Developing a Profiling Methodology for Displaced People in Urban Areas

Case Study: Aden, Yemen
In 2010-11 the US State Department’s Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration funded research by the Feinstein International Center to develop a profiling methodology for urban migrants and refugees. The purpose was to capture a range of livelihood, integration and vulnerability data in urban settings, so as to enable comparisons between refugees and other migrant and non-migrant groups living in the same districts. The research built on earlier studies by the principal investigator (Karen Jacobsen) and our partners, and sought to make the profiling approach easily utilizable by operational agencies.

As part of developing the methodology, we conducted case studies in three urban settings in key host countries. We collaborated with the following local partners:

- Aden, Yemen – INTERSOS
- Polokwane, South Africa – African Center for Migration Studies, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
- Mae Sot, Thailand – International Rescue Committee

The goals of the case studies were to test and adapt the profiling methodology, and to gather data that would contribute to urban livelihoods programming. Each case includes a contextual background on migration to the urban setting, our methods, findings, and recommendations.

The overview report of our study, which includes an introduction to profiling, our conceptual framework, and the main programming recommendations, can be found here: https://wikis.uit.tufts.edu/confluence/display/FIC/Feinstein+International+Center.

The full profiling methodology, including the survey, mapping and qualitative approaches, and toolkit (including the modules for a two-day training workshop) can be found here: https://wikis.uit.tufts.edu/confluence/display/FIC/Feinstein+International+Center.
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Map A: Yemen, showing refugee camps and regional routes

Source: UNHCR
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Yemen, historically an emigrant country, is now both a transit site for migrants seeking employment in the Gulf and Europe and a destination country for Somali and other refugees. The city of Aden is a key destination, both for international migrants and refugees and for rural Yemenis moving to the city. These migrants and refugees are concentrated in the low-income district of Dar Sa’ad and specifically in one sub-district, Basateen. For the purpose of humanitarian programming and advocacy, it is useful to understand whether and how these migrant groups differ in their vulnerability from each other and from the resident Adeni citizens living in the same districts. This study developed a profiling survey methodology that allows such comparisons at the household level, and then tested it in Aden in December, 2010 (it was also tested in two other urban settings in Thailand and South Africa).

The main purpose of the study was to develop and test a profiling methodology that could strengthen evidence-based decision-making tools used by humanitarian agencies. In Aden we tested survey-based profiling tools intended to discern differences at the household level. We also intended to test a qualitative component that would build on the survey findings, but here we were thwarted by political developments in Yemen. Our research came to an end when clashes erupted between pro- and anti-government demonstrators and the army in March 2011. Growing instability and security concerns meant we were unable to return to Yemen to conduct the qualitative phase. Still, our quantitative Aden study enabled us to refine both our conceptual framework and our methods, in addition to providing a set of data.

Our conceptual approach (for the overall study) was as follows. In order to compare the livelihood experience of urban refugee and non-refugee groups, we devised a four-dimensional construct of urban livelihood security comprising housing, financial, and employment security and physical safety. We operationalized these measures with survey questions that generated data allowing us to compare the differences between migrant groups.

We then sought to explain these differences and what they mean for refugees, at three analytical levels:

First, at the policy/institutional level, the actions (or non-actions) of the government and other key institutions influence the experience of different groups. In Yemen, the government permits Somali refugees to remain in urban areas, but has not implemented a comprehensive national refugee policy. This means there are protection gaps for refugees. Regulations make livelihoods more insecure for refugees, such as the injunction against owning land and housing.

Second, at the level of civil society where policy is implemented, wider social processes including what we call a ‘culture of harassment’ influences the vulnerability of different groups. For example, refugees working informal jobs are often stopped by the police and required to pay a bribe or perform other tasks.

The third level of analysis concerns characteristics at the household level, in particular aspects of migration experience, human capital and social networks.

Study Findings

Our final sample consisted of 808 respondents distributed across the city of Aden. Sixty-one percent of respondents were female, and 73% were heads of household.

Of our respondents, 517 (64%) had migrated to Aden as an adult (over 16), and are termed ‘migrants’ in our report – either Yemeni (internal) migrants, Yemeni returnees, or refugees. Seventy-two percent of respondents were Yemeni citizens and 63% were born in Yemen. For the purposes of profiling, we analyzed our data by dividing our respondents into four groups:

Refugees were those who were born in a country experiencing conflict, and/or self-identified as asylum seekers, and/or had a refugee ID card. Of our sample, 28% (229
respondents) met these criteria. Of these refugees:

- 78% possessed a new Government of Yemen refugee card. 15% had an old UNHCR refugee card, and 3% were without documentation.
- 96% were born in Somalia (including Somaliland and Puntland) and 2.6% were from Eritrea or Ethiopia. Before coming to Aden, 86% had been living in Somalia, with another 5.7% in other parts of Yemen or the Gulf.
- Most refugees (78%) said they left their home countries for reasons related to conflict, but when asked why they came to Aden rather than another place, 39% of refugees said they hoped to find work. Aden, like other urban settings, is thus characterized by mixed migration flows, where an individual may be a refugee while still reporting that he or she came for economic or family reasons.

**Yemeni migrants** were those who had Yemeni citizenship, and were born in Yemen but had come to Aden as an adult. Of our sample, 26.2% (212 respondents) were Yemeni migrants.

**Returnees** were those who had Yemeni citizenship but were not born in Yemen. We included those who had come from Saudi Arabia or one of the Gulf states during 1990 or 1991 (after the expulsions). Of our total sample, 12.3% (99 respondents) were returnees. Of these, 47% were born in Somalia, and 12% were born in Saudi Arabia.

**Adeni non-migrants** were those who had Yemeni citizenship and were either born in Aden or came to Aden as a child, and were not included in our migrant sub-sample (see above). Of our sample, 33.2% (268 respondents) were Adeni non-migrants.

**Demographic and household differences between groups**

**Gender:** Of our total sample, 61% were female, but the refugee group had the highest proportion (78%) of female respondents compared to 50% of Yemeni migrants, 56% of Adeni non-migrants and 58% of returnees. Higher proportions of females were also found in other profiling studies, suggesting that there are more female than male refugee in Aden.

**Age:** Refugees were younger than other groups, with more than half (56%) between ages 17 and 30, compared with 28% of Adeni non-migrants and 37% of both Yemeni migrants and returnees in this age range.

**Marital status:** Refugees and returnees were less likely to be married than were Yemeni citizens. Of those who were married, less than half the refugees (46%) and about half returnees (53%) had spouses present compared with three quarters of Adenis (71%) and Yemeni migrants (76%). Six percent of the total sample reported being polygamous.

**Education:** Refugees had the lowest levels of education. More than 50% of our refugee respondents had no school, less than one percent had any university education, and only 12% of refugees had any secondary education. Our other three groups were more or less equivalent in their education levels, with Adeni non-migrants having the highest levels and Yemeni migrants having lower levels.

**Language:** Less than a quarter (22%) of refugees spoke Arabic as a first language at home, and 76% spoke Somali. Sixteen percent of returnees spoke Somali as a first language at home. A very small percentage of all groups had someone in the household who spoke English.

**Household size:** Refugees had smaller households (average 5.33 members) than did Adeni non-migrants (6.55), Yemeni migrants (7.32), or returnees who had the largest (7.54).

**Household composition:**

- **Children under 16:** Overall, refugees had fewer children in their households than other groups. About a quarter of refugees, returnees and Adenis and 12% of Yemeni migrant had no children under 16. Yemeni migrants had the largest number of children, with a household average of 2.97 children under 16, compared with 2.33 for refugees, 2.47 for Adenis non-migrants and 2.56 for returnees. Yemeni migrant households had the most school-age children, one factor contributing to the dependency ratio.
• **People with disabilities:** Refugee households did not differ from other groups - about 20% of all four groups had a person with a disability living in the household.

• **The elderly:** Just 13% of refugees had household members aged 60+ compared to 36% of returnees and 28-29% of both Yemeni migrants and non-migrants. This finding fits with the generally younger age profile of refugees and somewhat older profile of returnees.

• **Household income earners:** The number of income earners differed by group. Only eight percent of Adenis said they had no income earners, compared with 19% of returnees, 15% of refugees and 12% of Yemeni migrants. Between 50% and 60% of all four groups had one income earner. Refugee households had a higher income earner dependency ratio than any other groups, indicating they had a relatively larger number of income earners in their households compared with other groups. This reflects the smaller refugee household size, with fewer children. Refugee households also had a significantly higher proportion of women earning income.

**Differences in livelihood security:**

1. **Housing**

*Dwelling type:* Most refugees (82%) lived in a shack in a slum area compared with less than a quarter of Adenis (22%), and just over a quarter of Yemeni migrants (27%) and less than half (43%) of returnees. Only 12% of refugees lived in a freestanding house or a flat, compared with almost three quarters of Adenis, 66% of Yemeni migrants and half (50%) of returnees.

*Eviction experience:* A total of 74 respondents, 9% of our sample, had been evicted from their homes, and of these, 55 were refugees, (24% of all refugees). This was a significantly larger proportion than the other groups (1% of non-migrants, 6% of migrants, and 3% of returnees). Reasons given by refugee respondents was because they could not pay rent, and because ‘the owner did not want them’ there. One reason for this high rate of eviction is that refugees are unable to own their houses or land. By contrast, about three quarters of returnees said they owned their houses and land, largely due to the government’s policy of granting a plot of land to Yemeni citizens returning to the country in the 1990s.

*Safe location of dwelling:* Overall, 67 respondents’ homes (8%) were located near an environmentally unsafe or hazardous location, such as garbage dumps, railroads, or industrial area. Of these, about half were located in Dar Sa’ad. Basateen is not a physically unsafe area, and almost all respondents in this area (96%) were not living in a dangerous site. Overall, Yemeni migrants were more likely to live in a dangerous site than were refugees.

*Access to drinking water:* Most of our refugees, returnees and Yemeni migrants (75% for all groups) and 85% of our Adeni non-migrants got their drinking water from direct pipe connections to their dwellings. But of those who had to get their water from other sources, refugees were more likely to use facilities used by the poor such as the mosque tap, a hand pump or an illegal connection.

2. **Income/Assets**

Overall, residents of Dar Sa’ad had the lowest incomes of the eight city districts of Aden, and refugees had the lowest income levels compared to other groups, and owned the fewest productive assets.

*Remittances:* Refugees were most likely to send help to family and friends living outside of Yemen, while Yemeni migrants were most likely both to send help to and receive help from family and friends living in other parts of Yemen. Returnees were by far the greatest percentage to receive help from others outside of Yemen. Refugees were about as likely to receive help from others outside of Yemen as Adeni non-migrants and Yemeni migrants, and did not receive help from anyone living in other parts of Yemen.

*Aid:* About 12% of our sample had ever received assistance from the government or an aid agency. Of refugees, 17% had received such assistance, and 20% of returnees had, likely because many returnees have refugee ID cards in addition to Yemeni IDs. Aid agency reviewers of this report
were surprised that the number of refugees receiving assistance was so low. One explanation is that respondents interpreted ‘assistance’ to mean financial rather than in-kind support such as courses, counseling, and health care. Future research should be explicit about describing assistance. Another explanation is that participants underreported in hopes of receiving additional aid. It could also be that indeed a smaller proportion of refugees are assisted than agencies believe, and our random sample revealed the ‘hidden’ populations that do not have contact with agencies.

3. Employment

Employment is a key aspect of refugee vulnerability in Aden, and refugees were more vulnerable in their employment than any other group. Refugees were more likely to be unemployed, part-time employed, and least likely to be full-time employed. About 13% of both refugees and returnees were unemployed, and almost half (45%) of refugees were self-employed in low-end, informal sector work. Only 6% of refugees were employed in formal sector jobs, compared with 32% of Adenis, 18% of returnees and 16% of Yemeni migrants.

4. Physical safety and security

Overall, most respondents said they felt their neighborhoods were safe, with only slight differences between groups. While experience of crime over the past year was low (less than 10%), refugees were most likely to have experienced theft and assault or harassment. Refugees and returnees experienced the same levels of theft or robbery (14%), and 7% of refugees experienced physical assault compared to 1% or less for the other groups. About 8% of refugees experienced harassment or threats, compared to 2% or less for the other groups.

Sharing a dwelling: People can feel unsafe if they are obliged (for economic or other reasons) to share their dwellings with other households or individuals. Sharing a dwelling can put children or women at risk for sexual abuse, and increase the risk of theft. Two thirds of refugees (66%) shared a dwelling, compared with 18% of Adeni non-migrants, 21% of Yemeni migrants, and 27% of returnees. A far greater percentage of refugees also shared kitchens and latrines. Of those who shared, refugees were least likely to share with others with whom they had a relationship; all other groups were likely to share with relatives.

Explaining Differences at the Household Level

We found the following factors important in predicting livelihood outcomes:

Legal status and documentation: In Aden, legal status is not as salient a factor as it is in other cities because all Somali refugees are accorded prima facie status, and most refugees are Somali.

Social networks – local and external: A small percentage of our respondents reported belonging to community organizations, with the highest being savings/credit associations at 6.1%. Refugees were much less likely to belong to any organization, and Yemenis and returnees had about the same rates of belonging. External networks, measured by asking about contact in other countries, indicate that well over half our migrant groups had such contacts.

Language skills: Speaking an international language such as English (or Arabic) can be useful for securing employment in international agencies, or for negotiating onward migration. Only a small percentage of households mentioned having someone who spoke English: 2% of Adeni non-migrants, 4% of Yemeni migrants, 6% of returnees, and 3% of refugees. Refugee households were also less likely to speak Arabic.

Programming Recommendations

Our profiling approach is a useful evidence-based decision-making tool that enables agencies to identify specific areas of vulnerability in migrant and refugee groups, and we recommend that agencies use profiling tools in order to better understand where to target resources.

Areas of vulnerability identified in Aden present opportunities for both advocacy and focused and strategic programming. In general, we believe that material program resources (such as microcredit, vocational training, health care etc) should be aimed at the host community where refugees live rather than at refugees.
in particular. In Aden this is relatively straightforward as refugees are concentrated in one area of the city (Basateen).

**Housing:** Our study found that refugees lived in less safe housing, and were less secure in their housing – more at risk for eviction, partly because of legal provisions that make them unable to own land or housing. The possibility of land ownership for non-Yemenis should be raised with the government as a key part of advocacy for refugees. More secure ownership of important assets like land and housing could improve the safety and dignity of refugees and, since housing is a key livelihood asset, could improve their livelihood potential. Other program initiatives could take the form of housing support such as temporary rent subsidies for the most vulnerable. Such support should not be provided only to refugees, but could be targeted at all vulnerable groups in the Basateen area.

