

A SURVEY OF THE
AFGHAN RETURNEES
2019

SURVEY OF THE AFGHAN RETURNEES

PROJECT DIRECTION

The Asia Foundation

EDITOR

Tabasum Akseer

AUTHORS

Tabasum Akseer, [REDACTED], [REDACTED], David Swift, [REDACTED]

FIELDWORK AND MONITORING

[REDACTED]

BOOK DESIGN

[REDACTED]

PHOTOGRAPHY

[REDACTED]

Tabasum Akseer

[REDACTED]

ABOUT THE ASIA FOUNDATION

The Asia Foundation is a nonprofit international development organization committed to improving lives across a dynamic and developing Asia. Informed by six decades of experience and deep local expertise, our work across the region addresses five overarching goals—strengthen governance, empower women, expand economic opportunity, increase environmental resilience, and promote international cooperation.

Headquartered in San Francisco, The Asia Foundation works through a network of offices in Afghanistan and 17 other Asian countries and in Washington, DC. Working with public and private partners, the Foundation receives funding from a diverse group of bilateral and multilateral development agencies, foundations, corporations, and individuals. For more information, visit asiafoundation.org

© 2020 The Asia Foundation

Printed on acid-free 100% recycled paper

Cover image by [REDACTED]. Cover image depicts a young retunee standing in the corridor of a settlement, near an internal displaced camp in Kabul, Afghanistan.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	15
2.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	19
3.	METHODS	35
4.	FINDINGS	39
4.1	AFGHAN RETURNEES	39
1	REASONS FOR RETURN TO AFGHANISTAN	40
2	SETTLEMENT CHOICE AND DECISION MAKING	42
3	EDUCATION/SKILLS ACQUIRED WHILE ABROAD.....	48
4	SERVICES.....	53
5	ECONOMIC SITUATION	61
6	REGISTRATION	68
7	ACCESS TO EDUCATION	72
8	INTEGRATION AND CONFLICT	77
9	CHANGES IN EXPERIENCE OVER TIME.....	100
4.2	HOST COMMUNITY PERCEPTIONS & EXPERIENCES	109
1	PERCEPTIONS OF RETURNEES.....	111
2	PROVIDING/OFFERING ASSISTANCE TO RETURNEES.....	114
3	RETURNEES' IMPACT ON NEIGHBORHOOD.....	117
4	ACCEPTANCE OF & TRUSTING RETURNEES IN THE COMMUNITY.....	126
5	RETURNEE PROBLEMS, RESOURCES AND SERVICES.....	138
6	GAPS IN PRESENT AND FUTURE RETURNEE NEEDS	153
7	INTEGRATION AND CONFLICT	161
	APPENDICES	171
	APPENDIX 1: DETAILED METHODOLOGY.....	171
	APPENDIX 2: RETURNEE QUESTIONNAIRE.....	187
	APPENDIX 3: HOST COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRE	221

TABLE OF FIGURES


1.	PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS, BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE	39
2.	COUNTRY RETURNED FROM, BY PROVINCE	40
3.	REASONS FOR RETURN TO AFGHANISTAN	41
4.	SETTLEMENT DECISION, BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE AND YEAR	43
5.	REASONS FOR RESETTLING, BY PROVINCE	44
6.	REASONS FOR RESETTLEMENT, WITHIN AND OUTSIDE OF AFGHANISTAN	45
7.	REASONS FOR IMPROVEMENT IN LIVING CONDITIONS, BY PROVINCE.	46
8.	REASONS FOR IMPROVEMENT IN LIVING CONDITIONS, BY YEAR.	46
9.	EDUCATION RECEIVED ABROAD, BY DEMOGRAPHICS	49
10.	EDUCATION RECEIVED ABROAD, BY PROVINCE AND STRATA	50
11.	SKILL OR EDUCATION ACQUIRED ABROAD, BY COUNTRY	51
12.	TYPE OF SKILLS ACQUIRED ABROAD, BY GENDER	52
13.	TYPE OF SKILLS ACQUIRED ABROAD, BY COUNTRY	52
14.	SUPPORT RECEIVED WHEN RETURNING TO AFGHANISTAN, BY YEAR	54
15.	SUPPORT RECEIVED, BY PROVINCE.	55
16.	SUPPORT RECEIVED, BY MARITAL STATUS.	55
17.	SUPPORT RECEIVED WHEN RETURNING TO AFGHANISTAN, BY PROVIDER	56
18.	SEEKING SUPPORT FROM GOVERNMENT OR NEIGHBORHOOD, BY YEAR	57
19.	GOVERNMENT OFFICES APPROACHED FOR ASSISTANCE	58
20.	APPROACHED GOVERNMENT FOR ASSISTANCE, BY PROVINCE AND STRATA.	59
21.	APPROACHED ANYONE IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD FOR ASSISTANCE, BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE	60
22.	GIVING MONEY/GIFT TO RECEIVE SUPPPORT FROM GOVERNMENT, BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE	61
23.	HOUSEHOLD FINANCIAL SITUATION, BY PROVINCE AND STRATA	62
24.	EMPLOYMENT SITUATION OF HOUSEHOLDS. BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE	63
25.	WORSENEO EMPLOYMENT SITUATION. BY YEAR AND PROVINCE	64
26.	OWNERSHIP OF HOUSEHOLD ITEMS	65
27.	SOURCE OF FINANCING FOR RETURN HOME, BY YEAR	66
28.	FEMALE CONTRIBUTION TO HOUSEHOLD INCOME, BY YEAR.	67
29.	FEMALE CONTRIBUTION TO HOUSEHOLD INCOME, BY PROVINCE, STRATA, AND YEAR.	67
30.	REGISTRATION WITH ORGANIZATIONS, BY YEAR	68
31.	REGISTRATION, BY PROVINCE AND STRATA.	69
32.	REGISTRATION STATUS, BY ETHNICITY.	70
33.	SUPPORT RECEIVED UPON RETURN TO AFGHANISTAN, BY REGISTRATION	


