilled labour	3	20.00
		4. Skilled labour (business)	3	20.00
		5. Skilled labour (government)	1	6.67
		6. Skilled labour	2	13.33
		7. House work	5	35.71
		8. Unemployed/student	0	0.00
		9. Retired	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
DA_2b	Second most important economic activity for women in this community	1. Agriculture	3	21.43
		2. Cattle rearing	0	0.00
		3. Unskilled labour	3	21.43
		4. Skilled labour (business)	5	35.71
		5. Skilled labour (government)	1	7.14
		6. Skilled labour	2	14.29
		7. House work	0	0.00
		8. Unemployed/student	0	0.00
		9. Retired	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100.00</b>
DA_2c	Third most important economic activity for women in this community	1. Agriculture	1	9.09
		2. Cattle rearing	2	18.18
		3. Unskilled labour	5	45.45
		4. Skilled labour (business)	2	18.18
		5. Skilled labour (government)	0	0.00
		6. Skilled labour	1	9.09

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		7. House work	0	0.00
		8. Unemployed/student	0	0.00
		9. Retired	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>DA_3a</b>	Most important economic activity for children aged below 12 in this community	1. Agriculture	1	8.33
		2. Cattle rearing	4	33.33
		3. Unskilled labour	4	33.33
		4. Skilled labour (business)	0	0.00
		5. Skilled labour (government)	0	0.00
		6. Skilled labour	2	16.67
		7. House work	0	0.00
		8. Unemployed/student	1	8.33
		9. Retired	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>DA_3b</b>	Second most important economic activity for children aged below 12 in this community	1. Agriculture	1	14.29
		2. Cattle rearing	0	0.00
		3. Unskilled labour	4	57.14
		4. Skilled labour (business)	0	0.00
		5. Skilled labour (government)	0	0.00
		6. Skilled labour	1	14.29
		7. House work	1	14.29
		8. Unemployed/student	0	0.00
		9. Retired	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>DA_3c</b>	Third most important economic activity for children aged below 12 in this community	1. Agriculture	1	9.09
		2. Cattle rearing	2	18.18
		3. Unskilled labour	5	45.45
		4. Skilled labour (business)	2	18.18
		5. Skilled labour (government)	0	0.00
		6. Skilled labour	1	9.09
		7. House work	0	0.00
		8. Unemployed/student	0	0.00
		9. Retired	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>DA_4a</b>	Most important economic activity for children aged between 12 and 18 in this community	1. Agriculture	4	30.77
		2. Cattle rearing	1	7.69
		3. Unskilled labour	5	38.46
		4. Skilled labour (business)	0	0.00
		5. Skilled labour (government)	0	0.00
		6. Skilled labour	3	23.08
		7. House work	0	0.00
		8. Unemployed/student	0	0.00
		9. Retired	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
DA_4b	Second most important economic activity for children aged between 12 and 18 in this community	1. Agriculture	2	20.00
		2. Cattle rearing	0	0.00
		3. Unskilled labour	5	50.00
		4. Skilled labour (business)	1	10.00
		5. Skilled labour (government)	0	0.00
		6. Skilled labour	2	20.00
		7. House work	0	0.00
		8. Unemployed/student	0	0.00
		9. Retired	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100.00</b>
DA_4c	Third most important economic activity for children aged between 12 and 18 in this community	1. Agriculture	2	28.58
		2. Cattle rearing	0	0.00
		3. Unskilled labour	5	71.43
		4. Skilled labour (business)	0	0.00
		5. Skilled labour (government)	0	0.00
		6. Skilled labour	0	0.00
		7. House work	0	0.00
		8. Unemployed/student	0	0.00
		9. Retired	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100.00</b>

**D.B WORKING AGE**

DB_1	Average age at which males start working full time	n = 15      Range 6 - 25	M = 16.67	SD = 4.94
DB_2	Average age at which females start working full time	n = 15      Range 5 - 23	M = 15.00	SD = 4.90
DB_3	Number of males younger than 18 that are currently engaged in paid	1. Almost none	6	42.86
		2. Less than half of them	8	57.14
		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
		<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100.00</b>
DB_4	Number of females younger than 18 that are currently engaged in paid employment	1. Almost none	7	53.85
		2. Less than half of them	6	46.15
		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
		<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100.00</b>
DB_5	Number of males younger than 12 that are currently engaged in paid employment	1. Almost none	13	92.86
		2. Less than half of them	1	7.14
		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
		<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
DB_6	Number of females younger than 12 that are currently engaged in paid employment	1. Almost none	14	100.00
		2. Less than half of them	0	0.00
		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	14	100.00
D. C. EMPLOYMENT				
DC_1	Rating of availability of employment in this community	1. Very low	7	46.67
		2. Low	5	33.33
		3. Medium	1	6.67
		4. High	2	13.33
		5. Very high	0	0.00
		Total	15	100.00
DC_2	Change of availability of employment in the past five years	1. Worsened a lot	5	33.33
		2. Worsened	0	0.00
		3. Stayed the same	2	13.33
		4. Improved	8	53.33
		5. Improved a lot	0	0.00
		Total	15	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	3	20.00
		2. They are finding it difficult	4	26.67
		3. They are coping (neutral)	6	40.00
		4. They are living comfortably	2	13.33
		5. They are living very comfortably	0	0.00
		Total	15	100.00
DD_2	Living conditions in this community compared to neighbouring communitys	1. Much worse than in other communitys	1	6.67
		2. Worse than in other communitys	2	13.33
		3. The same as in other communitys	7	46.67
		4. Better than in other communitys	5	33.33
		5. Much better than in other communitys	0	0.00
		Total	15	100.00
DD_3	Change in living conditions in this community compared to five years ago	1. Worsened a lot	3	20.00
		2. Worsened	2	13.33
		3. Stayed the same	3	20.00
		4. Improved	6	40.00
		5. Improved a lot	1	6.67
		Total	15	100.00

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
<b>D.E DIFFERENCES BETWEEN community MEMBERS</b>				
<b>DE_1_1</b>	Differences in education	1. Not at all	3	20.00
		2. A little bit	4	26.67
		3. Somewhat	1	6.67
		4. Much	3	20.00
		5. Very much	4	26.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>DE_1_2</b>	Differences in wealth/ material possessions	1. Not at all	5	33.33
		2. A little bit	2	13.33
		3. Somewhat	3	20.00
		4. Much	2	13.33
		5. Very much	3	20.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>DE_1_3</b>	Differences in landholdings	1. Not at all	5	33.33
		2. A little bit	1	6.67
		3. Somewhat	0	0.00
		4. Much	3	20.00
		5. Very much	6	40.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>DE_1_4</b>	Differences in social status (class)	1. Not at all	6	40.00
		2. A little bit	3	20.00
		3. Somewhat	4	26.67
		4. Much	0	0.00
		5. Very Much	2	13.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>DE_1_5</b>	Differences in employment	1. Not at all	6	40.00
		2. A little bit	1	6.67
		3. Somewhat	1	6.67
		4. Much	4	26.67
		5. Very much	3	20.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>

<b>DE_1_6</b>	Differences in food security	1. Not at all	2	13.33
		2. A little bit	3	20.00
		3. Somewhat	5	33.33
		4. Much	3	20.00