**Human capital and employment:** Our study revealed that refugees in Aden face high employment vulnerability, and like many of the urban poor, work largely in the informal sector. One skill that is likely to increase refugees’ ability to find more secure work is the ability to speak Arabic. Speaking the local language improves prospects for jobs and integration. Language training programs for adults should be targeted at all migrants. Refugees also have higher levels of illiteracy than other groups, and literacy and numeracy classes for adults could contribute to livelihood security.

**Social networks and community organizations:** Profiling studies by humanitarian agencies that seek to identify vulnerable households should explore the degree of linkages/integration into support networks. Households that are not linked in and are marginalized from social support are likely to be more vulnerable. In Aden, refugees have developed their own community-level support mechanisms through associations and social networks. Such efforts often go unrecognized by aid agencies due to their informal nature, but they can be successful in identifying and reaching needy households. Support for these groups is an appropriate way to address refugee needs and can ensure agencies that do not replicate what already exists. However, a careful analysis of these organizations and their role in the community should first be done.

Although our study did not explore refugee governance at the community level, Intersos recommends that programming efforts focus on improving the capacity of refugee representation committees. At present, the self-selected groups remain in their positions for long periods, despite their lack of training or qualifications to contribute to resolving refugee problems. The entrenched committee system means that some groups benefit more from services provided by UNHCR and its partners. Increasing the representation of refugees according to refugee nationality will reduce corruption of refugee committees and will improve and widen the accessibility of humanitarian resources, including to invisible and/or marginalized groups. ■
1. CONTEXT – BACKGROUND: MIGRATION TO YEMEN

The Republic of Yemen was created in 1990 when the Yemen Arab Republic (known as North Yemen, with Sana’a as the capital) joined with the People’s Democratic Republic of Yemen (known as South Yemen, with Aden as the capital). North Yemen obtained independence from the Ottoman Empire in 1918, while South Yemen was a British protectorate until 1967. Yemen is the poorest country in the Arabian Peninsula, and suffers from a host of social and economic problems, not least the uprising against the government that began as part of the Arab Spring in 2011. Agriculture and pastoralism are the dominant livelihoods activities, although these sectors are rapidly declining.1

The current population of Yemen is approximately 23.5 million, with about 31 percent urban residents, and an urbanization rate of 4.9 percent.2 The unemployment rate is about 35 percent, although informal livelihoods are not accounted for in official statistics. Urban dwellers benefited from predominantly oil-led growth between 1998 and 2006, leading to a decline in the percentage of urban poor from 32.2 to 20.7 percent in less than a decade.3

Yemen has long been considered a fragile state, and the Arab Spring (March 2011) has led to increased instability. Over the past six years, the government has been fighting a group of Shia rebels in the far north near the Saudi border (Sa’da governorate),4 while fighting between the government army and local militias is occurring in the Abyan governorate in the south of the country. The state has been unable to establish effective rule of law, and at the time of writing the government appears to have lost control of the urban centers as well. While tribal law partly fulfills the security vacuum left by the state, it results in severely limited access to justice for those belonging to weaker clans or groups, including refugees.

1.1 Historical migration from and to Yemen

Yemen has historically been an emigrant nation, but is now both a transit site for migrants seeking employment in the rich Gulf economies, Turkey, and Europe, and a destination country for Somali and other refugees.

Mass emigration from Yemen to the Gulf and Somalia began during British colonial times, although people from the Wadi Hadramawt in southern Yemen have worked abroad in East Africa, India, and Indonesia for centuries. Following independence and the establishment of a leftist regime in South Yemen, more than 300,000 people fled to the north, and virtually all minority groups left the country.5 Subsequent political upheavals resulted in further emigration in which Yemenis sought asylum in Somalia and elsewhere. According to the national census of 1975, there were some 1.23 million Yemenis working abroad, amounting to 19 per cent of the total population of 6.47 million.6 There were 1,168,199 citizens of Yemen working abroad in 1986. Most were working in Saudi Arabia and other Gulf states, and sending home some $3 billion a year in remittances.7

Returnees

When the Yemeni government supported the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in 1991, Saudi Arabia revoked the work privileges of Yemeni workers and expelled between 800,000 to one million workers.8 The following year (1992), some 60,000 Yemenis fled Somalia to escape the conflict,9 along with many Somalis seeking asylum. These ‘returnees’ faced significant difficulties with integration in Yemen.10 Those from Somalia are referred to by the denigrating term Mowalid, and face discrimination by other Yemenis.11 In particular, this word applies to children of mixed Somali–Yemeni descent. Many Yemeni returnees speak Somali better than Arabic. Some have been unable to reclaim their nationality and are thus considered stateless.12 In other cases, however, returnees qualify for dual documentation: they have a Yemeni ID card and enjoy full citizenship rights, whilst also benefitting from refugee status.13

Refugee flows

Like Yemen, Somalia has traditionally been a country of emigration, with Somalis migrating...
to the Gulf for work and to the West for education or to escape the regime of Siad Barre. In 1978, 1981, and 1988 armed conflicts led to the flight of 400,000 refugees to Ethiopia, Kenya, and Yemen and another 400,000 internally displaced.

The main flows of Somali refugees arrived in Yemen in two waves. The first took place between 1991 and 1993, when the overthrow of the Barre regime, ensuing civil war, and famine and drought in southern Somalia produced hundreds of thousands of refugees. Many fled to the capital and later to Puntland, Somaliiland, Ethiopia, Kenya, and Yemen. In 1995 the conflict lessened in intensity, the US-led UN peacekeeping forces departed the country, and many Somali refugees returned. But conflict resumed when the UN-backed government together with Ethiopian forces engaged with the Islamic Courts Union (ICU). The fighting intensified with the rise of Al-Shabab, or “the youth”, an Al-Qaeda backed Islamist group. This has led to another large-scale exodus in the past few years, which constituted the second wave of refugees to Yemen. These two waves have resulted in groups with different profiles: new arrivals, and longstayers who are well established in the country.

According to UNHCR, in 2010 there were about 203,500 refugees and asylum seekers in Yemen, of which 191,500 were from Somalia (this number has increased in 2011). At the time of UNHCR’s estimate there were 4,428 registered refugees from Iraq, 6,000 from Ethiopia, 150 from Eritrea, 580 from Palestine, and 178 from other countries. Somali and Ethiopian groups have grown steadily over the past decade; Yemeni government numbers now estimate the number of Somalis at half a million or even more. Most Somali refugees in Yemen were previously urban dwellers, and range from the extremely poor to the middle class. According to interviews conducted by Intersos, many Somalis reaching Yemen are transiting (or attempting to transit) through the country on their journey to the more affluent Gulf countries.

Since the Yemen uprising (part of the Arab Spring), IDPs have started to arrive in Aden. From June 2011, when conflicts broke out in Zinjubar (Abyan Governorate) in the South, Intersos believes that about 70,000 IDPs have reached Aden; however, figures are highly unreliable.

No data that we can find attests to the number of internal migrants in Aden, either from non-conflict-affected areas, or the conflict areas producing IDPs.

1.2 The Legal-Institutional context for refugees in Yemen

Yemen is the only Gulf country that has signed and ratified the 1951 United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and the 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees. The Government grants refugees prima facie status to Somalis regardless of their means of arrival, in contrast to other Middle East states which deport illegal entrants. However, Yemen has not yet concurrently, in 2000 remittances amounted to $1,288,000,000, or 15.1% of GDP, compared with 3 billion in the 1980s Yemen's border control offices are plagued with corruption, facilitating the flow of illegal migrants. Migrants enter the country with the help of relatives or friends, often smuggled by boat from Djibouti.

Migration within Yemen: Internal migration and IDPs

Since 2004, conflict between the government and the Al-Houthi movement in Sa’ada, in northern Yemen, has affected more than 800,000 people and caused repeated large-scale displacement in the northern governorates of Sana’a, Hajja, Amran, and Al Jawf. It is difficult to obtain accurate estimates of how many of these displaced Yemenis have found their way to the cities in the south, such as Aden. According to IDMC, “insecurity, checkpoints and (particularly in the north) landmines have limited movement and prevented many civilians from fleeing or seeking assistance there. They have also caused death and injury among those who have been able to flee.” Intersos believes there were virtually no IDPs in Aden in December 2010, as Aden was too far of a destination.

The returnee and asylum seeker influx has resulted in Yemen’s net emigration rate falling from 9.8 per 1,000 in 1990 to 0.1 migrants per 1,000 in 2000. Worker remittances have declined concurrently, in 2000 remittances amounted to $1,288,000,000, or 15.1% of GDP, compared with 3 billion in the 1980s Yemen's border control offices are plagued with corruption, facilitating the flow of illegal migrants. Migrants enter the country with the help of relatives or friends, often smuggled by boat from Djibouti.
codified international refugee law into its domestic legislation, and does not have administrative structures in place to serve asylum seekers. UNHCR established a presence in the country in 1991 and is working with the government to create national refugee legislation. A refugee policy is currently under discussion by the government. The legislation would be implemented by the National Committee for Refugee Affairs (NACRA), made up of representatives from UNHCR, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Interior, Immigration, the Political Security Office, and the National Security Office. The fate of this emerging policy in Yemen is unclear given the current political turmoil.

Until 2009, refugee registration was carried out by UNHCR. Somali refugees in the Aden area received a green ID card, those in Sana'a received a yellow card and a red card was given to refugees in the camps. In 2009 the Government of Yemen, with financial support from UNHCR, initiated a massive refugee registration effort. All refugees now receive green biometric ID cards issued by the Immigration, Naturalization, and Passport Authority. The government encourages Somalis to register and obtain the new card, but many refugees fear that the new registration is a first step towards deportation. While rumors about changes to refugee policy occasionally appear in the media, particularly concerning an end to prima facie refugee status for Somalis most refugee agency staff believe this to be an empty threat.

UNHCR is responsible for the refugee status determination of non-Somalis asylum seekers, although “government agencies often do not recognize UNHCR certificates given to non-Somalis, which increases refugees’ risk of arrest, detention or refoulement.” The government also relies on UNHCR to administer services and to operate a limited resettlement program for refugees with special needs.

A 2008 task force on mixed migration led by representatives from UNHCR, the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and various other aid groups helped shift priorities for aid to refugees in Yemen from that of material assistance to self-reliance. This included an emphasis on improved protection capacities of the government and the community, and the provision of skills and vocational training in towns. IOM favors refugee self-settlement in urban areas, which it equates with self-reliance. UNCHR is the official implementer of the agency’s urban refugee strategy; urban refugees are assisted with legal assistance, vocational training and general information about rights, procedures, services, regulations, and legal counseling.

Where refugees are mentioned in national laws the meaning tends to be ambiguous, leaving the authorities much discretion on how to apply them. The 1991 Law on the Entry and Residence of Aliens, for instance, has no provision about the determination of refugee status, nor does it discuss asylum seekers when listing legal means of entering the country. Yet Article 27 states that:

“The Minister of the Interior and Security shall decide on the form and status of travel documents given to certain categories of aliens and refugees, on conditions and procedures for their issue, and on fees to be levied on them, and cases qualifying for total or partial exemption from the payment of such fees.”

Employment for refugees is regulated by Article 3.2.e of the Yemeni Labor Code which states that “the provisions of this Code shall not apply to foreigners working in the Republic under an international convention to which the Republic is a party, this exemption being subject to the limits set by the Convention in question.” This could be seen as an exception allowing refugees, under the Refugee Convention, to work; however, many other articles in the same code appear to contradict this interpretation. Article 26.1.c, for example, states that the employment of a non-Yemeni shall be prohibited where he or she entered the Republic for reasons other than work.

Additional restrictions apply to the employment of non-Yemeni citizens, such as that laid out in Article 21: “the number of non-Yemeni workers working for an employer shall not exceed 10 percent of his total Yemeni workforce although the Minister may increase or reduce that proportion if necessary.” Article 20 stipulates that “the employment of non-Yemenis shall be subject to the following conditions:

1. obtention of residence and work permits;
2. possession of the occupational qualifications required for the job and full medical fitness;
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3. work in the job for which the permit was issued;
4. obtention of the appropriate permit in the case of occupations requiring special permits;
5. employment in a craft or occupation for which no qualified Yemeni is available.”

Further, begging is forbidden and punishable by law. This provision is used as a tool to threaten refugees and as an excuse to sanction them. Arbitrary arrests under this law are not uncommon, after which refugees are often required to pay a bribe for release.

1.3 Refugee settlement in Yemen: Camps and Basateen

In 1991, UNHCR established refugee camps around Aden for Somali refugees, first Al-Hiswa, followed by Medinat Al-Sha’ab in Al Bureka. At this time the camps were near enough to Aden that refugees could live there to receive assistance, including housing and food, while traveling to the city to supplement their income through livelihood activities. According to Somalis who lived in the camp in 1991, aid agency support at the time was relatively good, including high quality food rations and tents.

From the early 1990s, the government has progressively moved the camp further from Aden center, first one hour and now two hours’ travel from the city. Refugees are now unable to commute daily from the camp to the city, and this has prompted many to move into Aden. More than 80 percent of refugees have now settled in urban areas, most in Basateen.

In the early 1990s, the government provided free land in Basateen in the Dar Sa’ad district for Yemeni citizens expelled from Gulf countries at the start of the Gulf war. Most refugees in Aden now also live in Basateen, where they can engage in regular livelihood activities, capitalize on existing social networks, and work with Yemeni returnees who share the Somali language.

Basateen is one of eight districts in Aden, located northwest of the city limits. The district is divided into sixteen irregularly shaped “blocks” numbered from 1 to 11 and 21 to 25. (Map B) The western part is a slum area that includes an enclave of Akhdam, a marginalized Yemeni social group. The northeast portion is a mixed slum with some concrete houses. A third section is more developed, with bigger houses and access to water and sanitation facilities. The inhabitants of this wealthier part of Basateen call their neighborhood Al Jazeera — “the island.”

The spatial division in Basateen mirrors a social one: Somali (and other) refugees are concentrated in blocks 1 to 11 and the majority of Yemeni returnees live in blocks 10, 11, 21, 22 and 23. Somalis usually pay rent to Yemeni returnees who own the land. Yemenis tend to live in the wealthier areas, but the boundaries are often blurred: some Yemeni returnees live in the same blocks as refugees but generally in better houses. Refugees tend to live in congested rented houses, with as many as twelve people per room in order to afford the rent.
2. METHODS - THE ADEN SURVEY

The study’s findings come largely from quantitative methods. We initially intended our Aden study to begin with a household survey followed by qualitative interviews that would build on the survey findings. The survey was carried out successfully in December 2010, but our research came to an end when clashes erupted between pro- and anti-government demonstrators and the army in March 2011. This conflict is ongoing at the time of this writing (November 2011). Instability and security concerns meant we were unable to return to Yemen to conduct the qualitative phase in the spring of 2011, and our research partner organization, Intersos, became caught up in responding to the unfolding humanitarian emergency that engulfed the country.