STATUS, AND YEAR	71
34. SUPPORT RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT UPON RETURN, BY PROVINCE AND REGISTRATION STATUS	72
35. SOME OR NONE OF CHILDREN ATTENDED SCHOOL WHILE ABROAD, BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION AND GENDER	73
36. REASONS FOR CHILDREN NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL WHILE ABROAD, BY GENDER	74
37. REASONS FOR CHILDREN NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL, BY GENDER	75
38. FEMALE NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL, BY STRATA	76
39. MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES	78
40. MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES, BY PROVINCE	78
41. MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES, BY STRATA	79
42. MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES, BY SURVEY YEAR	80
43. MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES, BY NEIGHBORHOOD: IMMEDIATE FAMILY	80
44. MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES, BY NEIGHBORHOOD: EXTENDED FAMILY	81
45. MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES, BY NEIGHBORHOOD: RETURNEES FROM A SIMILAR ETHNIC GROUP	82
46. MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES, BY NEIGHBORHOOD: RETURNEES FROM OTHER ETHNIC GROUP	82
47. MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES, BY NEIGHBORHOOD: NEIGHBORS FROM SIMILIAR ETHNIC GROUP	83
48. MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES, BY NEIGHBORHOOD: NEIGHBORS FROM OTHER ETHNIC GROUP	84
49. MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES, BY NEIGHBORHOOD: NEIGHBORS FROM OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTRY	84
50. MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES, BY NEIGHBORHOOD: WEALTHY NEIGHBORS	85
51. MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES, BY NEIGHBORHOOD: IMPOVERISHED NEIGHBORS	86
52. MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES, BY REGISTRATION STATUS	87
53. CAMP/SHELTER AS THE MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR REGISTERED RETURNEES, BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE	88
54. EXPERIENCE OF CONFLICT OR DISPUTE, BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE	89
55. EXPERIENCE OF CONFLICT OR DISPUTE, BY TYPE OF NEIGHBORHOOD, AND YEAR	90
56. TYPE OF CONFLICT OR DISPUTE, BY PROVINCE AND YEAR	90
57. TYPE OF CONFLICT OR DISPUTE, BY STRATA AND YEAR	91
58. EXPERIENCE OF CONFLICT OR DISPUTE, BY RESPONDENT AND PROVINCE	92

59. EXPERIENCE OF CONFLICT OR DISPUTE, BY REGISTRATION STATUS, STRATA AND PROVINCE	93
60. CAUSE OF CONFLICT OR DISPUTE, BY STRATA	94
61. DISPUTE RESOLUTION MECHANISM, BY YEAR	95
62. DISPUTE RESOLUTION MECHANISMS, BY PROVINCE	95
63. CAUSES OF DISPUTES AND CONFLICTS, BY RESPONDENT	96
64. RETURNEE INTEGRATION INTO HOST COMMUNITY, BY NEIGHBORHOOD AND YEAR	97
65. PERCEPTION OF SAFETY, BY NEIGHBORHOOD.	98
66. EXPERIENCE OF LINGUISTIC DISCRIMINATION, BY NEIGHBORHOOD	99
67. EXPERIENCE OF LINGUISTIC DISCRIMINATION, BY PROVINCE AND STRATA.	100
68. REASONS FOR RETURN, BY YEAR	101
69. SOURCE OF FINANCING FOR RETURN TO AFGHANISTAN, BY YEAR.	102
70. EDUCATION RECEIVED ABROAD, BY YEAR.	103
71. PROBLEMS FACING WOMEN IN RETURNEES' HOUSEHOLD, BY YEAR	103
72. SITE OF RETURNEES' MOST CHALLENGING EXPERIENCE, BY YEAR	104
73. REASONS FOR PESSIMISM, BY YEAR	105
74. HOST COMMUNITY, BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE	109
75. TYPE OF PROFESSION THAT GENERATES MONEY, BY STRATA AND GENDER.	110
76. OWNERSHIP OF HOUSEHOLD ASSETS, BY STRATA	110
77. COUNTRY RETURNED FROM, BY PROVINCE	112
78. COMFORT WITH RETURNEE IN THE WORKPLACE	114
79. PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO A RETURNEE, BY YEAR	115
80. TYPE OF SUPPORT REQUESTED, BY STRATA WITHIN EACH PROVINCE	115
81. TYPES OF SUPPORT REQUESTED, BY STRATA	116
82. RETURNEE EFFECT ON SAFETY OF HOST COMMUNITY, BY YEAR AND PROVINCE	118
83. RETURNEE EFFECT ON CRIME IN HOST COMMUNITIES, BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE	119
84. RETURNEE AS NEGATIVE EFFECT ON CRIME IN HOST COMMUNITIES, BY PROVINCE AND YEAR .	120
85. RETURNEE EFFECT ON CLEANLINESS AND MAINTENANCE OF PUBLIC AREAS, BY YEAR	121
86. RETURNEE EFFECT ON JOB OPPORTUNITIES, BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE	122
87. RETURNEE EFFECT ON JOB OPPORTUNITIES, BY YEAR.	123
88. RETURNEE AS NEGATIVE EFFECT ON HOST COMMUNITIES, BY STRATA.	124
89. RETURNEE EFFECT ON GOVERNMENT SERVICES, BY PROVINCE	125
90. RETURNEE EFFECT ON GOVERNMENT SERVICES, BY AGE.	126
91. REASONS FOR OPPOSING A RETURNEE MOVING NEXT DOOR, BY YEAR	127
92. FAVORING HOST COMMUNITY CHILDREN OR SIBLINGS TO PLAY WITH RETURNEE CHILDREN, BY PERCEPTION OF RETURNEES' EFFECT ON LOCAL SAFETY	128
93. REASONS FOR OPPOSING CHILDREN OR SIBLINGS RECEIVING EDUCATION FROM A RETURNEE, BY YEAR.	129









