

Migrating Out of Poverty

Zimbabwe Household Survey – 2018

User Guide

This is an output from a project funded by UK Aid from the UK government. The views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK government's official policies.

Data may be used freely. Please acknowledge your use of the Migrating out of Poverty data by including the following phrase:

“Data for Zimbabwe was collected by the Centre for Applied Social Sciences (CASS) of the University of Zimbabwe, through funding from the UK's Department for International Development (DFID) and made available by the Migrating out of Poverty Research Programme Consortium, the School of Global Studies, University of Sussex, UK.”

This document was prepared by Hiram Carreno-Najera and Julie Litchfield of the Migrating out of Poverty Sussex team with inputs from our partners at CASS.

Migrating out of Poverty
Arts B, University of Sussex
Falmer, Brighton BN1 9QN, United Kingdom

email: migrationrpc@sussex.ac.uk

web: <http://migratingoutofpoverty.org>

The study in Zimbabwe is one of a number of comparable studies carried out by Migrating out of Poverty (MOOP) partners in Ghana, Ethiopia, Bangladesh and Indonesia, and this handbook provides information about the quantitative data resulting from fieldwork conducted in April and May 2018.

1. Definition of migrants

A current migrant is defined as a former member of the household who within the last 10 years has moved away from the village for at least three months for either work or study reasons and is currently away. Migrants are all who move either to a different location within Zimbabwe or abroad.

2. Sampling

The Zimbabwe household survey follows protocols used in other countries that form part of the MOOP consortium, namely a core household questionnaire for households that currently have a migrant living away and households without current migrants.

This study was undertaken in three districts in Zimbabwe, namely Chivi in Masvingo province in the south-east of the country, Gwanda in Matabeleland South province in the south-west and Hurungwe in Mashonaland West province, in the north, areas where the Centre for Applied Social Sciences (CASS) team in collaboration with University of Witwatersrand had already conducted qualitative research and had established relationships with district officials and village elders.

Figure 1: Map of Zimbabwe with the survey districts



In each district, two wards were selected, one close to the district's main town and the other some distance away, in order to facilitate eventually analysis of the role of proximity in migration decisions. From each of the selected wards, two villages (in practice VIDCOs, Village Development Committee,) were randomly selected. In each of the selected villages, listing of households was obtained from the

village development chairperson. Using a number of key informants in each village, each household was categorised in terms of whether it had migrants or not. For the purpose of this household listing, migrants were defined as any member who was currently living outside the VIDCO for a continuous period of 3 months or more, irrespective of when the household member migrated as we did not expect key informants to have precise information on date of migration. The breakdown between internal and international migrants within the group of households with migrants was not specified. One hundred households were then selected randomly from these lists in a ratio of 3:1, that is, 75 households with migrants and 25 households without migrants, giving a total intended sample size of 1200 households.

In practice, sampling based on information provided by key informants was more accurate in some areas than in others. While an attempt was made to replace households wrongly sampled, distances between households made this difficult in some areas. The resultant sample is slightly more heavily weighted towards households without migrants in Gwanda but otherwise broadly as planned in Chivi and Hurungwe. There is a relatively low proportion of households with migrants in Gwanda (65% of the sample rather than the intended 75%).

Table 1 shows the original 2015 sample broken down by district and migrant characteristics of the household.

Study District	Internal migrants		International migrants		Both migrants		No migrants		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Chivi	85	25.1	190	45.8	27	26	98	29.3	400	33.5
Hurungwe	202	59.6	74	17.8	24	23.1	99	29.6	399	33.4
Gwanda	52	15.3	151	36.4	53	51	138	41.2	394	33
Total	339	28.4	415	34.8	104	8.7	335	28.1	1,193	100

The re-survey of households in 2018 faced significant challenges resulting in a very high attrition rate. Households which could not be located or which declined to participate in round 2 were replaced with similar households in the same village. Households successfully interviewed in both rounds are indicated with the variable *panel* in the data sets. Table 2 shows the extent of attrition.

District	Households with internal migrants		Households with international migrants		Households with both internal & international migrants		Households with no migrants		Total	
	L	R	L	R	L	R	L	R	L	R
Chivi	30	30	45	44	3	3	24	24	102	101
Hurungwe	122	121	20	19	11	11	27	24	180	175
Gwanda	25	25	68	65	10	10	19	19	122	119
Total	177	176	133	128	24	24	70	67	404	395

3. Questionnaire

Our household survey questionnaire is similar in design to those developed by the consortium for other countries. It consists of nine sections, which are described in more detail below.

Section 1 – Household grid

This section contains the information of migrant status, gender, age, marital status, fertility, ethnicity, education and economic activity of each household member but current migrants.