After initial consultations with our partner organization, Intersos, during the fall of 2010, the field component of our study took place from December 2010 to January 2011. A consultant from the Feinstein International Center, Tufts University, led the mapping and training exercises in Aden, which were followed by the survey and data entry.

We generated a stratified random sample of 808 respondents distributed across the eight districts of Aden. The study also drew on key informant interviews during the pre-survey planning phase (see Table 3.1). The preparation and implementation of the survey sought to build as much as possible on the expertise of community members and national and international staff of NGOs and UN agencies. The survey data set was sent to Tufts for cleaning and analysis, which took place from February to June 2011. The case study was written up in the fall of 2011 and sent to Intersos for review and comments.

Our final survey sample consisted of 808 respondents distributed across the eight districts of the city of Aden, as shown in Chart 4.2 and Map C. Almost 70% of our interviews occurred in Dar Sa’ad district (where Basateen is located).

Refusal rate: Overall we solicited 850 households, of which 42 refused to participate in the survey, making our refusal rate 5%. More households who refused to participate were from low and medium refugee density areas of the city.

Household definition: We defined a household as those individuals sharing food or income on a daily basis.

The following steps briefly describe the field research component. A more detailed description of our overall approach can be found in the Methods section of our Final Report.

1. Mapping Aden

Our first step was to identify Aden’s city limits on a Google Earth map. The consultant drew on the expertise of local community member key informants and staff of local and international humanitarian organizations 34 to identify areas where refugees were concentrated and to create a map of Aden that reflected different ‘refugee densities’, or areas where refugees were concentrated in the city. We then used this map to obtain a stratified sample of high, medium and low refugee densities (see 3.1 Stratification and Sampling below).

2. Training of the survey team

The consultant and Intersos recruited a team of enumerators and team leaders and embarked on a week-long training that included a field pilot. The training was designed to ensure that the enumerator team understood the goals of the data collection (and the overall project) and that they could elicit and record accurate and detailed responses in the field. The training therefore ensured that they understood and were familiar with the questionnaire, could ask the questions in a uniform way (but explain where necessary), and understood the sampling strategy and the importance of following it. Topics also covered in the training included how profiling is a tool of protection for vulnerable populations in an urban setting, and the livelihood conceptual framework.

3. Adaptation of the questionnaire and pilot

As part of the training the consultant worked with the enumerator team to adapt and
translate/ back-translate the survey questionnaire (profiling tool). Questions were customized (adapted) to suit the Aden context, and Aden-relevant code categories were devised. To test the questionnaire, our enumerator team piloted the survey and it was then further revised. Once the questionnaire was deemed ready, it was translated and back-translated to ensure linguistic equivalence. The Aden questionnaire is included as an annex to this report.

4. Data collection and entry

The survey team carried out the data collection over a period of three weeks. Data entry occurred during and after the survey, over a period of 28 days. The full dataset is available upon request by contacting the Principal Investigator.

5. Report Write-up

The period of writing up the report included extensive cleaning of the data and statistical analysis. Since we were unable to conduct qualitative research and thereby explore in more detail some of our survey findings, we spent time gleaning from the reports of Intersos and other researchers’ additional information about the refugee experience in Aden so as to round out our findings.

Stratification and sampling

As with all our profiling surveys, we began by stratifying the city into areas of high, medium and low densities of refugee population using local knowledge derived from key informants in Aden. Stratification allows us to capture as many refugee respondents as possible in our random sample by sampling more heavily in high-density areas. In most cities, simple random sampling will not yield enough refugee respondents to enable comparison between groups. However, it is important to sample in low-density areas to allow for the possibility of capturing hidden or under-researched groups.

The pattern of refugee distribution in Aden is somewhat different from other cities with large refugee populations in that there is one district where the majority of refugees are concentrated, Basateen, and only one other relatively small area, Kallua, which can be considered medium density. Basateen has been the focus of humanitarian work by Intersos and other agencies in recent years.

Using knowledge derived from local experts and leaders, together with a table from Yemen’s census bureau that contained detailed population information on the eight districts and 200 sub-districts of Aden, the team calculated the estimated percentages of refugees in each district or sub-district (Table 3.1). We defined high-density areas where the population was estimated at two-thirds or more refugees. Medium density areas were mixed Yemeni and refugee communities, with one to two-thirds being refugee residents. Low density areas had one-third or less refugee residents.

We then marked up the Google Earth map of Aden by indicating areas of high and medium density refugee populations, with the unmarked areas by default low-density. The map was saved as a .kmz file. For verification, we compared the Google Earth map with a printed one from the census bureau.

Our target sample was 800 households. We arrived at this number by taking into consideration our available time and resources, and the need to ensure adequate statistical power. Logistical problems in urban areas make a simple random selection of households time consuming and difficult, so we used a cluster approach in which we randomly scattered GPS waypoints across our map of Aden. During the data collection, we traveled to each waypoint and selected five dwellings around each waypoint.

Our sample had more waypoints in high-density areas, as shown in Map C below:

- 500 households in high density areas around 100 waypoints
- 100 households in low density areas around 20 waypoints
- 200 households in low density areas around 40 waypoints

At each waypoint, five dwellings were selected by spinning a pen on a clipboard and going to the nearest household to which the pen pointed. If no one was available in the dwelling, the team
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refugee group</th>
<th>Presence by district</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Somalia</strong></td>
<td>2500 HHs in Basateen (Dar Sa’ad District)</td>
<td>Somalia community leaders in Basateen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80-100 HHs in Mukalla District</td>
<td>Somali Community center staff/members in Aden city (established in 1920)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80–100 HHs in Kallua District</td>
<td>Deputy Somalia Consul in Aden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50–60 HHs in Mansoura and Sheick Otman Districts (non Basateen areas)</td>
<td>Long term refugees in Basateen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yemeni returnees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UNHCR senior local staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iraq</strong></td>
<td>20 HHs in Maalla District</td>
<td>Iraqi barbers in Maalla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-10 HHs in Khormaxar District</td>
<td>Iraqi restaurant owner in Tawani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-10 HHs in Mansuora District</td>
<td>INTERSOS staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 HHs in Crater</td>
<td>UNHCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethiopia</strong></td>
<td>150 HHs in Basateen</td>
<td>Ethiopian community leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50–60 HHs mainly Khormaxar (Non Oromo)</td>
<td>UNHCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single families may be located in Kallua, and Sheick Otman.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Palestinian</strong></td>
<td>There is no indication about numbers, but most live in Khormaxar.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eritrea</strong></td>
<td>No information available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

returned later that day or the following day. If nobody was there at the second attempt they selected up to two replacements from neighboring houses. In some cases, the team only managed to interview respondents from two, three or four dwellings at a given waypoint. In such a case, an additional waypoint was selected in that district from a list of replacement points that had been prepared in advance. When an apartment building was selected, the team numbered the flats and the team leader drew numbers from a bag in order to select which apartment to sample.

In low-density areas a relatively small number of households (200) were drawn from a large area. To compensate, the team used Probability Proportional to Size (PPS) sampling, which uses Aden census data based on the eight districts in the city. We ensured that the 40 waypoints were selected in the areas with the highest overall (not refugee-specific) population density. We subtracted the high and medium refugee density sub-districts of Basateen and Kallua from the total population of that particular district and then listed the eight districts and applied PPS. The result of the PPS procedure is presented in the toolkit.

To select households from within each stratum, the team overlaid grids onto the Google Earth map. To design the grids, the team created three tables in Excel in different colors to differentiate refugee density areas, and labeled every five cells with a number. They saved the tables as PDF files and opened them with GIMP, an open-source image editor that works on both PC and Mac. The GIMP program made it possible to save the image as a file recognizable by Google Earth (.bmp or .jpeg) and to make the background transparent. The team then overlaid the grids onto Google Earth, placing a single grid on top of each district/sub-district. The grid overlaid onto Basateen district is shown in Map D below.
Map C: Distribution of survey locations (waypoints) in Aden

Map D: Basateen grid
3. MIGRATION CHARACTERISTICS, DEMOGRAPHICS AND HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Our final sample consisted of 808 respondents distributed across the eight districts of the city of Aden, as shown in Chart 4.2 and Map C. Almost 70% of our interviews occurred in Dar Sa’ad district (where Basateen is located).

Refusal rate: Overall we solicited 850 households, of which 42 refused to participate in the survey, making our refusal rate 5%. More households who refused to participate were from low and medium refugee density areas of the city.

Household definition: We defined a household as those individuals sharing food or income on a daily basis.

3.1 Migration to Aden

Of our respondents, 517 (64%) had migrated to Aden as an adult (over 16), and are termed ‘migrants’ in our report – either Yemeni (internal) migrants, Yemeni returnees, or refugees.

Of our 291 respondents who were born in Aden or came as child, 107 were from families who had migrated to Aden in the prior generation. Of these, 52 were from immediate families (usually parents) who had migrated and could report to us enough detail about their family’s migration experience, so they answered the migration section to our survey. We included these respondents in our migrant sub-sample.

Our sample of migrants thus includes those who could report on their families’ migration experience (n=52), and those who had migrated as an adult (n=517), for a total migrant sample of 569. In total, 72% percent of respondents were Yemeni citizens and 63% were born in Yemen.

Categories of respondents

In order to compare the experience of refugees with other migrant groups and non-migrants in Aden, we divided our respondents into four groups of interest as follows (Chart 4.1):

Refugees were those who were born in a country experiencing conflict, and/or who self-identified as asylum seekers, and/or who had a refugee ID card. Of our sample, 28.3% (229 respondents) met these criteria. Of them, 78 percent possessed a new Government of Yemen refugee card. 15% had an old UNHCR refugee card, and 3% were without documentation.

Yemeni migrants were those who had Yemeni citizenship, and were born in Yemen but had come to Aden as an adult. Of our sample, 26.2% (212 respondents) were Yemeni migrants.

Returnees were those who had Yemeni citizenship but were not born in Yemen. We included those who had come from Saudi Arabia or one of the Gulf states during 1990 or 1991 (after the expulsions). Of our sample, 12.3% (99 respondents) were returnees.

Adeni non-migrants were those who had Yemeni citizenship and were either born in Aden or came to Aden as a child, and were not included in our migrant sub-sample (see above). Of our sample, 33.2% (268 respondents) were Adeni non-migrants.

The distribution of our four groups across the districts of Aden is shown in Chart 3.2

Chart 3.1 Proportions of migrant groups

The majority of refugees and returnees were born in Somalia. Of the 229 refugees, 96% were born in Somalia (including Somaliland and Puntland) and 2.6% were from Eritrea or Ethiopia. Of the 99 returnees, 47% were born in Somalia, and 12% were born in Saudi Arabia.

We also asked where our respondents had been living before coming to Aden. Of our refugees,
86% had been living in Somalia before coming to Yemen, and 3% had been in Eritrea or Ethiopia, with another 5.7% having been in other parts of Yemen or the Gulf.

Most refugees came directly from Somalia, but in some cases refugees lived in other towns in Yemen or elsewhere in the region before coming to Aden.

**When people came**

Refugees tended to have been in Aden less time that other migrant groups. As shown in Chart 4.3, about two-thirds of both Yemeni migrants and returnees had been in Aden for more than 8 years. About half of the refugees (47%) had been in Aden that long, and another half for eight years or less. New arrivals (those who had been in Aden for less than one year) comprised about ten percent of all migrant groups: 9% of refugees, 10% of migrants, and 7% of returnees.

**Reasons for migrating**

We first asked our respondents why they left their place of origin, and then why they chose to come to Aden rather than another place. Refugees were much more likely than other groups to cite violent conflict as their reason for leaving: three quarters of refugees (78%) gave this reason compared with 49% of returnees, and 5% of Yemeni migrants - these could be IDPs but we were not able to verify this (Chart 4.4).

Many Yemeni migrants cited a combination of...
economic reasons and having family in Aden. Of our 212 Yemeni migrants, 52% left their place of origin for economic reasons, 10% left to find education and 21% came to Aden for family reasons (often for marriage). Our Yemeni migrants also gave medical or health reasons (4%) for coming to Aden. Returnees came to join family (12%) and they also cited deportations and government evictions (3%).

When asked why they came to Aden rather than another place, 39% of refugees said they hoped to find work, compared to 47% of Yemeni migrants and 20% of returnees. About a third of refugees (36%) and returnees (30%) said they came to Aden because it was safe, compared to less than 3% of Yemeni migrants.

As with other urban destinations, migration patterns represent a mix of reasons for coming. Refugees leave their place of origin for conflict reasons, but go to an urban setting for economic reasons. Aden, like other urban settings, is thus characterized by mixed migration flows, where an individual may be a refugee while still reporting that he or she came for economic or family reasons. While it was important for the survey to ask why people left their previous location, we did not use this self-identified information to create our migrant categories.

Chart 3.5 Gender of respondents
3.2 Demographics

This section compares the demographic characteristics of our entire sample, divided into our four groups of interest.

**Age and Gender**

Of our total sample, 61% were female. More than three quarters (78%) of refugees were female compared to 50% of Yemeni migrants, 56% of Adeni non-migrants and 58% of returnees (Chart 4.4). The higher proportion of females in our refugee and returnee groups could have been caused by our survey approach: men were often not home when our enumerators requested an interview. However, this bias holds for all households, and higher proportions of females were also found in the profiling studies conducted by Intersos and the Danish Refugee Council.

Our refugee respondents were younger than other groups (Chart 4.5). More than half (56%) of refugees were between ages 17 and 30, compared with 28% of Adeni non-migrants, and 37% of both Yemeni migrants and returnees. Just six refugee respondents (3%) were 61 or above, while 5% of Adeni non-migrants, 9% of Yemeni migrants and 13% of returnees fell in this group.

**Marriage**

Refugees and returnees were less likely to be married than were Yemeni citizens, with 60% of refugees and 64% of returnees reporting being married compared to 76% of Adeni non-migrants and 85% of Yemeni migrants.

Of those who were married, far fewer refugees (46%) and returnees (53%) than Adenis (71%) and Yemeni migrants (76%) had spouses present. Six percent of the sample reported being polygamous, with no significant differences between groups.