94. REASONS FOR OPPOSING CHILDREN OR SIBLINGS RECEIVING EDUCATION FROM A RETURNEE, BY PROVINCE.	130
95. REASONS FOR OPPOSING CHILDREN OR SIBLINGS RECEIVING EDUCATION FROM A RETURNEE, BY PROVINCE.	131
96. FAVORING RETURNEES IN THE SAME WORKPLACE, BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION	132
97. REASONS FOR OPPOSING WORK ALONGSIDE A RETURNEE, BY STRATA	133
98. FEELING SAFE IN NEIGHBORHOOD, BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE	135
99. TRUSTING RETURNEES IN DIFFERENT ACTIVITIES AND ROLES, BY STRATA.	136
100. REASONS FOR NOT TRUSTING RETURNEES TO BE A REPRESENTATIVE IN THE GOVERNMENT, BY YEAR	137
101. REASONS FOR NOT TRUSTING A RETURNEE TO SERVE IN ANDSF, BY YEAR	138
102. PERCEPTION OF RETURNEES' MAJOR PROBLEMS, BY STRATA	139
103. PERCEPTION OF RETURNEES' MAJOR PROBLEMS, BY PROVINCE	140
104. UNEMPLOYMENT AND JOBLESSNESS AS PROBLEM IN NEIGHBORHOOD, BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE	141
105. LACK OF FOOD AS PROBLEM IN NEIGHBORHOOD, BY PROVINCE	142
106. LACK OF FOOD AS PROBLEM IN NEIGHBORHOOD, BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE	142
107. HOUSEHOLD FINANCIAL SITUATION, BY PROVINCE	144
108. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF DRINKING WATER, BY PROVINCE.	145
109. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF HEALTH SERVICES, BY PROVINCE.	146
110. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN, BY PROVINCE.	147
111. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF ELECTRICITY SUPPLY, BY PROVINCE	148
112. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF TRANSPORTATION, BY PROVINCE	149
113. JOBS AND WORK OPPORTUNITIES, BY PROVINCE.	150
114. SAFETY AND SECURITY FOR FAMILY, BY PROVINCE	151
115. ACCESS TO HOUSING OR LAND, BY PROVINCE	152
116. SELF REPORTED HAPPINESS, BY PROVINCE	153
117. WHAT GOVERNMENT SHOULD PROVIDE RETURNEES ACCORDING TO HOST COMMUNITIES, BY YEAR	154
118. ASSISTANCE FOR RETURNEES, BY PROVINCE	155
119. ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE RETURNEES REQUIRE, BY YEAR	156
120. ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE RETURNEES REQUIRE, BY PROVINCE	157
121. ENTITIES RESPONSIBLE FOR PROVIDING SUPPORT FOR RETURNEES, BY YEAR.	158
122. HOST COMMUNITIES AWARENESS OF RETURNEE SUPPORT NETWORKS, BY YEAR.	159
123. TYPE OF SUPPORT EACH ENTITY PROVIDES TO RETURNEES, BY YEAR.	161
124. PERCEPTION OF RETURNEES' INTEGRATION, BY YEAR.	162
125. BARRIERS TO INTEGRATION, BY PROVINCE	163
126. REASONS WHY RETURNEES EXPERIENCE CHALLENGES WHEN INTEGRATING, BY STRATA	164
127. EXPERIENCES OF DISPUTE, BY PROVINCE AND YEAR	165

128. EXPERIENCES OF DISPUTE, BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE166
129. TYPE OF DISPUTE, BY STRATA166
130. CAUSE OF DISPUTE OR CONFLICT, BY YEAR167
131. CAUSE OF DISPUTE OR CONFLICT, BY PROVINCE167
132. WHERE DID THE ISSUE OCCUR? BY STRATA168





REGIONS

-  CENTRAL/KABUL
-  EAST
-  SOUTH EAST
-  SOUTH WEST
-  WEST
-  NORTH EAST
-  CENTRAL HIGHLANDS
-  NORTH WEST

PREFACE

The impact of returnees to Afghanistan remains a challenge. In 2019, limited institutional capacity and infrastructure continue to affect the ability of the Afghan government and international community to receive and process returnees. The likelihood that the Covid-19 pandemic will particularly affect poor and conflicted-affected countries like Afghanistan, brings additional burden to a donor-dependent economy and stressed institutions of governance, additional strain on already stretched resources is likely. And with positive developments regarding peace talks, there is a possibility that further strain may be placed on the system as individuals and families migrate towards Afghanistan.

Regionally, the pandemic will have follow-on impacts for migrants and returnees. Pakistan and Iran, the two main host nations for Afghan refugees, are facing their own Covid-19 challenges, with the pandemic showing no signs of abating, and with economic conditions globally likely to trend downwards, both countries may seek to hasten the return of migrants. In some respects, we may already be witnessing this: as of August 31, 2020, an additional one hundred thousand returnees have returned to Afghanistan from Iran and Pakistan in 2020, compared with 2019.

In the second year of a three-year public perception survey, *A Survey of the Afghan Returnees* (SAR), continues to document the issues and challenges faced by returnees and host communities. In 2019, the *Survey* gathered the views of over 8,000 returnees and host communities, in rural and urban areas of Balkh, Herat, Kabul, Kandahar and Nangarhar provinces. In 2018 and 2019, a combined total of 16,033 returnees and host community members have been surveyed on a range of issues.

This year, the *Survey* reveals a decrease in the number of respondents who report receiving access to government and humanitarian services than compared to 2018. The pressure on services seems constant, and with the ongoing increase in returnees, this is likely to be an enduring problem.