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		5. Very much	2	13.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>DE_1_7</b>	Differences in religion	1. Not at all	6	40.00
		2. A little bit	5	33.33
		3. Somewhat	2	13.33
		4. Much	0	0.00
		5. Very much	2	13.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>DE_1_8</b>	Differences in ethnicity	Not at all	8	53.33
		A little bit	2	13.33
		Somewhat	2	13.33
		Much	1	6.67
		Very much	2	13.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>DE_2</b>	Number of different ethnic groups living in this community	n = 10      Range 2 - 9	M = 4.3	
<b>DE_3</b>	Relative size of the ethnic groups living in this community	1. One group is significantly larger than the other(s)	9	81.82
		2. One group is a little bit larger than	2	18.18
		3. All groups are more or less the same size	0	0.00
		4. Other	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>DE_4</b>	Relationships between people from different ethnic groups in this community	1. Bad	0	0.00
		2. Neutral	0	0.00
		3. Good	6	50.00
		4. Very good	6	50.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>E. SHOCKS</b>				
<b>Environmental/ ecological shocks</b>				
<b>E_1_1</b>	Shocks in the past five years - drought	1. Yes	6	40.00
		2. No	9	60.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>E_1_1_20</b>	Drought in 2006	1. Yes	3	50.00
		2. No	3	50.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>E_1_1_20</b>	Drought in 2007	1. Yes	2	33.33
		2. No	4	66.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
E_1_1_20	Drought in 2008	1. Yes	4	66.67
		2. No	2	33.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100.00</b>
E_1_1_20	Drought in 2009	1. Yes	4	66.67
		2. No	2	33.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100.00</b>
E_1_1_20	Drought in 2010	1. Yes	2	33.33
		2. No	4	66.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100.00</b>
E_1_2	Shocks in the past five years - too much rain or flood	1. Yes	5	33.33
		2. No	10	66.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
E_1_2_20	Too much rain or flood in 2006	1. Yes	1	20.00
		2. No	4	80.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100.00</b>
E_1_2_20	Too much rain or flood in 2007	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	5	100.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100.00</b>
E_1_2_20	Too much rain or flood in 2008	1. Yes	2	40.00
		2. No	3	60.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100.00</b>
E_1_2_20	Too much rain or flood in 2009	1. Yes	1	20.00
		2. No	4	80.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100.00</b>
E_1_2_20	Too much rain or flood in 2010	1. Yes	3	60.00
		2. No	2	40.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100.00</b>
E_1_3	Shocks in the past five years - pests or diseases that affected crops or livestock	1. Yes	2	13.33
		2. No	13	86.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
E_1_3_20	Pests or diseases in 2006	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	2	100.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100.00</b>
E_1_3_20	Pests or diseases in 2007	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	2	100.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100.00</b>



Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
E_1_3_20	Pests or diseases in 2008	1. Yes	1	50.00
		2. No	1	50.00
		Total	2	100.00
E_1_3_20	Pests or diseases in 2009	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	2	100.00
		Total	2	100.00
E_1_3_20	Pests or diseases in 2010	1. Yes	1	50.00
		2. No	1	50.00
		Total	2	100.00
Economic/ market shocks				
E_1_4	Shocks in the past five years - very low business/ agricultural return	1. Yes	6	40.00
		2. No	9	60.00
		Total	15	100.00
E_1_4_20	Very low business/ agricultural return in 2006	1. Yes	3	50.00
		2. No	3	50.00
		Total	6	100.00
E_1_4_20	Very low business/ agricultural return in 2007	1. Yes	3	50.00
		2. No	3	50.00
		Total	6	100.00
E_1_4_20	Very low business/ agricultural return in 2008	1. Yes	4	66.67
		2. No	2	33.33
		Total	6	100.00
E_1_4_20	Very low business/ agricultural return in 2009	1. Yes	3	50.00
		2. No	3	50.00
		Total	6	100.00
E_1_4_20	Very low business/ agricultural return in 2010	1. Yes	3	50.00
		2. No	3	50.00
		Total	6	100.00
E_1_5	Shocks in the past five years - large increase consumption goods prices	1. Yes	12	80.00
		2. No	3	20.00
		Total	15	100.00
E_1_5_20	Large increase consumption goods prices in 2006	1. Yes	2	16.67
		2. No	12	83.33
		Total	12	100.00
E_1_5_20	Large increase consumption goods prices in 2007	1. Yes	3	25.00
		2. No	9	75.00
		Total	12	100.00

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
E_1_5_20	Large increase consumption goods prices in 2008	1. Yes	5	41.67
		2. No	7	58.33
		Total	12	100.00
E_1_5_20	Large increase consumption goods prices in 2009	1. Yes	9	75.00
		2. No	3	25.00
		Total	12	100.00
E_1_5_20	Large increase consumption goods prices in 2010	1. Yes	11	91.67
		2. No	1	8.33
		Total	12	100.00
E_1_6	Shocks in the past five years - land distribution	1. Yes	1	6.67
		2. No	14	93.33
		Total	15	100.00
E_1_6_20	Land distribution in 2006	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	1	100.00
		Total	1	100.00
E_1_6_20	Land distribution in 2007	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	1	100.00
		Total	1	100.00
E_1_6_20	Land distribution in 2008	1. Yes	1	100.00
		2. No	0	0.00
		Total	1	100.00
E_1_6_20	Land distribution in 2009	1. Yes	1	100.00
		2. No	0	0.00
		Total	1	100.00
E_1_6_20	Land distribution in 2010	1. Yes	1	100.00
		2. No	0	0.00
		Total	1	100.00
E_1_7	Shocks in the past five years - confiscation of assets	1. Yes	1	6.67
		2. No	14	93.33
		Total	15	100.00
E_1_7_20	Confiscation of assets in 2006	1. Yes	1	100.00
		2. No	0	0.00
		Total	1	100.00
E_1_7_20	Confiscation of assets in 2007	1. Yes	1	100.00
		2. No	0	0.00
		Total	1	100.00

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
E_1_7_20	Confiscation of assets in 2008	1. Yes	1	100.00
		2. No	0	0.00
		Total	1	100.00
E_1_7_20	Confiscation of assets in 2009	1. Yes	1	100.00
		2. No	0	0.00
		Total	1	100.00
E_1_7_20	Confiscation of assets in 2010	1. Yes	1	100.00
		2. No	0	0.00
		Total	1	100.00
Theft/ crime				
E_1_8	Shocks in the past five years - large-scale theft of crops or livestock	1. Yes	1	6.67
		2. No	14	93.33
		Total	15	100.00
E_1_8_20	Large-scale theft of crops or livestock in 2006	1. Yes	1	100.00
		2. No	0	0.00
		Total	1	100.00
E_1_8_20	Large-scale theft of crops or livestock in 2007	1. Yes	1	100.00
		2. No	0	0.00
		Total	1	100.00
E_1_8_20	Large-scale theft of crops or livestock in 2008	1. Yes	1	100.00
		2. No	0	0.00
		Total	1	100.00
E_1_8_20	Large-scale theft of crops or livestock in 2009	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	1	100.00
		Total	1	100.00
E_1_8_20	Large-scale theft of crops or livestock in 2010	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	1	100.00
		Total	1	100.00
E_1_9	Shocks in the past five years - large-scale theft or destruction of housing	1. Yes	1	6.67
		2. No	14	93.33
		Total	15	100.00
E_1_9_20	Large-scale theft or destruction of housing in 2006	1. Yes	1	100.00
		2. No	0	0.00
		Total	1	100.00
E_1_9_20	Large-scale theft or destruction of housing in 2007	1. Yes	1	100.00
		2. No	0	0.00
		Total	1	100.00

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
E_1_9_20	Large-scale theft or destruction of housing in 2008	1. Yes	1	100.00
		2. No	0	0.00
		Total	1	100.00
E_1_9_20	Large-scale theft or destruction of housing in 2009	1. Yes	1	100.00
		2. No	0	0.00
		Total	1	100.00
E_1_9_20	Large-scale theft or destruction of housing in 2010	1. Yes	1	100.00
		2. No	0	0.00
		Total	1	100.00
E_1_10	Shocks in the past five years - large-scale theft or destruction of other assets	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	15	100.00
		Total	15	100.00
E_1_10_2006	Large-scale theft or destruction of other assets in 2006	1. Yes	NA	NA
		2. No	NA	NA
		Total	NA	NA
E_1_10_2007	Large-scale theft or destruction of other assets in 2007	1. Yes	NA	NA
		2. No	NA	NA
		Total	NA	NA
E_1_10_2008	Large-scale theft or destruction of other assets in 2008	1. Yes	NA	NA
		2. No	NA	NA
		Total	NA	NA
E_1_10_2009	Large-scale theft or destruction of other assets in 2009	1. Yes	NA	NA
		2. No	NA	NA
		Total	NA	NA
E_1_10_2010	Large-scale theft or destruction of other assets in 2010	1. Yes	NA	NA
		2. No	NA	NA
		Total	NA	NA
E_1_11	Shocks in the past five years - large-scale land disputes	1. Yes	2	13.33
		2. No	3	86.67
		Total	15	100.00
E_1_11_2006	Large-scale land disputes in 2006	1. Yes	2	100.00
		2. No	0	0.00
		Total	2	100.00
E_1_11_2007	Large-scale land disputes in 2007	1. Yes	1	50.00
		2. No	1	50.00
		Total	2	100.00