**Ethnicity**

Respondents belonged to a wide range of ethnic groups. The largest groups represented were as follows:

- Of Adeni non-migrants, 47% were Adeni, 10% were Taizi, 8% were Lahji, 7% were Badoui, 5% were Hadrami and 5% were Yafai.
- Of Yemeni migrants, 19% were Taizi, 14% were Lahji, 9% were Badoui, and 8% were Hadrami.
- Of returnees, 21% were Hadrami, 13% were Yafai, 10% were Taizi, and 10% were Saadi.
- Of refugees, 27% were Hawiye, 26% were Rahanweyni/Digil, 15% were Banadiris, and 13% were Darod.
Education

Our education categories were:

• **No school**: no formal education or schooling.

• **Some primary school**: some or completed primary school in Yemen, some or completed Somali lower school, some or completed Somali intermediate school. On average this group had between one and eight total years of schooling.

• **Some secondary school**: some secondary school or completed secondary school.

• **Some university**: some university, completed university, or a postgraduate degree.

• **Other school**: religious education, non-formal education (eg. adult, bridge education, accelerated learning), vocational training, or ‘other’.

As shown in Chart 4.6, refugees had the lowest levels of education. More than 50% of our refugee respondents had no school, less than one percent had any university education, and only 12% of refugees had any secondary education. Our other three groups were more or less equivalent in their education levels, with Adeni non-migrants having the highest levels and Yemeni migrants having lower levels.

In order to compare across households, we also explored education levels of household heads alone. This reduces our sample size to 578 respondents. (Future studies should ask about the individual with the highest level of education in the household in addition to the respondent.) The same patterns emerge however - of the 193 household heads with no education, almost half (47%) are refugees and 25% are Yemeni migrants. Of the 57 household heads with some university, only one was a refugee, and more than half (56%) were Adeni non-migrants.

Languages spoken in the household

We asked about the first language spoken at home and then about up to two additional languages in the household. As expected, all Yemenis (99%) and most returnees (84%) spoke Arabic as a first language at home. Less than a quarter (22%) of refugees spoke Arabic as a first language at home, and 76% spoke Somali. Sixteen percent of returnees spoke Somali as a first language at home. We discuss the role of languages in livelihood vulnerability in our section on Explaining Vulnerability below.

3.3 Household size and composition

Household size and composition is an important indicator of economic vulnerability. Households with higher numbers of elderly, disabled people or children relative to household size are likely to have higher health and education expenses, and be less able to generate income.

As shown in Chart 4.6, refugees had slightly smaller households than did Adeni non-migrants, Yemeni migrants, or returnees.

Chart 3.7 Education level by migrant group

![Chart 3.7 Education level by migrant group](image)
Of our total sample, 73% were heads of household. Of female respondents, 69% were heads of household, and of males 79% were heads of household.

### Household income earner ratios

The number of income earners in a household is potentially an indicator of employment and income vulnerability. Households with high income-earner dependency ratios (i.e. those that have a high number of earners relative to household size) are likely to be less vulnerable to the loss of an income earner. We calculated the income earner dependency ratio as the number of income earners divided by the total number of the household. A higher ratio indicates a less vulnerable household. As shown in Chart 4.8, refugee households had a higher income earner dependency ratio than any other groups, indicating they had a relatively larger number of income earners in their households compared with other groups. This was expected as refugee households were smaller, as described above, and it is often those individuals who are capable of going to work who choose to migrate to the city rather than remaining in the camp. Refugee households also had a significantly higher proportion of women earning income, as shown in Chart 4.9.
The reduction in household vulnerability depends more on the amount of income brought in by earning household members than only whether they are earning income or not. The way in which respondents understood the term “income earners” may have varied, meaning that some counted in this ratio could have been fully employed while others were earning only occasional income. In the future it would be helpful to clarify the minimum amount of income the person should be earning monthly in order to factor into this ratio.

**Household Dependents**

We asked about dependents — children, disabled and elderly — living in the household, and compared the experience of our four groups. Overall, we found that refugees were not more likely to have dependents living in their households than other groups, rather, Yemeni migrants had a higher average number of school-age children, and Adeni locals had the highest proportion of household members over 60. All four groups had about the same proportion of disabled members — around 20% of all four groups had a person with a disability living in the household.

Chart 4.10 displays the average percentages of each group (under 16, over 60, and chronically ill or disabled) out of the total number of household members. as did 21% of Adeni non-migrants and 28% of returnees. Only 12% of Yemeni migrant household had no children under 16, and they had the largest number of children, with a total of 630 children among 212 households, or a household average of 2.97 children under 16 per household. Our 227 refugee households had a total of 535 children, and average of 2.33. Our 267 Adeni non-migrants had a total of 659 children, and average of 2.47. Our 97 reporting returnees had a total of 241 children, and average of 2.56. These finding indicate that Yemeni migrant households had the most school-age children, one factor contributing to the dependency ratio.

**People with disabilities:** About 20% of all four groups (17.5% of Yemeni migrants) had a person with a disability living in the household. The most common disability was chronic illness (n=68), with 12% of non-migrants, 5% of refugees and 8% of both returnees and Yemeni migrant households reporting having a chronically ill member. The next most commonly reported was physical disabilities (n=61), with 11% of refugees, 7% of both non-migrants and returnees and 5% of Yemeni migrants.

**The elderly:** We asked respondents whether any member of the household was over sixty. Refugees had a lower percentage of household members aged 60+ (13%) compared to 36% of returnees and 28-29% of both Yemeni migrants and non-migrants. This finding fits with the generally younger age profile of refugees and somewhat older profile of returnees.

**Chart 3.11 Household composition, averages**
4. DIMENSIONS OF URBAN LIVELIHOOD SECURITY

In our conceptual framework, we argued that urban vulnerability is strongly determined by livelihood security, and we identified four categories of livelihood security that are particularly important in urban settings. The importance of cash income is the conceptual basis of three dimensions of vulnerability (housing, assets/income, and employment). The other dimension, physical insecurity, relates to unsafe environments and infrastructure, high rates of crime, and lack of rights, particularly when it comes to matters related to labor and housing.

Our categories of urban vulnerability and the measures we used to operationalize them are as follows:

1. Housing security, measured by:
   a. Housing type (construction)
   b. Ownership of dwelling and land
   c. Experience of eviction

2. Financial security, measured by:
   a. Household income and assets
   b. External income (remittances + aid)

3. Employment security, measured by:
   a. Employment level and type

4. Physical safety and security, measured by:
   a. Housing location
   b. Experience of crime
   c. Perceptions of neighborhood safety
   d. Sharing the dwelling

Below we describe how refugees in Aden differed from other groups in terms of these four categories. We controlled for district to ensure that groups living in the same district were compared with each other.

4.1. Housing security

Housing is a key element of urban livelihoods and protection. Poor quality and legally insecure housing places people at risk for eviction or physical harm. Housing is itself an economic asset, as it can be used to generate income through home-based production activities, rental of a room, or secure storage of goods for vending or trade. We explored three indicators of housing security: type/quality of housing, whether the dwelling is in a safe location, ownership of dwelling and land, and experience of eviction.

**Housing Type**

Enumerators assessed respondents’ type of housing, based on categories of housing common in Aden. Refugees had the lowest quality of housing. Most refugees (82%) lived in a shack in a slum area compared with less than a quarter of...
Adenis (22%), and just over a quarter of Yemeni migrants (27%) and 43% of returnees (Chart 5.1). Only twelve percent of refugees lived in a freestanding house or a flat, compared with almost three quarters of Adenis (73%), 66% of Yemeni migrants and half (50%) of returnees.

These same proportions held within Dar Sa’ad district, where all of our refugee respondents and most of our returnees lived, most respondents lived in poor quality housing (backyard rooms, shacks or hostel/boarding houses).

Access to Drinking Water: Another indicator of housing quality (and poverty) is how people get access to drinking water. Most of our refugees, returnees and Yemeni migrants (75% for all groups) and 85% of our Adeni non-migrants got their drinking water from direct pipe connections to their dwellings. But of those who had to get their water from other sources, refugees were more likely to use facilities used by the poor such as the mosque tap, a hand pump or an illegal connection.

Safe location of dwelling

We explored whether our respondents’ dwellings were located in environmentally unsafe or hazardous locations, such as garbage dumps, railroads, or industrial areas, on steep slopes or on flood plains, and whether there were differences among our four groups of interest.

Overall in Aden, 67 respondents’ homes (8.3%) were located near an unsafe site. Of these, about half (48%) were located in Dar Sa’ad district, 22% were located in Seera, 9% were in Al Tawahi, and 7% were located in Al Mansura. Basateen is not a physically unsafe area, and most respondents in this area (96%) were not living in a dangerous site. The differences between groups were not significant in Basateen. Yemeni migrants were significantly more likely to live in a dangerous site than were refugees or Adeni non-migrants. There were no significant differences between refugees and Adeni non-migrants.

Dwelling and land ownership

Ownership of the dwelling or the land on which it stands means households are less vulnerable both because they can potentially utilize the house for productive activities without having to pay rent, and because ownership reduces the risk of eviction or forced relocation.

Both for our entire sample and when we controlled only for Dar Sa’ad district, most Adenis (87%) owned their home and 60% owned the land, as did 56% of Yemeni migrants (owned house) and 52% (owned land) (Chart 5.2). A large proportion of returnees said they owned their homes (73%) and land (66%). This is likely owing to the government policy of granting a plot of land to Yemeni citizens returning to the country in the 1990s, as discussed earlier in this
A total of 49 respondents, or 6% of our sample, said they had been forced to move because of conflict or violence within the city of Aden. Of these, 23 were refugees (10% of refugee subsample).

A total of 74, or 9% of our sample, had been evicted from their homes, and of these, 55 were refugees, constituting 24% of the refugee subsample. This was a significantly larger proportion than the other groups (1% of non-migrants, 6% of migrants, and 3% of returnees). Of the refugee respondents who had been evicted, two-thirds (37) said it was because they could not pay rent, and others reported that the owner did not want them there (15).

Overall we found that refugees were more vulnerable in their housing security: larger proportions lived in poor quality housing, fewer (likely none) owned their dwelling or land, and more had been evicted.

4.2. Financial security

We found significant differences when we asked how many income earners there were in the respondents’ households. Only eight percent of Adenis said they had no income earners, compared with 19% of returnees, 15% of refugees and 12% of Yemeni migrants. Between 50% and 60% of all four groups had one income earner.
Income and asset questions are sensitive, and the response rate for these questions was lower than for others: 25% of respondents either did not know or refused to answer income questions. A larger proportion of Adeni non-migrants (38%) said they did not know than Yemeni migrants (22%), refugees (10%) and returnees (30%). We assume that reporting inaccuracy is similar across all groups. Below we show ranges of reported monthly income but the Charts are difficult to verify, and are estimates at best.

**Household income (earned by household members)**

We asked respondents to estimate the total income earned by members of the household on a good and on a bad month. Chart 5.4 shows the distribution for respondents as reported on a good month. The income of refugees is clearly less than that of the other three groups, as indicated by the leftward skew of the purple graph compared to the other three graphs.

Table 4.1 shows the breakdown with respect to the modal household income (the highest number of respondents) during good and bad months. Non-migrants reported earning much higher amounts in both months than all other groups, and refugees earned by far the least.

In Dar Sa’ad, refugees had the lowest income levels compared to other residents, but the other three groups (Adeni non-migrants, Yemeni migrants, and returnees) all had significantly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Good month</th>
<th>Bad month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adeni Non-Migrants</td>
<td>40,001 _ 80,000 (20%), or about $185 _ $372.</td>
<td>23,001 _ 40,000 (18%), or about $105 _ $185.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemeni Migrants</td>
<td>23,001 _ 40,000 (28%), or about $105 _ $185</td>
<td>23,001 _ 40,000 (20%), or about $105 _ $185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returnees:</td>
<td>23,001 _ 40,000 (21%), or about $105 _ $185</td>
<td>Less than 5,000 (24%), or about less than $23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees</td>
<td>8,001 _ 15,000 (29%), or about $37 _ $70</td>
<td>Less than 5,000 (37%), or about less than $23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*On average, 1 USD is equivalent to 215 Yemeni Rial (September 2011 rate).*
lower incomes than the same groups in other districts of Aden.

**Working children:** We asked our respondents whether any children in their household were earning income. Overall, 43 households said they did. Returnees had the highest proportion with 12% saying they had one or more children earning income, compared with 6% of both refugees and Yemeni migrants and 2% of Adenis.

**Children in school:** We asked how many children of school age go to school and on average, only 40% of children in refugee households were attending school, compared with between 58% and 68% for the three other groups. When asked why children did not go to school, the most common response was that school fees were too costly, followed by ‘children must work’.

### Chart 4.5 Ownership of or access to household assets

![Chart 4.5 Ownership of or access to household assets](image)

**Assets**

We also asked respondents about ownership of or access to a range of household assets. We categorized assets into two types:

- **Productive assets** enable the household to better use their skills and knowledge, and improve their income-earning potential. Productive assets need not be owned: their value can be utilized if the household has access to them. In Aden we classified productive assets as: bicycle, cell phone, gas cylinder, electricity, computer, internet, car/motorcycle/minibus, and fridge.

- **High-value or transportable assets** can be sold or redeemed for cash, and can only be utilized if the household owns them. The value of some assets is contextual depending on the city. In Aden we asked whether the household owned a radio, TV, tables/chairs, a fan, a mosquito net, a washing machine, and an air conditioner.

As shown in Chart 4.5, refugees were less likely to own or have access to all types of assets, especially a computer, motorcycle/minibus, washing machine, air conditioning, and refrigerator. Relatively few people had access to a computer (20% for all groups except refugees (3%), and even fewer to the internet (less than 10%). The groups were similar in their access to electricity, or ownership of mosquito nets. Cell phone ownership rates were around 80% for all groups except refugees where the ownership rate was just 60%.

**External income: Remittances and aid**

External income is what the household can access from sources outside the home, such as remittances and cash assistance from the government or aid agencies. This income can take the form of regular monthly income, or simply be occasional, supplemental income that serves as insurance against economic shocks such as job loss, disability, or eviction from the home.

Taken alone, the receipt of remittances or cash assistance does not mean a household is better off; such income must be interpreted in the context of overall household income, assets, and
employment. While receiving households do have additional income, they might have needed it because they were more vulnerable in the first place. On the other hand, relatively better-off households might get remittances simply because they have relatives abroad who are willing to send to them. Thus remittance or aid is not a priori an indicator of either vulnerability or security.