The Asia Foundation has had a long presence on the ground in Afghanistan, from 1954 to 1979, and from 2002 to present. With a long history of planning and implementing effective programs that benefit the country and its citizens, the Foundation is committed to building strong relationships with the government and civil society that have led to sustainable initiatives in governance and law, women's empowerment, education, regional cooperation, and, policy and research.

Given the transitions underway, it remains imperative for the international community to maintain their commitment to supporting the Afghan people. It is hoped that the *Survey* can influence and inform policy – especially in the context of Covid-19 and in an environment where peace talks are finally tangible – in order to shape changes in the way returnees are integrated and supported.


Country Representative, The Asia Foundation–Afghanistan
August 2020

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A Survey of the Afghan Returnees is the product of numerous contributions from the partners and staff of The Asia Foundation. The survey report was produced under the guidance of Afghanistan Country Representative [REDACTED] and led by a team of Afghan data analysts [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and graphic designer [REDACTED], working under the direction of Tabasum Akseer, PhD director of Policy and Research.

The [REDACTED], a subsidiary of D3 systems, Inc., worked closely with the Foundation to conduct all survey fieldwork. The Foundation is grateful for [REDACTED]'s facilitation of third-party monitoring by [REDACTED], and for their commitment to quality-control best practices in one of the world's most challenging research environments. Special thanks are due to Managing Director [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]'s [REDACTED] for their professionalism and attention to detail.

The General Directorate for the Office of the Minister of Interior provided valuable assistance in securing permission to conduct fieldwork, the National Statistics and Information Authority (formerly the Central Statistics Organization) provided population estimates while the International Organization for Migration's Baseline Mobility Assessment Settlement Data provided a reliable frame of returnee settlements in Afghanistan.

The Asia Foundation thanks the United States Agency for International Development for their support of this survey and for Afghan research capacity.



1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The Asia Foundation (the Foundation) is a non-profit, non-governmental organization committed to the development of a peaceful, prosperous, just, and unprejudiced Asia-Pacific region. Drawing on 60 years of experience, the Foundation supports initiatives to improve governance; law and civil society; women's empowerment; economic reform and development; sustainable development and the environment; and international relations. The Asia Foundation has offices in 18 countries throughout Asia and is headquartered in San Francisco with an office in Washington, DC.

In Afghanistan, the Foundation supports five primary domains: governance and law; women's empowerment; education; regional cooperation and survey/research and knowledge development.

With the support of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the Foundation's Policy and Research Department is implementing a three-year survey titled: *A Survey of the Afghan Returnees* (SAR). The goal of the *Survey* is to assess the experiences of Afghan returnees and their host communities. The second-year findings of the Survey are presented in this report. Fieldwork was conducted from October 30 – November 13, 2019 by 5 supervisors and 312 enumerators (151 female and 161 male) who were gender-matched with respondents (i.e., men interviewed men and women interviewed women).¹

PROJECT BACKGROUND

This *Survey* is the second in a three-year long project designed to help understand and broaden knowledge surrounding the unique challenges and experiences of returnees and host communities across Afghanistan. In 2019, 4,033 returnees and host community members were interviewed, culminating in a combined total of 16, 033 returnees and host community members surveyed on a range of issues in 2018 and 2019. Perceptions and experiences among returnees, including their reasons for return to Afghanistan, their education and skills acquired abroad, access to services, economic situation, registration, access to education, and their experiences in reintegration and conflict are explored here. Among host community participants, some of the areas explored include their perceptions of returnees, provision of support to returnees, the impact of returnees on their communities, and perceptions of resources returnees require, experiences of conflict and integration, and, any gaps in current services. The *Survey* provides a depth of public opinion from both returnees and host communities across regions and demographics to support evidence-informed policy planning and program initiatives for returnees.

Per the International Organization for Migration (IOM)², 499,672 undocumented returnees arrived in Afghanistan during the period January 1 to December 31, 2019 – a significant reduction on the 805, 800 reported to have arrived during the period January 1 to December 31, 2018. The vast majority of these returnees came from Iran (485,096) and Pakistan (19,881)³. Projections for 2020 are unclear, but the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic threatens to increase returnee rates and introduce additional strains on returnee infrastructure. For example, during the period January 1 to April 11, 2020, the IOM recorded 244,830 returnees from Iran and Pakistan⁴, which threatens to overwhelm already stretched resources, and exacerbate reintegration challenges. That said, border closures due to the Covid-19 pandemic may mitigate this to a certain extent. However, for Afghans currently outside of Afghanistan, socio-

economic difficulties in host countries as a result of Covid-19 and resource availability may contribute to an increase in the near future.⁵

While not within the scope of this *Survey*, pressure on resources, and challenges with reintegration are exacerbated by the ongoing deportation of Afghan refugees from countries such as Turkey,^{6,7} Germany⁸ and others within the European Union⁹ throughout 2019, which will likely put additional strain on scarce resources.

The fears and challenges of returnees are many and extant. Some fear returning to an Afghanistan that is replete with much of the same security, economic and political conditions that led to their initial migration decision,¹⁰ and some still will be fearful of the deepening insecurity and economic fragility¹¹ that Afghanistan faces. Some of those returning may be leaving behind families, businesses, and jobs in their host countries, resulting in further anxiety. Some will never have lived in Afghanistan, may have no education, have underlying health conditions, have little money and be extremely pessimistic about what the future may hold for them. Indeed, the World Bank notes that those who are returning face socio-economic difficulties and are more likely to experience a decline in employment opportunities, wages, and job stability after returning to Afghanistan.¹² Further adding to the stresses of returning and reintegration, returnees are attempting to enter an economy that is producing few job opportunities¹³ and one that as of this writing will be facing challenges due to Covid-19. Concerns over the economy and finances are further reflected in findings where 40.9% of respondents reported that their overall household financial situation had gotten worse since returning to Afghanistan; and 53.1% of respondents reported employment opportunities had worsened, further highlighting the challenges that returnees face.