Section 2 – Current Migrants

This section asks about the current migrants. It includes the demographic information of gender, age, marital status, fertility, ethnicity and education. It then covers questions around the migration history: when they last migrated, and why, where they are currently living and what their activities were before moving, who decided, how the migration was financed, whether they had contacts at the destination and more.

Section 3 – Social Relationships and Remittances from Current Migrants

First, this section covers current employment and salary of the migrant. Then the household is asked how often and how they communicate with the current migrant(s) and also to report on remittances in cash and in goods received from each migrant and its usage.

Section 4 – Household Socioeconomic Wellbeing

The section comprises information on the land ownership and the quality of housing.

Section 5 – Other Sources of Household Income

The household states whether they earn any income from a long list of potential income sources, how much on average in the past year and who decides on the usage of this income.

Section 6a – Perceptions of Quality of Life

Questions are asked about the subjective perception on the overall quality of life of the household compared to 5 years ago, its income situation, its debt and savings, access to health services, relationship with other households in community, and effects of migration as well as the advantages or disadvantages of migration.

Section 6b - Perceptions of Quality of Life (Only Households with Migrants)

In this section only households with current migrants are asked on their subjective perception of the impact of migration on the household's wellbeing in terms of daily life and reasons for changes. They are also asked about their perception on the migrants' daily life and women's quality of life.

Section 7 – Household Expenditure on Food and Non-Food Items

This consumption module captures data on main items of food and non-food consumption, using a module similar in design but narrower in focus to the Living Standards Measurement Surveys consumption modules.

Section 8 – Migration Experience of Returned Migrants

This section includes questions directly asked to return migrants about their last destination, duration of migration, employment, salary, contact to family, remittances sent, reason for return and negative experiences inside and outside of workplace as well as overall perception of the migration experience.

4. Data Files

Files at the individual and household levels are available in Stata (.dta) and Excel (.xlsx) format. The details of each file are as follows:

- ZIM_2018_Individual_Data.

Contains 103 variables and 7,248 observations with information from Sections 1, 2 and 3. All individuals from each household are listed, including migrants and non-migrants.

- ZIM_2018_Household_Data.

Contains 91 variables for the 1,146 households with information on interview details, household location and all questions from Sections 4 and 6.

- ZIM_2018_Household_Income.

Contains 34 variables for the 1,146 households with information from Section 5.

- ZIM_2018_Household_Assets.

Contains 105 variables for the 1,146 households with information from Section 9.

- ZIM_2018_Household_Consumption.

Contains 249 variables for the 1,146 households with information from Section 7.

- ZIM_2018_Returnees.

Contains 33 variables for 113 identified returnees from 104 households, with information from Section 8. It is not possible to match these returnees with the individual file due to the lack of a member ID, but they can be matched with household data using the household identifier.

File	Variables
Individual_Data	migration_id, member_id, member_adj, migrant_id, migrant_adj, district_id, section1, Questions 5 - 71
Household_Data	migration_id, district_id, ward_id, village_id, migrants, interviewer, supervisor, date, start_time, end_time, Questions 1 -3; 22; 72 - 82; 87 - 103
Household_Income	migration_id, Questions 83 - 86
Household_Assets	migration_id, Questions 140 - 144
Household_Consumption	migration_id, Questions 104 - 109; 116 - 119
Returnees	migration_id, returnees, Questions 120 - 139

5. Variables

The variable names correspond to the question numbers in the questionnaire, for example, the variable q5 corresponds to question 5 in the questionnaire. The questionnaire contains the codes for each categorical variable. There are some additional variables:

- migration_id – Household Identifier. Comprises 1,146 unique values from 1 to 2832201. There are 15 households that refused to be interviewed, which can be identified using Question 2 from the Household_Data file.
- member_id – Member Identifier. Takes values from 1 to 15 for each household member included in the Household grid (Section 1).
- member_adj – Individual Identifier. Takes values from 1 to 23 for each household member included in the Individual_Data file. Every person is assigned a number regardless of whether she/he is a current member of the household or a migrant.
- migrant_id – Migrant Identifier. Takes values from 1 to 6 for each household migrant included in Sections 2 and 3.
- migrant_adj – Adjusted migrant identifier. There were cases of individuals included in the Household grid but reported as migrants, and not all of them appeared in Sections 2 and 3. This variable takes values from 1 to 10 for each migrant regardless of whether she/he was included in Section 1 or Sections 2-3.
- section1 – Identifies migrants coming from the Household grid and not included in Sections 2 and 3.
- district_id, ward_id and village_id – Location identifiers.
- panel – Identifies households from the 2015 – 2018 panel.