### Remittances

The sending and receipt of remittances plays a crucial role in the livelihoods and vulnerability of urban dwellers; however, only a small proportion of urban residents receive to remittances, and the obligation to send remittances can be a burdensome liability. Many refugees in Aden are obliged to send money to their family living in Kharaz camp and/or in their countries of origin (primarily Somalia).

**Within Yemen:** We asked our respondents first about remittance patterns within Yemen. Of our internal (Yemeni) migrant respondents, 58% had family in other parts of Yemen, compared to 47% of returnees, 34% of Adeni non-migrants and 20% of refugees. Of Yemeni migrants, 18% sent help to others in Yemen within the past year, as did 14% of returnees. Only 6% of both Adeni non-migrants and refugees sent help within Yemen. Just 3% of Yemeni migrants received help from family or friends in other parts of Yemen, and less than one percent of Adenis, refugees or returnees were recipients of such help.

**Outside Yemen:** We then asked about family outside Yemen, and found that overall, 297 or 37% of our respondents had friends or family in other countries. However, only 14% of respondents said they were receiving any help from the diaspora. Of returnees, 27% were receiving help, as were 12% refugees, 10% of Adenis, and 14% of Yemeni migrants.

Very few were sending help to others outside of Yemen, but refugees were more likely to do so: 6% of refugees were sending, most likely to Somalia, compared to 1% or less of returnees and Adeni non-migrants and no Yemeni migrants.

### Aid

We asked whether households had ever received assistance from the government or an aid agency, and a total of 95 respondents or 12% said they had. As shown in Chart 4.6, 17% of refugees and 20% of returnees had ever received assistance from an aid agency, compared to 8% of Adeni non-migrants and 7% of Yemeni migrants.

At the time of our survey, 37 respondents, or just under 5%, said they were currently receiving assistance. Of these 12% were returnees and 4% were refugees, with 3% each of Adeni non-migrants and Yemeni migrants.

That Yemeni returnees should get government assistance is not surprising, given that returnees were themselves Yemeni citizens. However aid agency reviewers of this report were surprised that the number of refugees receiving assistance
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**Chart 4.6 Percentage who have ever received aid**
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was so low. One explanation is that respondents interpreted ‘assistance’ to mean financial rather than in-kind support such as courses, counseling, and health care. Another explanation is that, as with any survey, participants underreported in hopes of receiving additional aid. It could also be that indeed fewer refugees are assisted than agencies believe, and our random sample revealed the ‘hidden’ populations that do not have contact with agencies. Future iterations of the survey should explicitly specify the types of assistance received.

Overall we found that in terms of housing, assets and income security, refugees tended to be more vulnerable on all indicators: they had less housing security, earned less income and owned or had access to fewer assets than other groups. Despite their greater vulnerability, we found that refugees receive significantly less assistance from the government or an aid agency than do returnees, who are generally better off than refugees, but worse off than Yemeni citizens. Refugees were also less likely than returnees to receive remittances from other countries, but were more likely to send help in the form of remittances.

4.3. Household Employment Security

Employment insecurity/vulnerability is manifest as some combination of lack of employment, under-employment, or high-risk employment. Vulnerable employment places people at risk of being underpaid, unpaid, or laid off at the whim of employers. It can place one at risk of physical, verbal, or sexual abuse, especially if individuals have to work in private homes or unmonitored places, or to travel to dangerous parts of the city, particularly at night. Such high-risk work includes that of maids, street cleaners, and street vendors.

We sought to explore all these components of employment vulnerability in the household. We asked about the experience of two income earners: the respondent’s employment and that of any other household member with a better employment situation than the respondent. For each respondent household we only report the highest level of employment.

We asked about the type of work they were currently engaged in, and whether they did full-time work, part-time work, or were unemployed. Our employment categories were as follows:

- employed part or full time by an individual or small business
- housewife
- salaried, working for organization or government (formal sector)
- self employed, low end including carwasher, maid, beggar (informal)
- self employed, own business
- unemployed, looking for work
- unemployed, not looking, including housewife, unwaged work for family business

As shown in Chart 4.7, 13% of both refugees and returnees were unemployed, and a much larger proportion of refugees (45%) compared with other groups were self-employed in low-end, informal sector work. Only 6% of refugees were employed in formal sector jobs, compared with 32% of Adenis, 18% of returnees and 16% of Yemeni migrants. Employment patterns in Basateen closely resembled the overall sample. Employment is thus a key aspect of refugee vulnerability in Aden.

Our survey questions gave us some indication of employment vulnerability, but they did not provide enough information to give us a full and reliable understanding. Future versions of the survey should operationalize employment questions in more detail, but understanding the nature of employment vulnerability in an urban setting really requires the in-depth exploration that comes from qualitative interviews.

From key informants we learned that vendors with market stalls in Basateen were Yemeni migrants, mostly from Taiz, a city about an hour’s drive from Aden, or from other rural areas. Shop owners in Basateen were returnees, or Somali shop owners used a returnee friend to officially register the shop.

4.4 Physical Safety + Security

Feeling physically safe and secure where one lives – in the home, in one’s own neighborhood and in the wider city – is a key dimension of vulnerability. People can feel and be unsafe for
In our survey we mainly explored safety issues stemming from problems outside the home, such as exposure to crime and harassment. (The safe location of the dwelling itself was discussed in Section 4.1 above.) We consider sensitive questions related to domestic violence and family issues as inappropriate for survey methodology. However, we did explore one risk factor related to the situation within the home, namely whether the family had to share their dwelling with other households. In what follows we discuss these safety issues, and then draw on an Intersos report which explored problems related to domestic violence.

**Experience of crime and harassment**

- Overall, our respondents’ experience of crime – theft and assault – or harassment over the past year was low, but refugees experienced significantly higher levels (shown in Chart 4.8):
  - Refugees and returnees experienced the same levels of theft or robbery (14%), while Yemeni migrants had the lowest (7%).
  - 8% of refugees experienced harassment or threats, compared to 2% or less for the other groups.
- 7% of refugees experienced physical assault compared to 1% or less for the other groups.

This pattern of findings held when we controlled only for Dar Sa’ad district.

Relatively few respondents who experienced any of these problems reported the incident, and

**Chart 4.8 Experience of crime or harassment**
those who did felt general dissatisfaction with the result – most felt it was not productive.

**Perceptions of neighborhood safety**

When we asked about how safe people felt in their communities, most respondents said their neighborhoods were safe, with no significant differences between groups: 88% of refugees considered their neighborhoods “safe” or “very safe,” compared to 93% of Adeni non-migrants, 95% of Yemeni migrants and 93% of returnees.

**Sharing a dwelling**

People can also feel unsafe if they are obliged (for economic or other reasons) to share their dwellings with other households or individuals they do not know. Sharing a dwelling can put children or women at risk for sexual abuse, and increase the risk of theft.

We asked respondents whether they shared a dwelling with other households, whether they shared latrines and kitchens, and the relationships with those other households. As shown in Chart 4.9, 66% of refugees shared a dwelling with others, compared with 18% of Adeni non-migrants, 21% of Yemeni migrants, and 27% of returnees. A far greater percentage of refugees also shared kitchens and latrines.

Adeni non-migrants and Yemeni migrants who shared a household only shared with relatives. In contrast, more than three-quarters of refugees
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**Chart 4.9 Shared Household**
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**Chart 4.10 Relationship with other households**

![Chart 4.10 Relationship with other households](image)
who shared a dwelling shared it with other households with whom they had no relationship (Chart 4.10).

Of those who lived with other households, a small number – 6% of refugees, returnees and Adeni non-migrants and 9% of Yemeni migrants – said they had felt unsafe as a result of this living situation. This is a situation that when found, is worth further exploration by the implementing agency to ensure protection for those who feel unsafe.

### 4.5 Summary of key differences between groups

In Aden, refugees appear to be more vulnerable than their neighbors in their human capital and in all four of our categories: their housing security, employment situations, income and assets, and physical safety.

In terms of their human capital, refugees were much less educated (more likely to have had ‘no schooling’ and less likely to have had university education) than other groups. Refugees were also more likely to not have their school-aged children attending school compared with other groups. Important urban skills, such as the ability to speak the local language, were also less present amongst the refugee group. Only 40% of refugee households had someone in the household that spoke Arabic, compared with 85% of returnees and 100% of both Yemeni groups. An important skill in urban settings is the ability to speak an international language such as English or French, but we found in this regard that refugees were no worse off than other groups – a very small percentage of all groups had someone in the household who spoke English.

When it came to housing, refugees were much more likely to live in a shack and least likely to live in a freestanding house or a flat than other groups. In Aden, no refugees can officially own their houses or land, which puts them at a disadvantage, but refugees were also more likely than other groups to have been evicted from their homes because they could not pay the rent.

We found employment to be a key aspect of refugee vulnerability in Aden. Refugees were far more likely to have insecure employment than other groups.

Refugees were also poorer - more income-vulnerable and with fewer assets - than other groups. Overall, refugees had the lowest incomes, but even when we looked only at Dar Sa’ad, the poorest district in Aden, refugees had the lowest income levels and the lowest number of total assets and productive assets compared to other groups living there. Refugees were also more vulnerable in that they were more likely to be sending help in the form of remittances to family and friends outside of Yemen, but – like all other groups – very few reported receiving remittances. Refugees were also less likely than returnees (who were less vulnerable on most counts) to have ever received assistance from the government or an aid agency.

In terms of physical safety, Aden is (or was, at the time of the survey) a relatively safe and crime-free city. Physical insecurity was not widely reported. Refugees mostly lived in Basateen neighborhood in the Dar Sa’ad district, and this neighborhood for the most part did not have physical dangers. (We found that Yemeni migrants were most likely to live in a physically unsafe site.) However refugees still appeared to be more vulnerable to crime and other risks. They were more likely than our other groups to share a dwelling with other households with whom they had no relationship (a potentially risky situation), and in Dar Sa’ad, refugees were more likely than other groups to experience harassment and physical assault but about equally likely to experience theft. This suggests that refugees are more likely to suffer from crimes related to discrimination (harassment, assault) than are other groups.
5. EXPLAINING VULNERABILITY AT THE HOUSEHOLD LEVEL

Our conceptual framework proposes that differences in the vulnerability of urban groups can be analyzed at three levels.

First, at the policy/institutional level, the government and other key institutions control the access to assets of different groups. In Yemen, as discussed in the Background section, the Yemeni government and other key institutions influence refugee vulnerability through the failure to implement a comprehensive national refugee policy, thus leaving open the possibility of reducing protection afforded to refugees at any time. Particular regulations make livelihoods more insecure for refugees. These include the injunction against owning land and housing and restrictions/contradictions about the right to work.

Second, at the level of civil society where policy is implemented, wider social processes including what we call a ‘culture of harassment’ influences the vulnerability of different groups. Refugees (and other migrants) working informal jobs such as beggars and car washers are often stopped by the police who claim that their income-generating activities are illegal. To be released, these individuals are forced to pay a bribe or complete a small task. For example, according to key informants, when police officers are assigned a menial task such as cleaning the police station, they make a refugee to do the work.

The culture of harassment and bribery works to the advantage of some in an environment where work is officially prohibited. For example, refugees can circumvent laws by obtaining fake permits. Somalis are not officially permitted to have a taxi license, but fake licenses can be acquired for about $100. Mini-van (public transportation) drivers are employed without a license and must pay small bribes if they are stopped.

The third level of analysis is the household or individual level, and we focus on this level in this section. We argue that specific factors increase household vulnerability, as diagramed in the causal model in Chart 5.1.

Below we explore how our three categories of causes varied between our three migrant groups, focusing on the experience of refugees. Difficulties with operationalizing our variables mean that our preliminary tests yielded inconclusive results. In future research we will
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Chart 5.1: Causal model (Predicting migrant vulnerability at the household level)

A. Household situation in urban setting:
   1. Legal status
   2. Social networks
      - Networks (within-city and external)
      - Involvement in community groups

B. Household situation pre-migration:
   1. Rural/urban background/skills
   2. Knew someone in city
   3. Abandoned assets

C. Human capital of household:
   1. Age + Gender
   2. Education, Skills (local and international languages)
   3. Health _ including mental, emotional health

Length of stay

Household vulnerability/resilience:
- Employment security
- Housing security
- Financial security
- Physical security
test these relationships more rigorously – by fitting regressions to our theoretical model – with data from our case studies. At present we know only there were differences between our three migrant groups in terms of our three sets of causes, and that refugees tend to be more vulnerable in terms of our four dimensions of vulnerability.

5.1 Household characteristics affecting vulnerability in Aden

Legal status and documentation

We hypothesized that having formal refugee status (i.e. refugees who have undergone individual or group status determination) makes refugees less vulnerable by allowing them to pursue livelihoods and making them less likely to be arrested or deported. Effective protection as a result of legal status, however, requires that a) refugees (or migrants) have the documentation to verify it, and b) immigration officers and police recognize the documents and act accordingly.

In Aden legal status is not as salient a factor as it is in other cities because all Somali refugees are accorded *prima facie* status, and most refugees are Somali. Only 3% of those without Yemeni citizenship (seven respondents) were without documentation, and this sample was too small to draw robust conclusions. The data did not offer a clear explanation for why these individuals were undocumented – they had all been in Yemen for different amounts of time (between one and eight years); five were Somalis, one was Ethiopian, and one was Yemeni, presumably a returnee or stateless person who did not report having Yemeni citizenship status. More in-depth interviews would be required to increase understanding about the reasons these individuals were undocumented, and what effects this had on vulnerability in Aden.

Documentation is not only an issue for refugees. According to Intersos, many returnees complain that they have not been able to obtain back their Yemeni nationality and proper identity documentation, which creates problems for reintegration. It is difficult to distinguish them from refugees, because many returnees hold a refugee ID card and do not even speak Arabic. Some returnees hold double documentation – both Yemeni and refugee ID cards.

Social networks – local and external

When people can draw on the social capital that comes from networks, they are less likely to be vulnerable. Networks help people find employment and housing, and increase local know-how that can result in more reasonable prices for goods and increased protection. Networks also provide access to financing, both during emergencies and for the purposes of consumption and investment.

Two types of social networks are relevant. The local network within the urban setting, which consists of co-ethnics or co-nationals, is important for helping refugees find employment, housing, and other forms of assistance. One measure of access to and participation in local

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Percent saying they belonged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refugees (n=230)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. charity group</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. sports club</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. women’s group</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. savings credit association</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. youth organization</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. religious society</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. political organization</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. self-help group</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 Membership in local organizations by migrant group
networks is whether household members participate in community groups and organizations. Such participation is one indicator of how involved the household is in the daily social life of the urban area, and an indicator of access to local networks. Not belonging to organizations does not necessarily mean people don’t have access to informal networks in the urban setting, but this linkage is more difficult to measure in a survey.