For host communities, there are also fears and worries. Returnees may place pressure on scarce public services, education facilities, hospitals, lead to issues surrounding land allocation and community integration and intensify competition for scarce economic opportunities.¹⁴ There may also be ethnic issues which can lead to tension between returnees and host communities. This tension is reflected in findings which document some returnees reporting intimidation, harassment and discrimination from their host communities.

To assist with reintegration, returnees are provided with differing levels of assistance via governmental, non-governmental and international organizations. For example, programs such as the IOMs post arrival assistance and reintegration efforts provide undocumented Afghans returning from Iran and Pakistan with immediate humanitarian post-arrival assistance. And in the reintegration phase, initiatives that include vocational training, construction of permanent shelters for vulnerable returnee families and construction of community infrastructure.¹⁵ However, despite such efforts, there are significant challenges in receiving assistance.¹⁶ Findings from the 2019 *Survey* show that the most prevalent forms of assistance received include the provision of food (35.9%), cash/loans (27.3%), health care (18.3%), housing (18.3%), employment (15.0%), clothes and kitchen materials (14.4%), and training (3.2%). These percentages are lower than those reported in 2018.

The unique challenges and experiences of returnees and host communities recorded in the *Survey* serves as a benchmark and represent The Asia Foundation's effort to increase empirical knowledge in this area, assist and inform policy makers and improve returnee program initiatives.

ENDNOTES

1. Returnees surveyed were asked to reflect on their experiences since returning to Afghanistan within the last five years, while host communities were asked to reflect on experiences of living next door to a returnee, unless otherwise stated.
2. “Return of Undocumented Afghans: Weekly Situation Report 5-11 Jan 2020”, International Organization for Migration (IOM), 2020, Retrieved from: https://afghanistan.iom.int/sites/default/files/Reports/iom_afghanistan-return_of_undocumented_afghans-situation_report_5_-11_jan_2020.pdf
3. “Return of Undocumented Afghans: Weekly Situation Report 29 Dec 2019- 4 Jan 2020”, International Organisation for Migration (IOM), 2020, Retrieved from: https://afghanistan.iom.int/sites/default/files/Reports/iom_afghanistan-return_of_undocumented_afghans-situation_report_29_dec_2019-4_jan_2020.pdf
4. “Return of Undocumented Afghans: Weekly Situation Report 05-11 April 2020”, International Organisation for Migration (IOM), 2020, Retrieved from: https://www.iom.int/sites/default/files/situation_reports/file/iom_afghanistan_return_of_undocumented_afghans_situation_report_05_-11_april_2020.pdf
5. Data collection occurred in October 2019 prior to the COVID-19 pandemic outbreak and is not reflective of new challenges and realities experienced by returnees and host communities.
6. Hasan Abdullah, “Turkey helps undocumented Afghans repatriated home with new jobs”, TRT World, August 19, 2019, Retrieved from: <https://www.trtworld.com/asia/turkey-helps-undocumented-afghans-repatriated-home-with-new-jobs-29089>
7. Navid Ahmad Barakzai, “Afghans deported from Turkey block Kabul airport road”, Pajhwok News, May 9, 2019, Retrieved from: <https://www.pajhwok.com/en/2019/05/09/afghans-deported-turkey-block-kabul-airport-road>
8. “Germany deports 44 Afghan Asylum seekers”, RadioFreeEurope RadioLiberty, October 9, 2019, Retrieved from: <https://reliefweb.int/report/germany/germany-deports-44-afghan-asylum-seekers>
9. Teri Schultz, “EU states push ahead with Afghanistan deportations, despite increased danger”, DW, October 10, 2018, Retrieved from: <https://www.dw.com/en/eu-states-push-ahead-with-afghanistan-deportations-despite-increased-danger/a-45835755>
10. “Distant Dreams: Understanding the aspirations of Afghan Returnees”, Mixed Migration Center, March 12, 2019, Retrieved from: http://www.mixedmigration.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/061_Distant_Dreams.pdf
11. “Living Condition and Settlement decisions of recent Afghan returnees: Finding from a 2018 Phone Survey of Afghan Returnees and UNHCR Data”, World Bank and UNHCR, June 2019, Retrieved from: <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/3444311561017281303/pdf/Living-Conditions-and-Settlement-Decisions-of-Recent-Afghan-Returnees-Findings-from-a-2018-Phone-Survey-of-Afghan-Returnees-and-UNHCR-data.pdf>
12. Ibid
13. “Multi-Cluster Needs Assessment: Food Security in Informal Settlements”, REACH, November 2017, Retrieved from: https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/reach_afg_report_mcna_food_security_in_informal_settlements_november2017_1.pdf
14. World Bank and UNHCR (2019)
15. “Return of Undocumented Afghans: Weekly Situation Report 06-12 Sep 2020”, International Organisation for Migration, 2020, Retrieved from: https://afghanistan.iom.int/sites/default/files/Reports/iom_afghanistan-return_of_undocumented_afghans_situation_report_06-12_sep_2020.pdf
16. REACH (2017)



2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A Survey of the Afghan Returnees (SAR) is the second of a three-year public perception survey on returnees and host communities in Afghanistan. In its second year, the *Survey* gathered the views of 8,044 returnees and host community members on the perceptions and experiences of returnee integration. Of these, 4,073 were returnees who had returned to Afghanistan from abroad within the last five years, while 3,971 were members of host communities (those communities to which the returnees had returned). Afghans in heavily populated returnee clusters in Balkh, Herat, Kabul, Kandahar, and Nangarhar were interviewed.