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
E_1_11_2	Large-scale land disputes in 2008	1. Yes	1	50.00
		2. No	1	50.00
		Total	2	100.00
E_1_11_2009	Large-scale land disputes in 2009	1. Yes	1	50.00
		2. No	1	50.00
		Total	2	100.00
E_1_11_2010	large-scale land disputes in 2010	1. Yes	1	50.00
		2. No	1	50.00
		Total	2	100.00
E.2. Conflict experiences				
Death of community members				
E_2_1	During the last period of conflict - prevalence of death of at least 10 % of community members due to disease	1. Yes	2	13.33
		2. No	13	86.67
		Total	15	100.00
E_2_2	During the last period of conflict - prevalence of death of at least 10 % of community members due to crime/ conflict	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	14	100.00
		Total	14	100.00
Migration				
E_2_3	During the last period of conflict - prevalence of forced-out migration of at least 10 % of community members	1. Yes	2	13.33
		2. No	13	86.67
		Total	15	100.00
E_2_4	During the last period of conflict - prevalence of large inflows of refugees	1. Yes	1	7.14
		2. No	13	92.86
		Total	14	100.00
Conflict				
E_2_5	During the last period of conflict - prevalence of attacks by rebel groups	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	14	100.00
		Total	14	100.00
E_2_6	During the last period of conflict - prevalence of confrontations between rebels and the army	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	15	100.00
		Total	15	100.00
E_2_7	During the last period of conflict - prevalence of large scale internal conflict	1. Yes	0	0.00
		2. No	15	100.00
		Total	15	100.00

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
<b>F. SAFETY AND SECURITY</b>				
<b>F_1_1</b>	Problems of gang/ rebel groups in the community	1. Yes	1	6.67
		2. No	14	93.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>F_1_2</b>	Problems of drug abuse in the community	1. Yes	6	40.00
		2. No	9	60.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>F_1_3</b>	Problems of alcohol abuse in the community	1. Yes	7	46.67
		2. No	8	53.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>F_1_4</b>	Problems of prostitution in the community	1. Yes	6	40.00
		2. No	9	60.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>F_1_5</b>	Problems of land disputes in the community	1. Yes	3	20.00
		2. No	12	80.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>F_1_6</b>	Problems of water disputes in the community	1. Yes	2	13.33
		2. No	13	86.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>F_1_7</b>	Problems of disputes on housing in the community	1. Yes	2	13.33
		2. No	13	86.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>F_1_8</b>	Problems of thefts/ assaults in the community	1. Yes	7	46.67
		2. No	8	53.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>F_1_9</b>	Problems of child abuse in the community	1. Yes	2	13.33
		2. No	13	86.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>F_1_10</b>	Problems of sexual assaults/ rape in the community	1. Yes	3	20.00
		2. No	2	80.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>F_2</b>	Rating of level of overall security of this community	1. Very bad	0	0.00
		2. Bad	1	6.67
		3. Medium	4	26.67
		4. Good	3	20.00
		5. Very Good	7	46.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
<b>F_3</b>	Overall level of security of this community compared to neighbouring communities	1. Much lower than in other communities	1	6.67
		2. Lower than in other communities	2	13.33
		3. The same as in other communities	4	26.67
		4. Higher than in other communities	8	53.33
		5. Much higher than in other communities	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>F_4</b>	Overall level of security in this community compared to five years ago	1. Worsened a lot	0	0.00
		2. Worsened	2	13.33
		3. Stayed the same	2	13.33
		4. Improved	9	60.00
		5. Improved a lot	2	13.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>G. SOCIAL TIES</b>				
<b>G. A. TRUST AND PARTICIPATION</b>				
<b>GA_1</b>	Level of trust between community members in this community	1. Very low	1	6.67
		2. Low	1	6.67
		3. Average	5	33.33
		4. High	5	33.33
		5. Very high	3	20.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>GA_2</b>	Change in the level of trust between community in the last five years	1. Much worse	1	6.67
		2. Worse	3	20.00
		3. The same	3	20.00
		4. Better	6	40.00
		5. Much better	2	13.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>GA_3</b>	Level of trust between community members compared to neighbouring communities	1. Much lower than in other communities	0	0.00
		2. Lower than in other communities	1	6.67
		3. The same as in other communities	7	46.67
		4. Higher than in other communities	7	46.67
		5. Much higher than in other communities	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>GA_4</b>	Spirit of participation in this community	1. Very low	1	6.67
		2. Low	0	0.00
		3. Average	3	20.00
		4. High	6	40.00

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		5. Very high	5	33.33
		Total	15	100.00
GA_5	Change in spirit of participation in the past five years	1. Much worse	1	6.67
		2. Worse	1	6.67
		3. the same	2	13.33
		4. Better	8	53.33
		5. Much better	3	20.00
		Total	15	100.00
GA_6	Spirit of participation compared to neighbouring communities	1. Much lower than in other communities	1	6.67
		2. Lower than in other communities	0	0.00
		3. The same as in other communities	5	33.33
		4. Higher than in other communities	8	53.33
		5. Much higher than in other communities	1	6.67
		Total	15	100.00
GA_7	Trust between people in this community in matters of lending and borrowing	1. No trust at all	2	13.33
		2. Little trust	2	13.33
		3. Neutral	0	0.00
		4. Some trust	3	20.00
		5. A lot of trust	8	53.33
		Total	15	100.00
G.B ASSOCIATIONS				
GB_1_1	Currently present in the community - water/waste or fishermen's group	1. Yes	1	6.67
		2. No	14	93.33
		Total	15	100.00
GB_1_2	Currently present in the community - agricultural cooperative	1. Yes	8	53.33
		2. No	7	46.67
		Total	15	100.00
GB_1_3	Currently present in the community - trader's association or business group	1. Yes	5	33.33
		2. No	10	66.67
		Total	15	100.00
GB_1_4	Currently present in the community - credit or savings association	1. Yes	11	73.33
		2. No	4	26.67
		Total	15	100.00
GB_1_5	Currently present in the community - burial/funeral association	1. Yes	14	93.33
		2. No	1	6.67
		Total	15	100.00



Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
GB_1_6	Currently present in the community - religious group of organization (church/ mosque)	1. Yes	12	80.00
		2. No	3	20.00
		Total	15	100.00
GB_1_7	Currently present in the community - political party or group	1. yes	13	88.86
		2. No	2	13.33
		Total	15	100.00
GB_1_8	Currently present in the community - sport, recreational, art, or music group	1. Yes	7	46.67
		2. No	8	53.33
		Total	15	100.00
GB_1_9	Currently present in the community - women's group or youth group	1. Yes	15	100.00
		2. No	0	0.00
		Total	15	100.00
GB_1_10	Currently present in the community - school or health committee	1. Yes	13	86.67
		2. No	2	13.33
		Total	15	100.00
GB_1_11	Currently present in the community - labour union	1. Yes	1	6.67
		2. No	14	93.33
		Total	15	100.00
GB_1_12	Currently present in the community - humanitarian or charitable organization/ NGO	1. Yes	6	40.00
		2. No	9	60.00
		Total	15	100.00
GB_1_13	Currently present in the community - justice or reconciliation association	1. Yes	5	33.33
		2. No	10	66.67
		Total	15	100.00
GB_2_1	Number of people engaged in water, waste or fishermen's group	1. Almost all of the community members	1	50.00
		2. More than half of the community	0	0.00
		3. Around half of the community members	0	0.00
		4. Less than half of the community	0	0.00
		5. Almost no community members	1	50.00
		Total	2	100.00
GB_2_2	Number of people engaged in agricultural cooperative	1. Almost all of the community members	3	33.33
		2. More than half of the community	2	22.22
		3. Around half of the community members	0	0.00