In Aden, a relatively small percentage of our respondents overall reported belonging to community organizations, with the highest being savings/credit associations at 6.1%. Refugees were much less likely to belong to any organization, and Yemenis and returnees had about the same rates of belonging, although Yemenis were more likely to say they belonged to religious societies than either of the other groups.

The second type of networks are those we term ‘external’, and these incorporate links to the diaspora in other countries (often in the West) and the country of origin. These networks are important for their potential for remittances, but also for onward migration or return. We measured access to external networks by asking whether the household had friends or family in other countries, and how often they were in contact.

As discussed above (section on Financial Security), we found that overall, 37% of our respondents had friends or family in other countries. Of our returnees, 64% were in contact, compared with 25.5% of Yemenis, and 54% of refugees.

Does having either local or external networks decrease people’s vulnerability? Our survey sought to identify some preliminary measures of both vulnerability and access to networks, but our data are not rich enough at this point to properly test our hypothesis and we got inconclusive results in our regressions. In future research, we will operationalize both our social network variables and our vulnerability variables with additional indicators that provide a richer and more valid test of our hypotheses. Such improved variables are identified in our revised survey questionnaire.

Length of stay

A household’s situation in the urban setting is often influenced by its length of stay in the city. We found that an increase in the length of stay in Aden by one year (within the first five years of arriving) is associated with reduced vulnerability in all areas.

5.2. Household situation pre-migration

A second category of variables that can affect migrant vulnerability is the household’s experience prior to migrating to the urban setting. We proposed three variables of particular importance: whether they possessed skills relevant to an urban environment prior to coming, whether they knew people in the city before coming (another network factor), and whether they had to abandon assets before leaving their previous location.

Transferable urban skills

The kind of skills a migrant household had prior to coming, i.e. whether these skills were easily transferable to the urban setting or whether they were largely rural-based skills (such as farming or pastoralism) can determine the kind of employment they are likely to obtain. This variable is strongly affected by length of stay – new arrivals with only rural skills are likely to have lower employment security than longer stayers with urban skills. But do new arrivals with urban skills fare better than those with rural skills?

We found that most refugees (78%) and returnees (80%) had previously lived in towns, while most Yemeni migrants (61%) had previously lived in villages or rural areas (Chart 6.3). This suggests that refugees and returnees, while perhaps disadvantaged in economic and social capital indicators, may have other advantages derived from being accustomed to living in an urban environment.

In order to explore whether respondents had transferable skills, we asked what their occupation had been before coming to Aden. We divided responses into those who had been doing livelihood activities that created a skill set that could be used in urban areas (such as office worker, business, trade, professional work, drivers, mechanics and so forth) and those who
had been doing rural-based activities such as farming, fishing etc, that were less useful in urban settings.

About a third of both refugees (33%) and Yemeni migrants (36%) and 40% of returnees had urban-based skills. In Aden, our data did not yield statistically significant findings about the effects of having transferable skills on employment vulnerability. While this test of our hypothesis failed, it is likely because we did not adequately operationalize the employment variable. Future research could explore this relationship further.

Knowing people prior to arrival

Social network theory suggests that for migrants, knowing someone in the city can help new arrivals get on their feet more quickly than those who arrive with no one to help find jobs and housing.

We used a rough measure to test this hypothesis, and found mixed support for it. We found that of those who migrated, about half (49%) knew people in Aden prior to arrival (Chart 6.4). Knowing people appeared to make the largest difference for those who were employed part-time (of those employed part-time, 62% knew someone). Those who were unemployed appeared to be equally divided between those who knew people and those who did not. Of fully employed people, the majority did not know anyone.

Future research should utilize a wider and more robust set of measures to operationalize pre-existing networks.

Abandoning assets prior to arrival

Whether a household had to leave economic assets behind prior to migrating could influence

Table 5.4 Knew people in Aden

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Knew people</th>
<th>Did not know people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>51% (n=48)</td>
<td>49% (n=46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed part-time</td>
<td>62% (n=99)</td>
<td>38% (n=60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full-time</td>
<td>41% (n=83)</td>
<td>59% (n=119)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.5 Abandonment of assets prior to migrating to Yemen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you have to abandon any assets before coming here?</th>
<th>returnees (n=69)</th>
<th>refugees (n=230)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>Count 30</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 43.5%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business</td>
<td>Count 2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 2.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>car</td>
<td>Count 4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 5.8%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>house</td>
<td>Count 18</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 26.1%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land</td>
<td>Count 7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 10.1%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>livestock</td>
<td>Count 0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% .0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>Count 0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% .0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don’t know</td>
<td>Count 0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% .0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing/ refused to answer</td>
<td>Count 8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 11.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

its financial situation when it arrives at its destination. Migrants who did not abandon assets are more likely to have some financial cushion to help them get started again.

In Aden we found that 62% of refugees but only 43.5% of returnees said they did not abandon assets (and another 11% of returnees refused to answer or were missing in or data). This meant that between 56-44% of refugees and returnees did abandon some assets. As shown in Table 6.5, houses were the most common abandoned asset (26% of returnees and 16% of refugees), followed by land.

We explored whether households that abandoned assets were worse off in terms of income, and while there is a significant relationship, and some evidence that those who are wealthier are less likely to have abandoned assets, we cannot be sure of this relationship yet.

5.3. Human capital of household

Demographic characteristics can be thought of as forms of human capital because age, gender, education, skills such as languages, and health are all important determinants of whether and how people can access livelihood assets.

Age, gender, education

Age, gender, and education are all important determinants of whether and how people can access livelihood assets. In order to test whether they explain vulnerability outcomes, we regressed age and gender onto our vulnerability measures. We found that being a woman tended to increase employment vulnerability (insecurity), and the completion of secondary education and especially university education, was significantly associated with a decrease in housing and employment vulnerability.
Languages – local and international

We were interested in whether having language skills – both local and international – might increase livelihood security. Households where no members are able to speak the dominant language of the city are often more vulnerable to discrimination, and least likely to integrate. In Aden, refugees were significantly less likely than other groups to have at least one person in the household who spoke Arabic, as shown in Chart 5.6. A proportion of returnees also did not speak Arabic, creating reintegration problems for them.

Controlling for district and looking only at Dar Sa‘ad where the majority of refugee and returnees resided, only 40% of refugees and 86% of returnees had someone in the household who spoke Arabic. The 14% of returnees who did not have someone who spoke Arabic all lived in Dar Sa‘ad. Outside of Dar Sa‘ad, all respondents (including the two refugees and all 13 returnees in the sample who did not live in Dar Sa‘ad) had someone who spoke Arabic.

Due to the high concentration of Somalis in Dar Sa‘ad, it may be that speaking Arabic is less important when living in this neighborhood since they can survive in this area speaking Somali. It may also be that it is just as important to speak Arabic in this neighborhood, but that it is more difficult to learn because refugees are secluded in the Somali blocks of the Basateen neighborhood and therefore are less integrated and less able to learn the local language.

As expected, refugees and returnees were more likely to have someone who spoke Arabic if they had been in Aden for a longer period of time. 67% of returnee and 62% of refugee households who had someone who spoke Arabic had been in Aden for more than 8 years. This proportion dropped significantly for those who had arrived more recently.

Households are also often less vulnerable if someone speaks another relevant international language. Migrants and refugees are often more likely than local residents to speak a relevant international language if they have moved often and needed to interact with different types of people, although this was not the case in Aden. Speaking an international language such as English (or Arabic) can be useful for securing employment in international agencies, or for negotiating onward movement from the city in which a migrant or refugee lives. We asked about up to three languages spoken in the household and only a small percentage of households mentioned having someone who spoke English: 2% of Adeni non-migrants, 4% of Yemeni migrants, 6% of returnees, and 3% of refugees.

Mental and emotional health

An Intersos study on risk factors for refugees in Yemen found that high levels of individual trauma are evident mainly due to the initial trauma caused by the conflict in their country of origin: “Refugees coming to Yemen ... face a very perilous journey and are subjected to abuse
by smugglers: severe beating is the most common violence perpetrated, but lack of food and water, dehydration, and skin diseases are reported, as well as rapes: in extreme cases smugglers also throw refugees, including children, overboard, causing their death.”

Health condition often strongly influences vulnerability in all areas, but particularly employment vulnerability due to the importance of labor for low-wage positions.

Domestic violence inside the home is a risk for women, and as is well established, more so for refugee women. Our survey did not inquire about SGBV threats to women, but the Intersos study noted that “many displaced women and girls experienced multiple traumatic events, including SGBV violence during the sea crossing and in the country of asylum. The impact of each event, if not treated by adequate psychosocial counseling, creates conditions of continued risks and heightened vulnerability for further abuse and trauma.” In addition, their experience in camps in Yemen has created problems for refugee women when they move to urban areas. Intersos reports how refugee women described the impact of camp condition on family life: “we have husbands but it’s like we don’t have: they are like children to us, they are useless”. The women said the behavior of their husbands had changed tremendously after they left Somalia. Those men who were unable to leave Yemen to go to Saudi Arabia or other Gulf countries and were obliged to remain in the camp, “became extremely frustrated and anxious in the absence of any chance of employment. Lack of job opportunities was reported as the main issue and the main reason [for the fragmentation] of the traditional family structure and increasing domestic violence, resulting from poverty and economic tension within the families”. Another factor women reported was that most men in the camp were selling part of their monthly food ration to buy qat, a local narcotic legal in Yemen.

For refugee men, the cultural tensions and lack of fulfillment associated with unemployment and few livelihood prospects potentially creates domestic tensions that can lead to violence against women and children, and possibly within in the wider community too. As mentioned, we did not investigate these issues in our survey, deeming them inappropriate and too sensitive for survey methodology. A qualitative study could and should include such issues to obtain a more rounded perspective on the factors affecting safety.
The profiling approach developed in this study is a useful evidence-based decision-making tool that enables agencies to identify specific areas of vulnerability characterizing different migrant and refugee groups. Our Aden study enabled us to test and strengthen this tool. In Aden, as elsewhere, the livelihood vulnerability of refugees and other migrants is influenced by both the policy-institutional contextual and by a range of household factors. While we have some preliminary evidence that some of these relationships are significant, we have not been able to test all the relationships in a robust manner. The vulnerability measures we tested should be expanded and enriched — a task to be undertaken in future studies. Our revised survey tool, which clearly outlines the four categories and the variables we believe can best operationalize them, will hopefully serve as a starting point for future research.

Our strongest programming recommendation is that agencies use profiling tools in order to better understand where to target resources.

In Aden, compared to other groups, refugees are more vulnerable in their housing security, financial security, and employment, but there is less of a gap in terms of their physical safety. These areas of vulnerability present opportunities both for advocacy and for focused and strategic programming. In general, we believe that material program resources (such as microcredit, vocational training, health care etc) should be aimed at the host community where refugees live rather than at refugees in particular. In Aden this is relatively straightforward as refugees are concentrated in one area of the city (Basateen).

**Housing** Our study found that refugees lived in less safe and dignified housing and they were less secure in their housing — they were more at risk for eviction, partly because of legal provisions that make them unable to own land or housing. The possibility of land ownership for non-Yemenis should be raised with the government, as a key part of advocacy for refugees. More secure ownership of important assets like land and housing could improve the safety and dignity of refugees and, since housing is a key livelihood asset, could improve their livelihood potential. Other program initiatives could take the form of housing support such as temporary rent subsidies for the most vulnerable. Such support should not be provided only to refugees, but could be targeted at all vulnerable groups in the Basateen area.

Programming can also address factors that influence refugee livelihood vulnerability, including human capital and social networks.

**Human capital and employment** Refugees in Aden face high employment vulnerability, and like many other urban poor, work largely in the informal sector. Our study identified factors that are likely to increase refugees’ ability to find more secure work. One key skill lacking in refugee households compared to other groups was the ability to speak Arabic. Speaking the local language improves prospects for jobs and integration. Language training programs for adults should be targeted at all migrant adults. It is not language alone that makes a difference — refugees have higher levels of illiteracy than other groups, and literacy and numeracy classes for adults could contribute to livelihood security.

**Social networks** In Aden as elsewhere, refugees have developed their own community-level support mechanisms through associations and social networks. Such efforts are often go unrecognized by aid agencies due to their informal nature, but they can be successful in identifying and reaching needy households. Support for the services provided by these groups is an appropriate way to address refugee needs and can ensure agencies that do not replicate what already exists. In addition, household profiling studies by humanitarian agencies that seek to identify vulnerable households should explore the degree of linkages/integration into these support networks. Households that are not linked in or otherwise marginalized from social support should be identified.

Although our study did not explore refugee governance at the community level, Intersos recommends that programming efforts focus on
improving the capacity of refugee representation committees. At present, the self-selected groups remain in their positions for long periods, despite their lack of training or qualifications to contribute to resolving refugee problems. The entrenched committee system means some groups benefit more from services provided by UNHCR/partners.

Increasing the representation of refugees according to refugee nationality will reduce corruption of refugee committees and will improve and widen the accessibility of humanitarian resources including to invisible and/or marginalized groups.
ANNEX 1  ADEN QUESTIONNAIRE

URBAN HOUSEHOLD PROFILING SURVEY: ADEN, YEMEN

Z01 Form Number (unique ID)  

Z02 Interviewer Code (write name)  

Z03 Date of Interview (DD/MM/YY)  / /  

Z04 Administrative District  

Z05 Administrative Division  

Z06 Stratum Code  

Z07 GPS Unit  

GPS Information  

Z08 Way Point  

Z08a Latitude  

Z09b Longitude  

Approach to Dwelling  
1. Ask to speak to the person who is the head of the household.  
2. If he/she is not available, ask to speak to another person who can speak on behalf of the household. If both are not present, find out when they are likely to be back.  
3. Scheduled return time………………………… (check with supervisor)  

Z09 Status of questionnaire. Check the box that applies.  