Returnees residing in settlements were randomly sampled using the International Organization for Migration's (IOM) Baseline Mobility Assessment Settlement Data. A total of 8,044 interviews were conducted with Afghan respondents aged 18 years and above. Fieldwork was conducted from October 30 – November 13, 2019 by 5 supervisors and 312 enumerators (151 female and 161 male) who were gender-matched with respondents (i.e., men interviewed men and women interviewed women). All enumerators were residents of the provinces in which they conducted the interviews.

Screening questions were used to identify returnees who returned to Afghanistan within the five years preceding the survey and host community respondents who reported knowing at least one returnee personally. The final sample was 53% male and 47% female. Due to accessibility challenges, rural households comprised 66% of the unweighted sample, while urban households comprised only 34% of the unweighted sample.

For the returnee sample, the estimated design effect was 2.3. Using this design effect, the complex margin of error at the 95% confidence interval (CI) with $p=0.5$ was calculated to be $\pm 2.33\%$. For the host community sample, the estimated design effect was 2.1. Using this estimate of a design effect, the complex margin of error at the 95% CI with $p=.5$ is $\pm 2.23\%$.

As with the Foundation's flagship survey, *A Survey of the Afghan People*, the Foundation's longstanding research partner, the [REDACTED], conducted the fieldwork for this project. D3 Systems, Inc., [REDACTED]'s parent company, provided analytical and methodological support. [REDACTED] led the third-party verification of the fieldwork, a best practice for conducting survey research in challenging environments.

The Foundation and its partners employed additional quality control mechanisms at every step of the process. During fieldwork, interviewers were observed by a supervisor or third-party validator. Field supervisors and third-party validators also conducted back-checks of interviews. In total, 37% of interviews were subject to some form of back-check or quality control.

Two versions of the questionnaire were developed; one for implementation among returnees and the

other for host community respondents. The questionnaires addressed the experiences of returnees before and after returning to Afghanistan, skills learned abroad, reasons for returning, the impact of returnee integration on host communities, and conflicts and cooperation between returnees and host communities. Both versions of the questionnaire included 29 management questions. The returnee questionnaire contained four screener questions for respondent selection, 93 substantive questions, and 23 demographics questions while the host community questionnaire contained 3 screener questions, 71 substantive questions, and 22 demographics questions. However, both questionnaires contained extensive filtering such that no respondent was asked 100% of the questions in either questionnaire.

Chapter 3 provides a brief overview of the survey methodology, while more comprehensive information is offered in Appendix 1, Detailed Methodology. The survey instruments can be found in Appendix 2: Returnee Questionnaire, and Appendix 3: Host Community Questionnaire.

RETURNEES' PERCEPTIONS AND EXPERIENCES

REASONS FOR RETURN TO AFGHANISTAN

In 2019, Afghan returnees interviewed in Balkh, Herat, Kabul, Kandahar and Nangarhar cited unemployment in the host country (32.3%), deportation / forced removal (30.9%), and family reunification (20.0%) as the main reasons for their return to the country. This differs from the top cited findings in 2018; deportation / forced removal (37.1%), unemployment in the host country (34.0%), family reunification (24.4%), and people of the host country were unwelcoming (23.6%) as the main reasons for returning.

Reasons also vary based on the country where the returnees are returning from. Those returning from Pakistan or Turkey were more likely to say deported or being forcibly removed (33.8%, and 33.1% respectively), and unemployment in the host country (Pakistan: 30.3%, Turkey: 29.6%) resulted in their return to Afghanistan, while those returning from Iran more often cited unemployment in the host country (36.8%), and being forcibly removed or deported (25.2%). More returnees from Pakistan mentioned poor security in the host country (13.3%), approximately twice that of those returning from Iran (6.7%).

SETTLEMENT CHOICE AND DECISION MAKING

This year, 11.6% of respondents say they lived in another location or place in Afghanistan since their return. A subsequent question asked why they have moved to their current location and the most frequent answers were “staying/living with family” (30.6%), and “to be around people of the same

ethnicity” (17.2%). Lower proportions mentioned “because it is my own land/house” (10.8%), “better job opportunities here” (10.4%), “better security here” (8.5%), and “better services available here” (7.9%).

A majority of the respondents (94.1%) planned to settle where they were currently living, while only 5.0% planned to move elsewhere. The most cited reasons for settling in their present location were better employment opportunities (52.8%), better security situation (30.8%), better standard of living (29.3%), education (17.2%), and better environmental conditions (16.1%). In addition, returnees were asked if they planned to live alone or with their family, to which 15.3% answered alone, and 78.0% said with family.

This year the level of optimism among returnees about their future has increased from 33.9% in 2018 to 39.9%. These respondents believed that their family’s living conditions would improve if they continued to stay at their present settlement. The major reasons behind this improvement are the perception of improved security (56.6%), improvement in education (22.4%), increased awareness about reconstruction (37.1%) and patriotism (13.7%). However, 30.8% of respondents believed that the living condition for their households would deteriorate if they stayed in their present settlements, lower than 39.0% last year. Major reasons for pessimism cited are: unemployment (49.2%), insecurity (30.4%), poor economy (26.3%), weak government (21.6%), and high cost of living (16.1%).

Returnees who reported feeling unsafe in their neighborhood were more likely to want to move elsewhere (10.8%) than those who reported feeling safe (4.4%), or those who experienced a conflict since their return to Afghanistan (11.6% of respondents indicated that they would move elsewhere compared to those who did not report any case of conflict or violence with community, 4.1%). Those who lived somewhere else in Afghanistan since their return were approximately five times more likely to want to resettle elsewhere (14.7%) compared to (3.7%) those who had lived in their current location since they had returned to Afghanistan.

EDUCATION/SKILLS ACQUIRED WHILE ABROAD

Respondents were asked whether they received any formal education while abroad, to which 13.2% responded positively, while 86.8% said they had not received any formal education abroad. By marital status, single respondents were also more likely to have acquired some formal education abroad (26.6%), compared to married respondents (11.0%). Men were more likely to say they acquired a formal education abroad than women (16.3% males, and 9.7% females).