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		4. Less than half of the community members	3	33.33
		5. Almost no community members	1	11.11
		Total	9	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	1	20.00
		4. Less than half of the community members	4	80.00
		5. Almost no community members	0	0.00
		Total	5	100.00
GB_2_4	Number of people engaged in credit or savings association	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	3	27.27
		4. Less than half of the community members	8	72.73
		5. Almost no community members	0	0.00
		Total	11	100.00
GB_2_5	Number of people engaged in burial/funeral association	1. Almost all of the community members	11	78.57
		2. More than half of the community members	1	7.14
		3. Around half of the community members	0	0.00
		4. Less than half of the community members	2	14.29
		5. Almost no community members	0	0.00
		Total	14	100.00
GB_2_6	Number of people engaged in religious group or organization (church, mosque)	1. Almost all of the community members	5	41.67
		2. More than half of the community members	2	16.67
		3. Around half of the community members	3	25.00
		4. Less than half of the community members	2	16.67
		5. Almost no community members	0	0.00
		Total	12	100.00
GB_2_7	Number of people engaged in political party or group	1. Almost all of the community members	3	23.08
		2. More than half of the community members	2	15.38
		3. Around half of the community members	2	15.38
		4. Less than half of the community members	6	46.15
		5. Almost no community members	0	0.00
		Total	13	100.00

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
GB_2_8	Number of people engaged in sport, recreational, art, or music group	1. Almost all of the community members	1	12.50
		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	6	75.00
		5. Almost no community members	1	12.50
		<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100.00</b>
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	1	6.67
		3. Around half of the community	4	26.67
		4. Less than half of the community members	10	66.67
		5. Almost no community members	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
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	1	7.69
		3. Around half of the community members	1	7.69
		4. Less than half of the community members	10	76.92
		5. Almost no community members	1	7.69
		<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100.00</b>
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	0	0.00
		3. Around half of the community members	0	0.00
		4. Less than half of the community members	1	50.00
		5. Almost no community members	1	50.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100.00</b>
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	0	0.00
		3. Around half of the community members	0	0.00
		4. Less than half of the community members	6	85.71
		5. Almost no community members	1	14.29
		<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
GB_2_13	Number of people engaged in justice or reconciliation association	1. Almost all of the community members	1	20.00
		2. More than half of the community	1	20.00
		3. Around half of the community members	1	20.00
		4. Less than half of the community members	2	40.00
		5. Almost no community members	0	0.00
		Total	5	100.00
H. CHILDREN				
H_1b	Number of pre-schools that are currently in this community	n = 11                      Range 0 - 6	M = 2.55	SD = 1.86
H_2b	Availability of pre-schools in this community for girls	1. Yes, all are available for girls	9	90.00
		2. Yes, but only partially available for girls	0	0.00
		3. No, not available for girls	1	10.00
		Total	10	100.00
H_3b	Main problem for pre-schools in this community	1. Lack of teacher(s)	2	20.00
		2. Lack of teaching materials (books, paper, etc.)	5	50.00
		3. Lack of health and hygiene facilities (e.g. toilets)	0	0.00
		4. Lack of water	0	0.00
		5. Lack of electricity	0	0.00
		6. Other	3	30.00
	Total	10	100.00	
H_5	Number of primary schools (public and private) that are currently in this community	n = 14                      Range 0 - 7	M = 2.14	SD = 1.61
H_6	Availability of primary schools in this community for girls	1. Yes, all are available for girls	12	92.31
		2. Yes, but only partially available for girls	0	0.00
		3. No, not available for girls	1	7.69
		Total	13	100.00
H_7	Number of days the children received classes in primary school during the last month	n = 13                      Range 5 - 6	M = 5.08	SD = 0.28
H_8	Main problem for primary schools in this community	1. Lack of teacher(s)	2	15.38
		2. Lack of teaching materials (books, paper, etc.)	5	38.46

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		3. Lack of health and hygiene facilities (e.g. toilets)	1	7.69
		4. Lack of water	1	7.69
		5. Lack of electricity	1	7.69
		6. Other	3	23.08
		<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100.00</b>
H_9	Number of secondary schools (public and private) that are currently in this community	n = 13      Range 0 - 2	M = 0.46	SD = 0.66
H_10	Availability of secondary schools in this community for girls	1. Yes, all are available for girls	4	26.67
		2. Yes, but only partially available for girls	1	6.67
		3. No, not available for girls	1	6.67
		Missing	9	60.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
H_11	Number of days the children received classes in secondary school during the last month	n = 6      Range 0 - 5	M = 4.17	SD = 2.04
H_12	Main problem for secondary schools in this community	1. Lack of teacher(s)	0	0.00
		2. Lack of teaching materials (books, paper, etc.)	1	6.67
		3. Lack of health and hygiene facilities (e.g. toilets)	0	0.00
		4. Lack of water	0	0.00
		5. Lack of electricity	0	0.00
		6. Other	3	20.00
		Missing	11	73.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
H_13_1	Number of weeks that the primary school(s) in the past academic year in this community was/were closed	n = 13      Range 0 - 5	M = 1.15	SD = 1.77
H_13_2	Number of weeks that the secondary school(s) in the past academic year in this community was/were closed	n = 13      Range 0 - 4	M = 0.77	SD = 1.36
H_13_3	Number of weeks that the preparatory school(s) in the past academic year in this community was/were closed	n = 12      Range 0 - 4	M = 0.58	SD = 1.24
H_14_1	Main reason primary school(s) were closed	1. Due to agricultural work	0	0.00
		2. Due to bad weather/natural	0	0.00
		3. Due to lack of teacher(s)	0	0.00
		4. Due to security concerns	0	0.00