1. Selected Sample Site  
2. 1st Replacement Site (Alternate 1)  
3. 2nd Replacement Site (Alternate 2)  

a. Accepted  
b. Not home or did not answer  
c. Refused to participate  
d. Other reason for non-selection (write in)  

Oral Consent  

[Greeting], my name is [your name]; I am working on a research project to understand the livelihoods of people in Aden. I would like to ask if you migrated here, your livelihood activities, and a few other questions. This survey is conducted by INTERSOS organization together with an independent research organization. The scope of this survey is to gain a better understanding of the populations in Aden, but it is not directly related to any humanitarian program. For this reason, we cannot give you anything for participating in this survey, except our appreciation. You are under no obligation to participate, and are free to not answer any question and stop the interview at any time. We will keep what you say confidential and it will not be given to the government or any other group. Your name will never appear in our research. We will not write your name on this interview form. The interview should take less than 30 minutes.  

Developing a Profiling Methodology for Displaced People in Urban Areas • Case Study: Aden, Yemen

**Questionnaire number ________________ (please fill)**

---

**TO BE FILLED OUT BY INTERVIEWER (DO NOT ASK RESPONDENT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z10 Respondent Sex</th>
<th>1 = male</th>
<th>2 = female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the dwelling located in, on or near (within sight) of any of the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = landslide area/steep hill/slope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = flood prone area/river bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = garbage mountain/pile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = railroad/flyover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = industrial area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 = other dangerous site write in________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 = none of the above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z11</th>
<th>1 = freestanding house</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 = flat in block of flats:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = backyard house or room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = backyard shack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = shack in shack settlement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 = hostel or boarding house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 = other write in________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z12</th>
<th>1 = earth/mud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 = Wood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = stone/brick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Cement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = other write in________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 = Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z13 Walls</th>
<th>Z14 Roof</th>
<th>Z15 Floor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = respondent is alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = spouse is present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = other adult(s) present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = children are present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Begin Interview

**DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE**

I want to ask you only about your household, not about any other households living in this dwelling, by “your household” I mean a person or a group of person who reside in the same compound, but not necessarily in same dwelling unit, having the same cooking arrangement and are answerable to the same household head. Members of a household are not necessarily related (by blood/marriage).

Waxaan rabaa inaan wax kaa warsada/weydiyo reerkiina, kama wado reero kale oo ku nool aqalkan, “reerkiina” waxaan ka wada qof ama dad isku meel(dhowr guri oo meel ku wada yaal("mujamac")) wada deggan, lagama maarumaana ma aha inay isku qab wada deggan yihii, balse waa inuu dheri ka wada dheexeya/inay dheri wadaag yihii, ayna kawadul amar quataan/kahadal maafka bisaaduixed waan reerka? Xubnaha reer waxaa muhiim inay inuu ka dheexeyey dhalasho ama dhas/qaraabanimo ama guur.

---

Questionnaire number ________________ (please fill)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **D01** Are you the head of this household? | 1 = yes (If yes → D02)  
2 = no  
8 = DK  
9 = RA |
| **D01a** What is your relationship to the head of the household? | 1 = spouse of head  
2 = child of head  
3 = parent of head  
4 = other relation of head  
5 = adopted/fostered child  
6 = friend/not related  
7 = other write  
8 = DK  
9 = RA |
| **D02** What is your age? | Write in number of years |
| **D03** Where were you born? | Country code  
Province Code  
(Write in name of town/village) |
| **D04** What is your Ethnic Group? (Use code sheet) | Ethnic group (tribe) code |
| **D05** What is your marriage status? | 1 = married  
2 = engaged, in a partnership  
3 = single  
4 = widowed  
5 = divorced/separated  
6 = RA  
(If not married → D07) |
| **D06** Is your spouse currently living here with you? | 1 = yes  
2 = no  
9 = DK/RA |
| **D06a** Is there more than one wife in the marriage? (Polygamous) | 1 = yes  
2 = no  
9 = DK/RA |
| **D07** What is your level of education? | 01 = no school  
02 = religious education  
03 = some primary school  
04 = completed primary school  
05 = Some Somali Lower School  
06 = complete Somali Lower School  
07 = Some Somali Intermediate  
08 = complete Somali Intermediate  
09 = some secondary school  
10 = completed secondary school  
11 = some university  
12 = completed university degree  
13 = postgraduate (Masters, MD, PhD, etc)  
14 = other  
15 = Non formal (adult, bridge education, accelerated learning program)  
16 = vocational training Only  
88 = DK  
99 = RA |
| **D08** What is your ethnic origin? | 1 = Yemeni (→ D10)  
2 = Other |
**Maxay tahay dhalashadaada?**

What is your Citizenship (Yemen)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 = old UNHCR refugee card</td>
<td>09 = exempted from residency requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 = new GoY refugee card</td>
<td>10 = permanent residency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 = Asylum seeker</td>
<td>11 = no documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 = Mandate Refugee Certificate</td>
<td>12 = Stateless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 = Convention Travel Document</td>
<td>13 = UNRWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 = closed file</td>
<td>88 = DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 = passport only (no legal status)</td>
<td>99 = RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 = passport w/visa (has legal status)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Ma la dhalashadaada aad ku joogtid?**

What is your immigration status in Yemen?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immigration Status</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 = old UNHCR refugee card</td>
<td>09 = exempted from residency requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 = new GoY refugee card</td>
<td>10 = permanent residency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 = Asylum seeker</td>
<td>11 = no documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 = Mandate Refugee Certificate</td>
<td>12 = Stateless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 = Convention Travel Document</td>
<td>13 = UNRWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 = closed file</td>
<td>88 = DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 = passport only (no legal status)</td>
<td>99 = RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 = passport w/visa (has legal status)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Maxay yihii afafka aad ugu hadashaan reerkiina?**

What languages you speak at home?

List up to three.

See code sheet

1st language

2nd language

3rd language

---

**II HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION**

**Aqalkan immisa qol ayuu ka kooban yahay?**

How many rooms are in this dwelling?

Write in number of rooms

---

Waxaan rabaa in aan wax kaaweydiyoxa reerkiina, ma ahaan reeraha kale ee halkan kunoool, reerkiina waxaan ugu jiray dhaqalaha laga raashin kama maalin walba.

Waxaan rabaa in aan wax kaaweydiyoxa reerkiina, ma ahaan reeraha kale ee halkan kunoool, reerkiina waxaan ugu jiray dhaqalaha laga raashin kama maalin walba.

I want to ask you only about your household, not about any other households living in this dwelling. By “your household” I mean people you share income and food with on a daily basis.

---

**Reerkiina Musqul idii gooni ah ma leeyahay, mise waxaad la wadaagtaan reerkiina?**

Does your household have your own latrine, or do you share with other households?

1 = own latrine

2 = shared with others households

9 = DK/RA

---

**Reerkiina ma leeyahay jiko idii gooni ah, mise waa la wadaagtaan reerkiina?**

Does your household have your own kitchen, or do you share with other households?

1 = own cooking facilities

2 = shared with others households

9 = DK/RA

---

**Maxay tahay tirada guud ee dadka qoyskiina kuna nool halkan oo aad adigu kamid tahay?**

number of people

---

**Questionnaire number**

(please fill)
**H04a (Only migrants)** Do you have any immediate family (children, siblings, parents, spouse) living elsewhere in Yemen?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Who?</strong></th>
<th><strong>Where?</strong></th>
<th><strong>How often in the past two years were you in contact?</strong></th>
<th><strong>How do you communicate?</strong></th>
<th><strong>Do you ever send them help?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = children</td>
<td>1 = Kharaz</td>
<td>1 = Every month</td>
<td>1 = I call from my own mobile</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = siblings</td>
<td>2 = Sana’a</td>
<td>2 = 4 times per Year or more</td>
<td>2 = skype or chat</td>
<td>No = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = parents</td>
<td>3 = Taiz</td>
<td>3 = Once or twice</td>
<td>3 = they call me</td>
<td>They send me help = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = spouse</td>
<td>4 = Mukalla</td>
<td>4 = not for past year</td>
<td>4 = internet phone (VOIP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 = Hodeida</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 = email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 = Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 = facebook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 = phone booth (call centre)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 = send message with friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 = SMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ONLY WRITE IN FIRST TWO CHOICES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**H04b** Are you in contact with family or friends in other countries, for example in Australia, Canada, Saudi Arabia, Somalia?

Ma la leedahay xiriir qaraabo ama aasaabta da ku nool waddamo kale, tusaa ahaan Australia, Canada, Suucudiga ama Soomaaliya?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Family member</strong></th>
<th><strong>State + town</strong></th>
<th><strong>How often in the past two years were you in contact?</strong></th>
<th><strong>How do you communicate?</strong></th>
<th><strong>Do they ever send you help?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xubin qoys</td>
<td>+ Gobol + magaalo</td>
<td>1 = Every month</td>
<td>1 = own mobile</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Immed family</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 = 4 times per Year or more</td>
<td>2 = skype or chat</td>
<td>No = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Extended family</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Once or twice</td>
<td>3 = they call me</td>
<td>They send me help = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = friends, others</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 = not for past year</td>
<td>4 = internet phone (VOIP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONE GROUP OF PERSONS PER ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 = email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 = facebook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 = phone booth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 = send message with someone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 = SMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ONLY WRITE IN FIRST TWO CHOICES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Questionnaire number ________________ (please fill) 5
Meeqa carruur ayey da’doodu ka yar tahay 16 jir? (If 00 → H09)

How many children are under 16?

Meeqa carruur ah oo reerkiina ka mid ah ayaan da’daa iskuulka gaartay oo iskuul aadda?

In your household, How many children of school age go to school? Write in number

(Multiple responses allowed)

Meeqa qof oo ka mid ah reerkiina ayaa da’doodu ka weyn tahay 60 jir?

How many people in your household are over 60?

Are any children in your household earning income?

If none, write 00

Maka mid yahay reerkiina qof naafo ah ama uu hayo jiro dheeraaday (chronic ah)? (Ma jiraa qof fikhiisa fikhaa wax la’yihiin)

Are there any disabled also chronically ill persons in your household?

If none, write 00, and → H12

Waa nooce naafanimada ama xanuunka dheeraaday/raagay?

What type of disability or chronic illness?

(multiple responses allowed)

Ma adigaas iska leh gurigan/aqalkan, mise qof ka tirsan qoyska oo ku nool

Do you have a fire number (please fill)
halkan?
Do you (or a family member living here) own this house/dwelling?

Dhulka gurigu ka dhisan yahay ma idinkaa iska leh?
1 = yes  
2 = no (If no → H16)  
7 = NA 8 = DK 9 = RA

Do you own the land on which your house stands?

Lacag intee leq ayuu reerkinu bishii iska gudaa ama uu ijaar ahaan u bixiyaa?
1 = No rent  
2 = 1 to 8000 YR  
3 = 8001 to 11000 YR  
4 = 11001 to 15000 YR  
5 = Above 15000 YR  
8 = DK 9 = RA

How much rent or monthly payments does your household pay each month?

Hadda waxaan rabaa inaan wax kaa weydiiyo reeraha kale ee deggan aqalkan:

Now I want to ask you about any other households that live in this dwelling:

Ma jiraan reero kale oo reerkaaga ee kula nool aqalkan?
1 = yes  
2 = no (If no → Section III)  
8 = DK 9 = RA

Are there other households besides yours live in this dwelling?

Meeqa reer oo kale ayaa ku nool aqalkan/dhismahan? Write in number
99 = DK / RA

How many other households live in this dwelling/structure?

Waa maxay xiriirka dhaqaale ee idinka dhexeya idinka iyo reeraha kale ee halkan ku nool?
01 = share rent  
02 = share food  
03 = Share Income  
04 = share bills (medical, water, electricity)  
05 = other write in  
06 = hosted for free  
07 = no relationship – each household is on their own  
88 = DK  99 = RA

(Indicate all – multiple answers allowed)

Questionnaire number ________________ (please fill) 7
Muxuu yahay xiriirka idinka wada dhexeeyo reeraha halkan ku nool?
What is your relationship with the other households living here?

1 = relatives
2 = old friends
3 = no relationship, just neighbors
9 = DK/RA

Weliga ma dareentay in aysan adiga iyo xubnaha reerkaaga midna ammaan (badbaado) u ahayn inuu reeraha kale ee halkan la noolaado?
Do you ever feel that it is unsafe for yourself or members of your household to live with the other households here?

1 = yes
2 = no
9 = DK / RA

Maxay halkan u yimaadeen reeraha kale ee ku nool aqalkan?
Why did any of these other households come to this place?
(Fill out for maximum two other households. Do not read possible answers. Indicate all responses)

(more than one allowed for each household)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. 1st household</th>
<th>b. 2nd Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = conflict or violence in home area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = land disputes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = government evictions/ development projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = environmental problems (drought or floods)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = migrated here for economic reasons (livelihoods, work)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 = migrated here for education (own or children’s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 = migrated here for to join family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 = migrated here for no special reason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 = did not migrate here (are from Aden)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 = other (write in)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 = don’t know their situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 = political persecution in country of origin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 = unable to pay rent in another house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 = looking for separated housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 = RA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questionnaire number ________________ (please fill)
III HOUSEHOLD ECONOMIC SITUATION

In the past year, what has been your employment situation? Please tell me first what your situation is now, then if you do other jobs, or have in the past year.

01 = unemployed but looking for work, no income
02 = unemployed and not looking for work (he/she is supported by others, or too old, or any reason)
03 = student
04 = Housewife (includes anyone staying home and looking after children etc)
05 = car washer
06 = Beggar
07 = maid
08 = self employed in low-end jobs, offer services, employs no one (casual work: porter, selling home made food; NOT CAR WASHER)
09 = self employed in more structured activity: for example shop owner, owner of a stall at the market, tailor, taxi driver, mechanic, beauty salon, vendors... (he/she may own or rent the taxi or any assets)
10 = own business, employs at least one person for wage: example owner of a bigger shop, restaurant, mini-bus owner... Mark in this category also those who are not working, just the owners.
11 = PART-TIME wages, employed by individual/small business (for example shopkeeper, mini-bus driver, mechanic, WORKING ONLY FEW HOURS OR EVERY NOW AND THEN)
12 = FULL-TIME wages, employed by individual/small business (for example shopkeeper, mechanic working everyday full time in someone's shop, English teacher....)
13 = salaried, works for organization or company
14 = salaried, works for government (includes teachers in public school, police and people working in Govt. offices)
15 = works for a family business, no direct wage (ie shop assistant in father's shop, coloring fabric at home with relatives, shopkeeper in the father's shop...)
99 = DK/ RA

current situation

past year or additional situation

WRITE_________________

How many people, including yourself, are currently earning income in your household? (If only income earner→E05)

number of income earners

How many income earners are women?

number of women income earners

Of these income earners, how many are women?