In general, 28.1% of respondents reported learning new skills while abroad. This was reported more frequently by those who lived in Iran (31.8%) than those who lived in Pakistan (25.8%). However, those who lived in Pakistan were more likely to have earned a formal education (15.0%) than those who lived in Iran (10.3%). Skills acquired while abroad, not including formal education, included tailoring (29.2%), embroidery/handicrafts (22.9%), and masonry (14.3%).

SERVICES

When returning to Afghanistan, returnees were provided with some form of assistance and services, including receiving food (35.9%), cash/loan (27.3%), housing and healthcare (18.3%), employment/job (15.0%), training (3.2%) and other services such as clothes or kitchen materials (14.4%).

Findings reveal that provision of healthcare services is often attributed to the government (37.7%), while NGOs and UN agencies have most often provided training and cash/loans (70.1%, and 41.8% respectively), family support cited for providing housing (33.9%), and neighbors for providing food (34.6%).

Findings also indicate that one fifth of respondents have approached the government for assistance (20.2%), while two fifths have approached neighbors for assistance (41.3%). In terms of government institutions or entities, returnees were more likely to approach the Refugee Directorate (66.9%), the Ministry of Education (5.0%) and the Provincial Government Office (4.7%).

Among returnees who approached government offices for help, 76.4% reported not experiencing any corruption, while 13.2% reported experiences of corruption in order to receive assistance/service.

ECONOMIC SITUATION

Regarding the economic situation or status of returnees' households, respondents were asked whether the financial situation of their households has gotten better or worse compared to their situation before returning to Afghanistan. Less than half, 40.9% responded it has gotten worse, for 31.1% it has gotten better, and 27.9% reported no difference. The proportion who indicated it has worsened was highest in urban Kabul (61.2%) and lowest in rural Herat (19.3%).

Moreover, more than half said job and work opportunities for their household have gotten worse (54.1%), and nearly one fifth (21.5%) said the situation has improved for them, and 24.3% said there is no difference. The proportion who said the situation has gotten worse for them was highest in rural Kabul with 74.7%, and lowest in urban Kandahar with 34.5%.

Returnees from Iran were more likely to say employment opportunities for them have gotten worse (57.1%) than those returning from Pakistan (52.1%). Those who received some level of formal education abroad were somewhat more likely to say the employment situation has worsened for them (56.3%), than those who had not acquired any formal education (53.7%).

Returnees who registered with an organization when they returned to Afghanistan were slightly more likely to say their employment situation has worsened (56.4%) compared to those who had not registered (53.2%).

Furthermore, 90.7% of returnee households reported owning at least one mobile phone, 58.7% a TV,

and 50.4% a bicycle, 40.5% motorcycle, 37.6% livestock, 28.0% jeribs¹ of lands while roughly 10.6% of the households own a car.

Among host community respondents, a majority (89.8%) of host community households have at least one mobile phone, 65% a television, 50.8% a bicycle, 44.0% a motorcycle, 43.4% livestock, 36.3% lands and only 16.0% own a car.

This year, 63.8% returnees indicated they had savings while returning to Afghanistan compared to 52.3% last year. In a related question, returnees were asked about sources of financing for their trip home, with more than half (52.4%) mentioning savings and 21.7% saying loans from family and friends, followed by support from UNHCR (6.8%), and sale of property (6.5%). These findings are consistent with the 2018 *Survey* data.

Approximately one fifth of the respondents said a female member contributes to their household income, while last year this proportion was about a quarter (2019: 20.8%, and 2018: 24.7%). Households with a female member contributing to income were more likely to report a better financial situation (37.6%) compared to those in which they did not contribute (29.5%), a similar finding held true in 2018 (36.5%, and 27.3% respectively).

REGISTRATION

Among returnees, 31.7% said they have registered with an organization when they returned to Afghanistan, lower than (34.3%) last year. Among registered returnees, 39.5% were registered with the government, followed by IOM (39.4%), UNHCR (24.1%), and the World Bank (1.7%).

Returnees in Nangarhar were more likely to register (40.0%) than those in Herat (17.4%). More rural respondents (32.5%) than urban ones (29.5%) said they had registered. Returnees from Iran were less likely to have registered (23.7%) than those returning from Pakistan (36.4%). This is a decrease from the reported proportions in 2018, 22.9% (Iran) and 43.6% (Pakistan) respectively.

One fifth (20.2%) of the returnees approached government offices for assistance and subsequently those who were non-registered were slightly more likely (26.6%) to receive the help they sought than the registered peers (24.7%). In 2018, a reverse finding held true (registered: 34.7% compared to non-registered: 28.0%).

By province, more registered returnees in Kabul (9.3%), and Herat (36.9%) reportedly received the help they sought than their non-registered peers (5.9% and 27.4% respectively), whereas in other provinces more non-registered returnees received support than registered.

Registered returnees were more likely to cite the UNHCR (11.1%), and IOM (6.5%) to assist them in financing their trip home than their non-registered peers (UNHCR: 4.8%, and IOM: 3.7%).

ACCESS TO EDUCATION

Overall, 48.8% of returnees said they have at least a school aged daughter, and 61.3% said they have a school-age son in their household while abroad; among these respondents, 27.7% said some or none of their daughters attended primary school, 35.2% secondary school, and 45.2% high school. With regard to their sons, respondents say they were more likely to have attended school. Those who said at least some of their sons had not attended school, the specific levels they were unable to attend were, 17.2% primary, 23.1% secondary school, and 34.0% high school.

Among returnees who reported their children have not attended school, less than a third, 27.3% said they could not afford tuition fees, and 12.3% cited transportation difficulties. With regard to male children who did not attend school abroad, the reasons were mostly the need to work (male: 32.5%, compared to female: 6.0%), and could not afford tuition fees (male: 22.0%, compared to female: 27.3%).