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		5. Other	4	80.00
		6. Not applicable	1	20.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>H_14_2</b>	Main reason secondary school(s) were closed	1. Due to agricultural work	0	0.00
		2. Due to bad weather/natural	0	0.00
		3. Due to lack of teacher(s)	0	0.00
		4. Due to security concerns	0	0.00
		5. Other	3	75.00
		6. Not applicable	1	25.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>H_14_3</b>	Main reason preparatory school(s) were closed	1. Due to agricultural work	0	0.00
		2. Due to bad weather/natural	0	0.00
		3. Due to lack of teacher(s)	0	0.00
		4. Due to security concerns	0	0.00
		5. Other	2	66.67
		6. Not applicable	1	33.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>I. HEALTH</b>				
<b>I_1a</b>	Most important health problem that currently affects adult women in this community	1. Diabetes	1	6.67
		2. HIV/AIDS	6	40.00
		3. Malaria	2	13.33
		4. Pneumonia (and other respiratory in	1	6.67
		5. Trachoma (and other eye problems)	1	6.67
		6. Lack of access to care	1	6.67
		7. Other	2	13.33
		8. No (major) health problems	1	6.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>I_1b</b>	Second important health problem that currently affects adult women in this community	1. Blood pressure	2	20.00
		2. Malaria	1	10.00
		3. Pneumonia (and other respiratory in	1	10.00
		4. Tuberculosis	3	30.00
		5. Stomach illness	1	10.00
		6. Other	2	20.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>I_1c</b>	Third important health problem that currently affects adult women in this community	1. HIV/AIDS	3	37.50
		2. Malaria	1	12.50
		3. Cancer	1	12.50
		4. Typhoid (and other waterborn disea	2	25.00
		5. Other	1	12.50
		<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
I_2a	Most important health problem that currently affects adult men in this community	1. Blood pressure 2. HIV/AIDS 3. Malaria 4. Pneumonia (and other respiratory infections) 5. Trachoma (and other eye problems) 6. No (major) health problems <b>Total</b>	1 6 2 1 2 2 <b>14</b>	7.14 42.86 14.29 7.14 14.26 14.29 <b>100.00</b>
I_2b	Second important health problem that currently affects adult men in this community	1. Diabetes 2. Malaria 3. Pneumonia (and other respiratory infections) 4. Tuberculosis 5. Stomach illness 6. Other <b>Total</b>	1 2 1 3 1 1 <b>9</b>	11.11 22.22 11.11 33.33 11.11 11.11 <b>100.00</b>
I_2c	Third important health problem that currently affects adult men in this community	1. HIV/AIDS 2. Tuberculosis 3. Typhoid (and other waterborn diseases) <b>Total</b>	3 1 2 <b>6</b>	50.00 16.67 33.33 <b>100.00</b>
I_3a	Most important health problem that currently affects children under 18 in this community	1. Diabetes 2. HIV/AIDS 3. Malaria 4. Pneumonia (and other respiratory infections) 5. Trachoma (and other eye problems) 6. Typhoid (and other waterborn diseases) 7. Cold/flu 8. Other <b>Total</b>	1 2 3 1 1 1 5 3 <b>17</b>	5.88 11.76 17.65 5.88 5.88 5.88 29.41 17.65 <b>100.00</b>
I_3b	Second most important health problem that currently affects children under 18 in this community	1. HIV/AIDS 2. Malaria 3. Diarrhea 4. Tuberculosis 5. Typhoid (and other waterborn diseases) 6. Malnutrition 7. Other <b>Total</b>	2 1 2 1 1 1 4 <b>12</b>	16.67 8.33 16.67 8.33 8.33 8.33 33.33 <b>100.00</b>
I_3c	Third most important health problem that currently affects children under 18 in this community	1. HIV/AIDS 2. Malaria 3. Typhoid (and other	1 1 1	16.67 16.67 16.67

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		waterborn diseases)		
		4. Malnutrition	1	16.67
		5. Dehydration	1	16.67
		6. Other	1	16.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>I_4</b>	Quality of health care services in this community	1. Very bad	1	7.14
		2. Bad	3	21.43
		3. Medium	5	35.71
		4. Good	4	28.57
		5. Very good	1	7.14
		<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100.00</b>

<b>I_5</b>	Main issue influencing the quality of health care services in this community	1. Lack of medication	7	50.00
		2. Lack of staff	2	14.29
		3. Lack of other resources such as beds	4	28.57
		4. Other	1	7.14
		<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100.00</b>

<b>I_6</b>	Change in the quality of health care services in this community in the past five years	1. Much worse	1	7.14
		2. Worse	1	7.14
		3. The same	2	14.29
		4. Better	8	57.14
		5. Much better	2	14.29
		<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100.00</b>

**J. MIGRATION****J.A CURRENT MIGRATION STOCKS**

<b>JA_1</b>	Number of households in this community that currently have a migrant abroad	1. Less than 25 households	0	0.00
		2. Between 25 and 50 households	2	13.33
		3. Between 50 and 75 households	5	33.33
		4. Between 75 and 100 households	3	20.00
		5. More than 100 households	5	33.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>

<b>JA_2</b>	Number of households in this community that currently have a household member living in another city or village in Ethiopia	1. Less than 25 households	4	26.67
		2. Between 25 and 50 households	2	13.33
		3. Between 50 and 75 households	0	0.00
		4. Between 75 and 100 households	3	20.00
		5. More than 100 households	6	40.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>

<b>JA_3</b>	Number of households in this community that currently have a return migrant	1. Less than 25 households	10	66.67
		2. Between 25 and 50 households	2	13.33
		3. Between 50 and 75 households	0	0.00
		4. Between 75 and 100 households	1	6.67



Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		5. More than 100 households	2	13.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>J. B MIGRATION HISTORY: FORCED MIGRATION</b>				
<b>JB_1</b>	Large groups of community members that were forced to leave in the history of the this community	1. Yes 2. No <b>Total</b>	5 10 <b>15</b>	33.33 66.67 <b>100.00</b>
<b>JB_2a</b>	Start year of forced migration	1969 1970 1990 1994 1997 <b>Total</b>	1 1 2 1 1 <b>6</b>	16.67 16.67 33.33 16.67 16.67 <b>100.00</b>
<b>JB_2b</b>	End year of forced migration	1972 1980 1991 1993 1994 1997 <b>Total</b>	1 1 1 1 1 1 <b>6</b>	16.67 16.67 16.67 16.67 16.67 16.67 <b>100.00</b>
<b>JB_3</b>	Number of community members involved in forced migration	n = 6      Range 10 - 1500	M = 285.33	SD = 595.70
<b>JB_4</b>	Gender distribution of community members involved in forced migration	1. Mostly men 2. Mostly women and children 3. Both men and women equally <b>Total</b>	3 1 2 <b>6</b>	50.00 16.67 33.33 <b>100.00</b>
<b>J. C MIGRATION HISTORY: LABOUR MIGRATION</b>				
<b>JC_1</b>	Large flows of labor out-migration in the history of this community	1. Yes 2 No <b>Total</b>	6 9 <b>15</b>	40.00 60.00 <b>100.00</b>
<b>JC_2a</b>	Start year large flow of labour migration out of community	1982 1983 1986 1987 1993 1998 1999 2000 <b>Total</b>	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 4 <b>12</b>	8.33 8.33 8.33 8.33 8.33 8.33 8.33 33.33 <b>100.00</b>

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
JC_2b	End year large flow of labour migration out of community	1992	1	14.29
		1996	1	14.29
		1999	1	14.29
		2001	2	28.57
		2003	1	14.29
		Total	7	100.00
JC_3	Number of community members involved in labour migration	n = 12                  Range 20 - 750	M = 216.83	SD = 205.92
JC_4	Gender distribution of labour migration	1. Mostly men	4	36.36
		2. Mostly women and children	7	63.64
		3. Both men and women equally	0	0.00
		Total	11	100.00
JC_5	Destination of labour migration	1. Ethiopia	4	80.00
		2. Other country	1	20.00
		Total	5	100.00
JC_6	Country to which people migrated for labour	Kuwait	1	100.00
		Total	1	100.00
J. D MIGRATION HISTORY: RETURN MIGRATION				
JD_1	Large flows of return migration in the history of this community	1. Yes	3	20.00
		2. No	12	80.00
		Total	15	100.00
JD_2	Start year large flow of return migration into community	1985	1	33.33
		1990	1	33.33
		2003	1	33.33
		Total	3	100.00
JD_2b	End year large flow of return migration into community	No observations	NA	NA
			NA	NA
		Total	NA	NA
JD_3	Number of community members involved in return migration	No observations	NA	NA
JD_4	Gender distribution of comm members involved in return migration	1. Mostly men	2	66.67
		2. Mostly women and children	0	0.00
		3. Both men and women equally	1	33.33
		Total	3	100.00