Questionnaire number ________________ (please fill) 9
**Questionnaire number ________________ (please fill) 10**

**Kuwa kale ee dakhli shaqeysta ee ka tirsan reerkiina sidey ku kabsadaan dakhli hadda?**

How are the other income earners in your household currently earning income?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First person</th>
<th>Second person</th>
<th>Third person</th>
<th>Fourth person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 = car washer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 = Beggar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 = maid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 = self employed in low-end jobs, offer services, employs no one (casual work: porter, selling homemade food; NOT CAR WASHER)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 = self employed in more structured activity: for example shop owner, owner of a stall at the market, tailor, taxi driver, mechanic, beauty salon, vendors... (he/she may own or rent the taxi or any assets)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 = own business, employs at least one person for wage: example owner of a bigger shop, restaurant, mini-bus owner... Mark in this category also those who are not working, just the owners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 = PART-TIME wages, employed by individual/small business for example shopkeeper, mini-bus driver, mechanic, WORKING ONLY FEW HOURS OR EVERY NOW AND THEN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 = FULL-TIME wages, employed by individual/small business (for example shopkeeper, mechanic working everyday full time in someone's shop, English teacher...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 = salaried, works for organization or company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 = salaried, works for government (includes teachers in public school, police and people working in Govt. offices)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 = works for a family business, no direct wage (ie shop assistant in father's shop, coloring fabric at home with relatives, shopkeeper in the father's shop...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99 = DK or RA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Waa meeqa dhaqaalaha ugu badan ee reerka soo gala qiyaaqAbaan bisha ugu fiican/roon?**

Approximately how much income does your household get per on a good month (high end estimate)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = less than 5000</th>
<th>2 = 5001 – 8000</th>
<th>3 = 8001 – 15000</th>
<th>4 = 15001 – 23000</th>
<th>5 = 23001 – 40000</th>
<th>6 = 40001- 80,000</th>
<th>7 = more than 80,001</th>
<th>88 = DK</th>
<th>99 = RA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Waa meeqa dhaqaalaha ugu yar ee reerka soo gala qiyaaqAbaan bisha ugu xun?**

Approximately how much income does your household get on a bad month (low end estimate)?

| 1 = less than 5000 | 2 = 5001 – 8000 | 3 = 8001 – 15000 | 4 = 15001 – 23000 | 5 = 23001 – 40000 | 6 = 40001- 80,000 | 7 = more than 80,001 | 88 = DK | 99 = RA |
## Reerkiinu ma leeyahay mase heli karaa waxyaabaha soo socda?

Does your household own or have access to any of the following?

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Raadiyo</td>
<td>radio</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>Koronto</td>
<td>electricity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Telefisiyoon</td>
<td>television</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>Kumbiyuutar</td>
<td>computer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Baaskiil/Bushkaleeti</td>
<td>bicycle</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>Leen internet</td>
<td>access to internet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Moobeel</td>
<td>cell phone</td>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Miisas iyo kuraas</td>
<td>tables/chairs</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>car, motorcycle or mini-bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Marwaxad</td>
<td>fan</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>gasalad</td>
<td>K = washing machine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>gaaska wax lagu karsado</td>
<td>gas cylinder</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>qabooliyiye</td>
<td>air conditioning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>M = faranjeer</td>
<td>fridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### For the following questions, ask:

- **Waqti intee ayay kugu qaadanaysaa inaad u lugaysid iskuulka carrera ee kuugu dhow?**
  - To the nearest children’s school?
- **Goobta caafimaadka ee kuugu dhow?**
  - To the nearest health facility?
- **Isteeshinka(xarunta) booliska ee kuugu dhow?**
  - To the nearest police station?
- **Meesha baabuurta laga raaco(boostejo) kuugu dhow(taksi, bas yar)?**
  - Nearest transport (Mini-bus, taxi)?
- **Goobtaada shaqo?**
  - To your employment area?
### IV. ASSISTANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A01</th>
<th>Have you or your household ever received any assistance from the government or an aid agency?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = yes</td>
<td>2 = no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A02</th>
<th>What kind of assistance was it?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = food aid</td>
<td>2 = housing assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = health services</td>
<td>4 = information about rights, protection, legal matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = basic need grants</td>
<td>8 = NFI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A02a</th>
<th>Where did you got it?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = in a camp (e.g. Kharaz)</td>
<td>2 = in town (e.g. Basateen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = at arrival in Yemen (i.e. Maifa)</td>
<td>4 = in another country</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V. MIGRATION AND HOUSEHOLD MOBILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A03</th>
<th>Are you or your household receiving any assistance now?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = yes</td>
<td>2 = no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A03a</th>
<th>Where are you getting it?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = in a camp (e.g. Kharaz)</td>
<td>2 = in town (e.g. Basateen)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Questionnaire number ________________ (please fill) 12
M01
How long have you lived in this city?

1 = born here (→ M01a)
2 = came as a child (before 16) (→ M01a)
3 = more than 8 yrs
4 = 5-8 years
5 = 3-4 years
6 = 1-2 years
7 = less than 1 yr
88 = DK  99 = RA

M01a
IF RESPONDENT WAS BORN HERE OR CAME AS CHILD:
When did your family (parents) come to Aden (IF MORE THAN ONE TIME, WRITE DOWN LAST ONE)?

01= family was born here (→ sec VI)
02=family came as children (→ sec VI)
03 = more than 8 yrs
04 = 5-8 years
05 = 3-4 years
06 = 1-2 years
07 = less than 1 yr
88 = DK  99 = RA

M02
Sanadkee ayaad timid(ama waalidkaagu imaadeen) magaaladan markii ugu dambeysay?
What year did you (or your parents) come to this city (IF MORE THAN ONE TIME, WRITE DOWN LAST ONE)? (Year)

M03
Adiga ama qoyskiinu xaggeed ku nooleydeen intaadan iman Cadan ka hor?
Where were you (or your family) living before you (they) came to ADEN?
(Write in name of town, (and country if not Yemen)

M04
Maxaad uga soo tagtay/maxay uga soo tagteeni meeshaas?
Why did you (they) leave that place?

01= conflict or violence
02= land disputes
03= government evictions/development projects
04= environmental problems (drought or floods)
05= for economic reasons (could not make a living, to find work)
06= for education (own or children’s)
07= to join family in ADEN
08 = other (write in)
88 = DK  99 = RA

M05
Ma waxaad ku nooleydeen xilligaas adiga (qoyskiina) magaalo, tuulo ama baadiye?
Did you (or your family) live in a town or village, or were you nomadic?

1 = city or town
2 = village
3 = rural area
4 = nomadic
8 = DK  9 = RA

M06
Oo waan ugu baahanayn qoyskiina ka codsanayaan?

01 = farmer
02 = pastoralist
03 = business
04 = trader
09 = housewife
10 = office worker
11 = factory worker
12 = farm worker

Questionnaire number ________________ (please fill)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Maxay ahayd shaqadaada | 05 = profession (teacher, lawyer)  
| rasmiga ah ka hor intaadan ka soo tegin meeshaad ka timid? | 06 = student  
| What was your (or your father’s) primary occupation in your home area before coming here? | 07 = religious officer  
| Indicate who respondent is referring to: | 08 = government official  
| 22 = Father  
| 33 = Mother | 24 = Self |
| 05 = profession (teacher, lawyer) | 13 = services, repair, beauty  
| 14 = fisherman  
| 16 = other | write in |
| 77 = NA  
| 88 = DK  
| 99 = RA | |
| Ma ku qasbanayd adiga ama reerkiinaha inaad ka soo tagtaan hantidillaa markaad ka imaadeen dalkiina? Macnaha waxaan ula jeedaa waxyabhiibi aad lahaydeen ama aad heli karten kuwaasoo aad hadda u malayneysid inaad helayn? | 01 = no (if no → M09)  
| Did you or your household have to abandon any assets when you left your home? I mean things you owned or had access to, but which you think are lost to you now? | 02 = land  
| 03 = livestock  
| 04 = house | 05 = car  
| 06 = business  
| 07 = other | write in  
| 88 = DK  
| 99 = RA | |
| Waa maxay sababta aadan awood ugu lahayn inaad aad sheegatid (ku doodid)………………. haddii aad dib u noqoto? If yes: Why would you not be able to reclaim [items mentioned above] if you returned? | 1 = no proof of ownership  
| 2 = someone else has taken it  
| 3 = they are destroyed/lost  
| 4 = I would be afraid to claim | 5 = lack of support by authorities/ or law enforcement agencies  
| 6 = other | write in  
| 8 = DK  
| 9 = RA | |
| Maxaad u timaadeen Cadan adiga ama reerkiinka, oo aad meel kale u tegi wayday? Why did you or your family come to ADEN, and not go to another place? | 01 = I hoped to find work here  
| 02 = It was safe here  
| 03 = my family was here | 04 = there were people who could help me here  
| 05 = as a transit to other countries (for example to go Saudi Arabia) | 06 = NGO (humanitarian) assistance  
| 07= hoped for resettlement to another country | write in  
| 08 = educational opportunities  
| 09 = other | 88 = DK  
| 99 = RA | |

Questionnaire number ________________ (please fill)  

14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VI. EXPERIENCE IN ADEN (including displacement within the city)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you (or your family) were considering coming to this city, did you or your family already have relatives or friends living here?</td>
<td>1 = no, 2 = yes, 8 = DK, 9 = RA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M11</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwee ayey ahaayeen? If yes, who were they?</td>
<td>1 = parents, 2 = siblings, 3 = wife/husband, 4 = children, 5 = other relatives, 6 = friends/villagers, 7 = Others, 8 = DK, 9 = RA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N01</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadan gudaheeda, weligaa ma lagu qabsay inaad guurto, dagaal ama xadgudubyo jira awgee? Here in ADEN, have you ever been forced to move because of conflict or violence?</td>
<td>1 = no, 2 = yes, 8 = DK, 9 = RA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N02</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, why were you evicted?</td>
<td>1 = government relocation, 2 = private development, 3 = could not pay rent, 4 = owner did not want us there, 5 = other, write in</td>
<td>8 = DK, 9 = RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N03</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labada sano ee soo socota maxaa kuu qorsheysan inaad sameysid? In aad joogtid halkan ama aad meet kale aadid? In the next two years what are you planning to do? Stay here or go elsewhere?</td>
<td>1 = stay where we are now, 2 = move elsewhere in ADEN, 3 = go back to our home area, 4 = go elsewhere in Yemen (write in place: ), 5 = go to another country (write in place: )</td>
<td>8 = DK, 9 = RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N04</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire number ________________ (please fill)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waxaan raabaa inaan ku akhriso liis kooxo bulshadeed, faadlan ii sheeg haddii adiga ama reerka ay ka mid yihiin kooxahan.

I am going to read you a list of community groups. Please tell me if you or anyone in your household belongs to any? **Read list.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Group Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>urur samafal (Charity group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>urur ciyaareed (sports club)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>ururka haweenka (women’s group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>ayuuto (savings credit association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>urur dhalinyaro (youth organization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>urur diimeed (religious society)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>urur siyaasadeed (political organization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Iskaashato (self help group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>waxkale (other write in below)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sanadkii ugu dambeeyay, adiga ama mid ka mid ah reerka ma idinka soo gaartay waxyeello tuuganimo ama boob?

In the last year, have you or anyone in your household suffered from theft or robbery?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>I did not report it (→ N09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>family or friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>community watch or civic organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>vigilante group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>local security company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>local police station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>NGO staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>other write in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Miyaa lagaa /qofka laga qanciyey arrintan? Mase ahayd mid waxtar leh?

Were you/the person satisfied with this? Was this productive?

Sanadkii la soo dhaafays, adiga ama mid ka mid ah reerkiina jir dil (waxyeello jirka ah) ma idin gaaray?

In the last year, have you or anyone in your household suffered from physical assault?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>I did not report it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>family or friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>community watch or civic organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>vigilante group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>local police station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>NGO staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Questionnaire number ________________ (please fill)* 16
ugu horreeyay ee aad war gelisay/qofku wargeliyey yuu ahaan?
If yes, who did you (or the person) report the assault to first?

Ma lagaa/laga qanciyay qofka arrintaa? Mase ahayd mid waxtar leh?
Were you/person satisfied with this? Was this productive?

Sanadkii ugu dambeeyay gudhiisa ma jireen wax daanaduus(gardaro) ama handadaad ah oo loo geystay adiga ama reerkina?
In the last year have you or someone in your household experienced harassment or threats from anyone?

Yaa ku handaday/handaday qofka?
If yes, who has threatened you/person?

Adigoo la barbardhigaya derisada kale ee magaaladan, sideed u malaysaa inuu deriskaagu ammaan u yahay?
Compared to other neighborhoods in the city, how safe do you think your neighborhood is?

Questionnaire number ________________ (please fill)
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Questionnaire number ________________ (please fill)  

18

Dad aan kugu qabiil ahayn (ama kula jinsiyyad haddu yahay Falastiini, Hindi, iwm)  
people who are not from your tribe (or nationality if Palestinian, Indian etc)

c

Garbixiyayaaal maskamadeed  
court officials

h

Ugaas/suldaan chief  
court officials

d

Shirkadaha amniga ee gaarka ah  
private security companies

i

Boolis/askari  
Police

E

الشرطة

الشرطة
For each of the following statements please tell me whether you strongly agree, agree, are indifferent, disagree, or strongly disagree?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rating Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid walba oo kamid ah jumladaha soo socda ii sheg hadii aad ku racsantahay si xoog ah, aad ku racsantahay, ama dhaxdhaxaad, aadan ku racsaneen ama aadan ku racsaneen si xoog ah.</td>
<td>1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = indifferent, 4 = disagree, 5 = strongly disagree, 8 = DK, 9 = RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N16</td>
<td>My family’s access to food has improved since we moved here.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N17</td>
<td>If a crime was committed the court would resolve it fairly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18</td>
<td>The police here protect my family.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N19</td>
<td>In Aden, it is normal to pay a bribe to a government official to encourage them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questionnaire number ________________ (please fill)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II</th>
<th>CLOSE OF INTERVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z19</td>
<td>Who is present at the end of the interview?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = respondent is alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = spouse is present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = one other adult is present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = more than adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 = children are present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z20</td>
<td>How long did the interview take? (minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z21</td>
<td>Was the respondent willing to answer all questions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z22</td>
<td>Were there any problems during the interview? (write in box)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z23</td>
<td>How does the condition of the household compare with others in the neighborhood?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = worse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z24</td>
<td>Do you think this person is a refugee or an IDP?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = yes, refugee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = yes, IDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99 = DK/unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z25</td>
<td>If yes, why? (write in box)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z26</td>
<td>Other comments? (write in box)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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