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
<b>J. E VIEWS OF MIGRATION</b>				
<b>JE_1</b>	Perceptions of community members that leave this community to live elsewhere	1. Very negatively	0	0.00
		2. Negatively	0	0.00
		3. Neutral	1	6.67
		4. Positively	8	53.33
		5. Very positively	5	33.33
		6. This is mixed	1	6.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>JE_2</b>	Explanation perceptions on community members that leave this community to live elsewhere	1. They leave to prosper economically	7	46.67
		2. With the money earned they can help their family	6	40.00
		3. They leave for good	1	6.67
		4. Other	1	6.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>JE_3</b>	Perceptions on return migrants in this community	1. Very negatively	1	6.67
		2. Negatively	0	0.00
		3. Neutral	0	0.00
		4. Positively	10	66.67
		5. Very positively	4	26.67
		6. This is mixed	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>JE_4</b>	Explanation perceptions on return migrants	1. Returnees are expected to have money --> help family and/or	6	40.00
		2. It is good they returned to their homeland	3	20.00
		3. People have respect for the returnees	1	6.67
		4. Returnees accept lifestyle of community	1	6.67
		5. Migrants shouldn't return = lazy	1	6.67
		6. Other	3	20.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>JE_5</b>	Perceptions on households with a current migrant in this community	1. Very negatively	0	0.00
		2. Negatively	0	0.00
		3. Neutral	4	28.57
		4. Positively	3	21.43
		5. Very positively	6	42.86
		6. This is mixed	1	7.14
		<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
JE_6	Explanation perceptions on households with a current migrant in this community	1. Migrant family benefits from it economically	9	60.00
		2. Migrant family is respected by community	1	6.67
		3. Neutral attitude	3	20.00
		4. Mixed feelings: respect but also jealous	1	6.67
		5. Other	1	6.67
		Total	15	100.00
JE_7	Thoughts on how international migration affects this community	1. Very negatively	0	0.00
		2. Negatively	2	13.33
		3. Neutral	4	26.67
		4. Positively	7	46.67
		5. Very positively	2	13.33
		Total	15	100.00
JE_8	Explanation on thoughts on affect of international migration in this community	1.Support the community	3	20.00
		2. Support HH/family members economically	3	20.00
		3. Create jobs	1	6.67
		4. Generate wealth	2	13.33
		5. Young, productive (and educated) workforce leaves	3	20.00
		6. No effect	2	13.33
		7. Other	1	6.67
		Total	15	100.00
JE_9	Thoughts on how internal migration affects this community	1. Very negatively	0	0.00
		2. Negatively	0	0.00
		3. Neutral	6	40.00
		4. Positively	8	53.33
		5. Very positively	1	6.67
		Total	15	100.00
JE_10	Explanation on thoughts on affect internal migration on this community	1.Improve living standards	4	26.67
		2. Better opportunities elsewhere	3	20.00
		3. Migrant becomes independent from HH	1	6.67
		4. No effect	6	40.00
		5. Other	1	6.67
		Total	15	100.00

JE_11	Thoughts on how international	1. Very negatively	0	0.00
-------	-------------------------------	--------------------	---	------

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
	migration affects this country in general	2. Negatively	4	28.57
		3. Neutral	2	14.29
		4. Positively	6	42.86
		5. Very positively	2	14.29
		<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100.00</b>
JE_12	Explanation on thoughts on how international migration affects this country in general	1. Support the family and/or	8	53.33
		2. Positive effect on currency	1	6.67
		3. Young productive (and educated) workforce leaves	2	13.33
		4. Bad image for the country	1	6.67
		5. People lose affection for country	1	6.67
		6. No effect	1	6.67
		7. Other	1	6.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
JE_13	Perception on return migrants being different from other community members	1. Yes, very different	5	33.33
		2. Yes, a little bit different	3	20.00
		3. No	7	46.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
JE_14	Explanation of return migrants being different from other community members	1. More knowledge	2	13.33
		2. Behaviour is different (clothes, the way they talk) = adapted to a different culture	4	26.67
		3. Have become hard workers	1	6.67
		4. Complain about services in community	1	6.67
		5. Not applicable (answer previous question was no)	7	46.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
JE_15	Effect on community of return migrants being different from other community members	1. Very negatively	1	7.69
		2. Negatively	2	15.38
		3. Neutral	4	30.77
		4. Positively	6	46.15
		5. Very positively	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100.00</b>
JE_16	Explanation of effect on community of return migrants being different from other community members	1. Support family	1	7.69
		2. Role model for com. members (knowledge)	2	15.38
		3. Returnees have no problems integrating	1	7.69
		4. Returnees don't fit in (dif. culture)	1	7.69
		5. Stimulate more migration	1	7.69
		6. No effect	5	38.46
		7. Other	2	15.38

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>JE_17</b>	Perception of return migrants having different values and norms than other community members	1. Yes, very different 2. Yes, a little bit different 3. No <b>Total</b>	3 7 5 <b>15</b>	20.00 46.67 33.33 <b>100.00</b>
<b>JE_18</b>	Explanation on perception of return migrants having different values and norms than other community members	1. Their behaviour is different 2. More knowledge about hygiene, health 3. Easily fit in the community 4. Need time to adjust 5. Other 6. Not applicable <b>Total</b>	4 1 2 1 1 6 <b>15</b>	26.67 6.67 13.33 6.67 6.67 <b>100.00</b>
<b>JE_19</b>	Effect on community of return migrants having different norms and values compared to other community members	1. Very negatively 2. Negatively 3. Neutral 4. Positively 5. Very positively <b>Total</b>	1 2 3 3 0 <b>9</b>	11.11 22.22 33.33 33.33 0.00 <b>100.00</b>
<b>JE_20</b>	Explanation of effect on community of return migrants having different norms and values compared to other community members	1. Their behaviour is different 2. Share knowledge (about hygiene) 3. Easily fit in the community 4. Respected by community 5. Returnees think they are special (neg) 6. No effect 7. Other <b>Total</b>	2 2 1 1 1 1 1 <b>7</b>	28.57 28.57 14.29 14.29 14.29 14.29 14.29 <b>100.00</b>
<b>K. CHILDREN LEFT BEHIND</b>				
<b>K_1</b>	Number of households in this community that have children of which at least one parent currently	1. Less than 25 households 2. Between 25 and 50 households 3. Between 50 and 75 households 4. Between 75 and 100 households 5. More than 100 households <b>Total</b>	11 3 1 0 0 <b>15</b>	73.33 20.00 6.67 0.00 0.00 <b>100.00</b>
<b>K_2</b>	Main reasons why the parent(s) of these children left this community	1. They were forced to leave due to security issues or conflicts 2. They left to seek for better economic opportunities 3. Other Not applicable <b>Total</b>	0 14 1 0 <b>15</b>	0.00 93.33 6.67 0.00 <b>100.00</b>
<b>K_3</b>	Type of available support for children	1. Emotional or psychological support	7	0

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
	of which at least one parent lives abroad (all that apply)	2. Material support (e.g., clothing, food, etc.)	5	0
		3. Financial support	4	0
		4. Social support (e.g., help in household work or family business/farm)	3	0
		5. Support for schooling (e.g., allowance, free or reduced admission/books/supplies, etc.)	2	0
		6. Other	5	0
		<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>K_4</b>	Perception on children left behind by other community members	1. Very negatively	0	0.00
		2. Negatively	2	13.33
		3. Neutral	7	46.67
		4. Positively	5	33.33
		5. Very positively	1	6.67
		6. This is mixed	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>L. MONETARY REMITTANCES - MONEY OR GOODS</b>				
<b>L. A RECEIVING INTERNATIONAL MONEY REMITTANCES</b>				
<b>LA_1</b>	Number of households in this community that receive international remittances on a regular basis	1. Almost all of the households	2	13.33
		2. More than half of the households	5	33.33
		3. Around half of the households	2	13.33
		4. Less than half of the households	6	40.00
		5. Almost no households	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>LA_2a</b>	Most important way of households receiving international remittances in this community	1. The household members bring it themselves	3	20.00
		2. Friends or relatives bring it for the household members	2	13.33
		3. Through a money transfer operator (formal)	6	40.00
		4. Through a shop keeper/call house/hawala (informal)	1	6.67
		5. Through a bank	3	20.00
		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	0	0.00
		Not applicable	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>LA_2b</b>	Second most important way of households receiving international	1. The household members bring it themselves	2	13.33

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
	remittances in this community	2. Friends or relatives bring it for the household members	4	26.67
		3. Through a money transfer operator (formal)	1	6.67
		4. Through a shop keeper/call house/hawala (informal)	1	6.67
		5. Through a bank	1	6.67
		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	0	0.00
		Not applicable	6	40.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
LA_2c	Third most important way of households receiving international remittances in this community	1. The household members bring it themselves	0	0.00
		2. Friends or relatives bring it for the household members	1	11.11
		3. Through a money transfer operator (formal)	1	11.11
		4. Through a shop keeper/call house/hawala (informal)	0	0.00
		5. Through a bank	3	33.33
		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	0	0.00
		Not applicable	4	44.44
		<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100.00</b>
LA_3a	Most important problem households encounter when receiving international remittances	1. The costs are too high	1	7.14
		2. There are limited possibilities to send money or goods	3	21.43
		3. The money travels too slowly	0	0.00
		4. The system is insecure	1	7.14
		5. There are legal restrictions in sending money	1	7.14
		6. Other	4	28.57
		Don't know	0	0.00
		Not applicable	4	28.57
		<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100.00</b>
LA_3b	Second 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	1	6.67
		3. The money travels too slowly	1	6.67
		4. The system is insecure	1	6.67
		5. There are legal restrictions in sending money	0	0.00



Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		6. Other	0	0.00
		Don't know	0	0.00
		Not applicable	12	80.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>LA_3c</b>	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	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	0	0.00
		Not applicable	3	100.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>LA_4</b>	Extent to which households in this community are dependent on international remittances	1. Very dependent	2	13.33
		2. Dependent	6	40.00
		3. Neutral	2	13.33
		4. Not dependent	3	26.67
		5. Not dependent at all	1	6.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>L.B RECEIVING INTERNAL MONETARY REMITTANCES</b>				
<b>LB_1</b>	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	3	20.00
		3. Around half of the households	0	0.00
		4. Less than half of the households	7	46.67
		5. Almost no households	5	33.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>LB_2a</b>	Most important way of households receiving internal remittances in this community	1. The household members bring it themselves	1	6.67
		2. Friends or relatives bring it for the household members	4	26.67
		3. Through a money transfer operator (formal)	2	13.33
		4. Through a shop keeper/call house/hawala (informal)	0	0.00
		5. Through a bank	7	46.67
		6. Through the mail	0	0.00
		7. Via stored value card (bank/phone)	0	0.00
		8. Not applicable	1	6.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>LB_2b</b>	Second most important way of households receiving internal	1. The household members bring it themselves	1	6.67

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
	remittances in this community	2. Friends or relatives bring it for the household members	3	20.00
		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	2	13.33
		6. Through the mail	0	0.00
		7. Via stored value card (bank/phone)	0	0.00
		8. Not applicable	9	60.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>LB_2c</b>	Third most important way of households receiving internal remittances in this community	1. The household members bring it themselves	1	16.67
		2. Friends or relatives bring it for the household members	1	16.67
		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. Not applicable	4	66.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100.00</b>

<b>LB_3a</b>	Most important problem households encounter when receiving internal remittances	1. The costs are too high	1	6.67
		2. There are limited possibilities to send money or goods	2	13.33
		3. The money travels too slowly	1	6.67
		4. The system is insecure	0	0.00
		5. There are legal restrictions in sending money	1	6.67
		6. Other	5	33.33
		7. Not applicable	5	26.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>LB_3b</b>	Second most important problem households encounter when receiving internal remittances	1. The costs are too high	0	0.00
		2. There are limited possibilities to send money or goods	1	6.67
		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

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		7. Not applicable	14	93.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>LB_3c</b>	Third most important problem households encounter when receiving internal 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	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
		7. Not applicable	1	100.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>LB_4</b>	Extent to which households in this community are dependent on internal remittances	1. Very dependent	2	13.33
		2. Dependent	1	6.67
		3. Neutral	4	26.67
		4. Not dependent	5	33.33
		5. Not dependent at all	2	13.33
		6. Not applicable	1	6.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>L. C VIEWS ON RECEIVING REMITTANCES</b>				
<b>LC_1</b>	View on effect remittances have on receiving households in this community	1. Very negatively	0	0.00
		2. Negatively	2	13.33
		3. Neutral	1	6.67
		4. Positively	10	66.67
		5. Very positively	2	13.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>LC_2</b>	Explanation on view on effect remittances have on receiving households in this community	1. Used for daily needs/consumption	4	26.67
		2. It improves their lives (buy house, land, set up a business)	5	3.33
		3. It helps the community	1	6.67
		4. It's good to help your family	1	6.67
		5. People become dependent on the money (and stop working)	3	23.08
		6. No effect	1	6.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>LC_3</b>	View on effect remittances have on this community as a whole	1. Very negatively	0	0.00
		2. Negatively	1	6.67
		3. Neutral	4	26.67
		4. Positively	9	60.00
		5. Very positively	1	6.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>LC_4</b>	Explanation on view on effect remittances have on this community	1. Used for daily needs/consumption	2	14.29
		2. It improves their lives (buy house,	5	35.71

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
	as a whole	land, set up a business)	5	35.71
		3. People become dependent on the money (and stop working)	1	7.14
		4. Promotes migration	1	7.14
		5. (Almost) No effect	3	21.43
		6. Other	1	7.14
		7. Don't know	1	7.14
		<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100.00</b>
LC_5	View on perception of household members that receive remittances by other community members	1. Very negatively	0	0.00
		2. Negatively	1	6.67
		3. Neutral	4	26.67
		4. Positively	8	53.33
		5. Very positively	2	13.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
LC_6	Explanation view on perception of household members that receive remittances by other community members	1. Lucky/wealthy/have a comfortable or better life	8	61.54
		2. They help the community	2	15.38
		3. No specific perception (neutral)	3	23.08
		<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>L. D SENDING INTERNATIONAL MONETARY REMITTANCES</b>				
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	1	6.67
		5. Almost no households	14	93.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
LD_2a	Most important way of households in this community sending international remittances	1. The household members bring it themselves	1	6.67
		2. Friends or relatives bring it for the household members	1	6.67
		3. Through a money transfer operator (formal)	1	6.67
		4. Through a shop keeper/call	0	0.00
		5. Through a bank	1	6.67
		6. Through the mail	0	0.00
		7. Via stored value card (bank/phone)	0	0.00
		8. Other	2	13.33
		9. Not applicable	9	60.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
LD_2b	Second most important way of households in this community sending international remittances	1. The household members bring it themselves	1	6.67
		2. Friends or relatives bring it for	1	6.67

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		the household members		
		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
		9. Not applicable	13	86.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
LD_2c	Third most important way of households in this community sending international remittances	1. The household members bring it themselves	0	0.00
		2. Friends or relatives bring it for the household members	0	0.00
		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
		9. Not applicable	2	100.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100.00</b>
LD_3a	Most important problem households encounter when sending international remittances	1. The costs are too high	0	0.00
		2. There are limited possibilities to send money or goods	1	6.67
		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	1	6.67
		7. Not applicable	13	86.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
LD_3b	Second most important problem households encounter when sending 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 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
		7. Not applicable	15	100.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
<b>LD_3c</b>	Third most important problem households encounter when sending international remittances	1. The costs are too high 2. There are limited possibilities to send money or goods 3. The money travels too slow 4. The system is insecure 5. There are legal restrictions in sending money 6. Other 7. Not applicable <b>Total</b>	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 <b>0</b>	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 <b>0.00</b>
<b>L.E SENDING INTERNAL MONETARY REMITTANCES</b>				
<b>LE_1</b>	Number of households in this community that send internal remittances on a regular basis	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 <b>Total</b>	0 1 2 9 3 <b>15</b>	0.00 6.67 13.33 60.00 20.00 <b>100.00</b>
<b>LE_2a</b>	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 9. Not applicable <b>Total</b>	1 4 0 0 8 0 0 0 2 <b>15</b>	6.67 26.67 0.00 0.00 53.33 0.00 0.00 0.00 13.33 <b>100.00</b>
<b>LE_2b</b>	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)	1 2 0 1 1 1 0	6.67 13.33 0.00 6.67 6.67 6.67 0.00

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		8. Other	0	0.00
		9. Not applicable	9	60.00
		Total	15	100.00
LE_2c	Third most important way of households sending internal remittances from this community	1. The household members bring it themselves	0	0.00
		2. Friends or relatives bring it for the household members	0	0.00
		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
		9. Not applicable	6	100.00
		Total	6	100.00
LE_3a	Most important problem households encounter when sending internal remittances	1. The costs are too high	2	13.33
		2. There are limited possibilities to send money or goods	1	6.67
		3. The money travels too slow	2	13.33
		4. The system is insecure	0	1.00
		5. There are legal restrictions in sending money	1	6.67
		6. Other	2	13.33
		7. Not applicable	7	46.67
		Total	15	100.00
LE_3b	Second most important problem households encounter when sending internal 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 slow	0	0.00
		4. The system is insecure	1	6.67
		5. There are legal restrictions in sending money	0	0.00
		6. Other	0	0.00
		7. Not applicable	14	93.33
		Total	15	100.00

LE_3c	Third most important problem households encounter when sending internal remittances	1. The costs are too high	0	0.00
		2. There are limited possibilities to send money or goods	0	0.00

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		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
		7. Not applicable	1	100.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>M. MIGRANTS' INVESTMENT AND CHARITABLE ACTIVITIES</b>				
<b>M_1</b>	Frequency of visits from community members that live abroad	1. Never	1	6.67
		2. Sometimes	11	73.33
		3. Often	3	20.00
		4. Always	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>M_2</b>	Investments of community members that live abroad	1. Yes	7	46.67
		2. No	8	53.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>M_3a</b>	Most important sector of investment of community members that live abroad	1. Agriculture (incl. animals)	2	28.57
		2. Construction	2	28.57
		3. Hotels	2	28.57
		4. Business	0	0.00
		5. Transportation	1	14.29
		6. Other	0	0.00
		7. Not applicable	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>M_3b</b>	Second most important sector of investment of community members that live abroad	1. Agriculture (incl. animals)	1	16.67
		2. Construction	1	16.67
		3. Hotels	2	33.33
		4. Business	1	16.67
		5. Transportation	0	0.00
		6. Other	1	16.67
		7. Not applicable	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>M_3c</b>	Third most important sector of investment of community members	1. Agriculture (incl. animals)	0	0.00
		2. Construction	1	25.00



Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
	that live abroad	3. Hotels	0	0.00
		4. Business	0	0.00
		5. Transportation	0	0.00
		6. Other	2	50.00
		7. Not applicable	1	25.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>M_4</b>	Involvement in humanitarian or charitable (NGO) activities of community members	1. Yes	3	20.00
		2. No	12	80.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>M_5a</b>	Most important sector of humanitarian involvement of community members that live abroad	1. Construction of schools/mosques	1	33.33
		2. HIV/AIDS	1	33.33
		3. Providing goods to elderly (e.g. blankets)	1	33.33
		4. Helping poor people	0	0.00
		5. Holiday celebrations	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>M_5b</b>	Second most important sector of humanitarian involvement of community members that live abroad	1. Construction of schools/mosques	0	0.00
		2. HIV/AIDS	0	0.00
		3. Providing goods to elderly (e.g. blankets)	0	0.00
		4. Helping poor people	1	100.00
		5. Holiday celebrations	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>M_5c</b>	Third most important sector of humanitarian involvement of community members that live abroad	1. Construction of schools/mosques	0	0.00
		2. HIV/AIDS	0	0.00
		3. Providing goods to elderly (e.g. blankets)	0	0.00
		4. Helping poor people	0	0.00
		5. Holiday celebrations	1	100.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>M_6</b>	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	0	0.00
		4. Positively	5	71.43
		5. Very positively	2	28.57
		<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100.00</b>

<b>M_7</b>	Explanation of effect of investments made by community members that	1. Create job opportunities	5	71.43
		2. People are happy about	1	14.29

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
	live abroad	the investments		
		3. Other	1	14.29
		<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>M_8</b>	Effect of charitable activities of community members that live abroad on this community	1. Very negatively	0	0.00
		2. Negatively	0	0.00
		3. Neutral	0	0.00
		4. Positively	0	0.00
		5. Very positively	2	100.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>M_9</b>	Explanation of effect of charitable activities of community members that live abroad	1. Money/support helps with access to education	2	66.67
		2. People are happy (esp. elderly)	1	33.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>M_10_1</b>	When people leave their country they make life harder for those who stay	1. Strongly disagree	4	26.67
		2. Disagree	4	26.67
		3. Neutral	0	0.00
		4. Agree	7	46.67
		5. Strongly agree	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>M_10_2</b>	When people leave their country they still contribute to the country of origin	1. Strongly disagree	1	6.67
		2. Disagree	2	13.33
		3. Neutral	1	6.67
		4. Agree	7	46.67
		5. Strongly agree	4	26.67
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>M_10_3</b>	When people leave their country they are able to support families in country of origin	1. Strongly disagree	3	20.00
		2. Disagree	0	0.00
		3. Neutral	0	0.00
		4. Agree	7	46.67
		5. Strongly agree	5	33.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>M_10_4</b>	When people leave their country they abandon their country	1. Strongly disagree	4	26.67
		2. Disagree	9	60.00
		3. Neutral	0	0.00
		4. Agree	0	0.00
		5. Strongly agree	2	13.33
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>

<b>M_10_5</b>	When people leave their country they get rich	1. Strongly disagree	1	7.14
		2. Disagree	2	14.29

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
		3. Neutral	4	28.57
		4. Agree	5	35.71
		5. Strongly agree	2	14.29
		<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>M_10_6</b>	When people receive money from abroad they become lazier	1. Strongly disagree	2	14.29
		2. Disagree	5	35.71
		3. Neutral	2	14.29
		4. Agree	2	14.29
		5. Strongly agree	3	21.43
		<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>M_10_7</b>	When people receive money from abroad it leads to resentment from others	1. Strongly disagree	2	14.29
		2. Disagree	3	21.43
		3. Neutral	3	21.43
		4. Agree	6	42.86
		5. Strongly agree	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>M_10_8</b>	When people receive money from abroad they get rich	1. Strongly disagree	0	0.00
		2. Disagree	4	30.77
		3. Neutral	2	15.38
		4. Agree	6	46.15
		5. Strongly agree	1	7.69
		<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>M_10_9</b>	When people receive money from abroad it helps develop our country	1. Strongly disagree	2	15.38
		2. Disagree	2	15.38
		3. Neutral	1	7.69
		4. Agree	5	38.46
		5. Strongly agree	3	23.08
		<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>M_10_10</b>	When people who have lived abroad come back they help the country	1. Strongly disagree	0	0.00
		2. Disagree	2	14.29
		3. Neutral	2	14.29
		4. Agree	8	57.14
		5. Strongly agree	2	14.29
		<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>M_10_11</b>	When people who have lived abroad come back they do not fit in	1. Strongly disagree	1	6.67
		2. Disagree	6	40.00
		3. Neutral	2	13.33
		4. Agree	6	40.00
		5. Strongly agree	0	0.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>M_10_12</b>	When people who have lived abroad come back they bring new ideas,	1. Strongly disagree	1	6.67
		2. Disagree	1	6.67

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
	knowledge and technology	3. Neutral	1	6.67
		4. Agree	6	40.00
		5. Strongly agree	6	40.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>M_10_13</b>	When people who have lived abroad come back they receive preferential treatment	1. Strongly disagree	0	0.00
		2. Disagree	2	18.18
		3. Neutral	0	0.00
		4. Agree	8	72.73
		5. Strongly agree	1	9.09
		<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Var.	Label	Category	Frequency	Percent
<div> <div>ETHIOPIA Community Codebook</div> <div> Migration and Development: A World in Motion  Maastricht Graduate School of Governance,  Maastricht University </div> <div> <b>CONTACT INFORMATION:</b>  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: <a href="mailto:migration-mgsog@maastrichtuniversity.nl">migration-mgsog@maastrichtuniversity.nl</a> </div> </div>				



Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the  
Netherlands



**Maastricht University**