Respondents were also asked about number of school-age female and male children they had at the time of interview, whether they attended school, and the reasons why they did not attend school, if any. 68.5% of respondents said they had at least one school-aged daughter in their household and 77.6% said they had at least one school-age son at their household. Females were less likely to attend school (some or none of them attended school; 20.0% primary, 30.3% secondary, 40.1% high school) than males (some or none of them attended school; 11.9% primary, 15.0% secondary, and 22.2% high school).

The main reasons provided by respondents for not having their children attend school included: cannot afford school supplies (female: 12.1%, male: 11.1%), transportation difficulties (female: 12.8%, male: 7.8%), and they need to work (female: 11.8%, male: 37.4%).

REINTEGRATION AND CONFLICT

Respondents were asked what places were most challenging for them since their return to Afghanistan. One fourth, 20.8%, said returnee camp/shelter, 20.0% mentioned neighborhood, 16.0% marked the bazaar/market, and 15.1% cited the workplace.

Additionally, 11.8% of returnees reported having a dispute/conflict with their community members, marginally lower than last year's 12.7%. The reported disputes were most frequent in Kandahar (16.7%) and least frequent in Kabul (6.8%).

In a follow up question, the most common types of conflict experienced were verbal arguments or confrontation (66.4%), physical attack or fight (20.2%), and property dispute (13.0%).

Vandalism (24.8%), immorality (23.8%), intimidation (15.5%), harassment (12.8%), and discrimination (8.5%) were the most cited self-reported reasons for the experienced dispute or conflict.

Moreover, respondents who reported an experience of dispute or conflict were also asked where the

conflict occurred, to which 27.8% mentioned in the home, 19.5% at the workplace, 18.3% on the street, 17.1% said in the market, and 7.4% mentioned a government office

Of those who have experienced dispute/conflict, 83.0% said the case was resolved (the remaining 16.0% were negative). Among the resolved cases, 52.2% said the parties themselves have resolved it, 33.1% mentioned the *Shura/Jirgas* helped in the resolution, 7.4% named the Huquq department, and 6.0% cited state court. Compared to last year, there are some variations in responses, the most noticeable differences in cases resolved through shura/jirgas (2018: 23.6%, and 2019: 33.1%).

Over half of respondents, 56.2%, reported the perception of being discriminated against because of their language or way of speaking, 9.0% say they cannot comfortably go to their neighbors for help, and 8.6% reported feeling unsafe in their neighborhood.

CHANGES IN EXPERIENCE OVER TIME

The *Survey* asked respondents the year they returned to Afghanistan, followed by the reason for their return. Those who returned in 2019 were more likely to cite poor economic condition in the host country as a push factor for their return, than those returning in 2018 (21.8% and 15.6% respectively). Conversely, those who returned in 2018 were more likely to indicate they were deported / forcibly removed from the host country (31.6%) than those who returned in 2019 (26.4%). Family reunification has increased as a reason cited for return, from 18.6% among those who returned 2014 to 23.4% among those returning in 2019.

Pooling the responses over both rounds of the *Survey*, those who returned home in 2019 were less likely to say poor security conditions in the host country than those who returned in 2013 (9.3% versus 16.8%). Those who returned in 2019 were also less likely to say people of the host country were unwelcoming compared to those who returned in 2013 (12.1% versus 25.7%). More recent returnees were more likely to cite poor economic condition in the host country (for instance, 2018: 22.0%, and 2019: 21.8% versus 16.1% among those who returned in 2013).

HOST COMMUNITY PERCEPTIONS AND EXPERIENCES

Host community respondents report engagement in different types of activities. Less than one fifth, 17.1% are unemployed, 20.2% are housewives, 9.4% work in kiosks/shops, 9.0% are farmers on their own land, 7.5% are tailors, 7.3% mason/brickmaker/bricklayer, 4.2% are engaged in handicrafts and 4.2% are taxi drivers. Urban respondents are more likely to be unemployed than rural respondents (22.9% vs.15.0% respectively).

Overall, 60.1% report being employed, and among them, 44.7% said it was difficult for them to get the job. For 11.7% it was not very difficult, and a small proportion (5.4%) indicated that it was easy.

PERCEPTIONS OF RETURNEES

All respondents in the host community personally knew a returnee; 60.0% said the returnee was a relative, and 40.0% indicated that returnee was unrelated to them.

Over half said the returnees were from Pakistan 53.9%, Iran (35.0%), Turkey (5.6%) and 1.7% from Germany, and other Asian and European countries.

The majority of host community respondents (97.0%) felt comfortable interacting with returnees, while only 2.5% said they felt uncomfortable. Perceptions of comfort are consistent with 96.4% in 2018. Respondents who were related to a returnee are more likely to report feeling very comfortable interacting with returnees than those who are not related (74.4% vs. 66.2%).

Those who felt uncomfortable interacting with returnees cited the following reasons; linguistic problems (23.8%), they bully us (17.0%), don't know (15.3%), I don't know them (15.2%), cultural differences (6.1%), they are drug addicts (5.6%), they are corrupt (5.4%), and they have economic problems (3.3%).

OFFERING ASSISTANCE TO RETURNEES

Findings show that 21.6% of host community members were approached for help, slightly lower than last year (24.4%). Here, the most common request was for food assistance (27.4%), followed by financial aid (19.9%) and home appliances (12.4%), 8.5% asked for house/land, 3.5% for a loan, 3.5% for clothes, 2.3% for water and electricity, 2.2% sought advice, and 2.0% approached host community members for employment.

Urban host community respondents were more likely to report being approached for help than those in rural areas (25.4% compared to 20.2%).

RETURNEES IMPACT ON NEIGHBORHOOD

Respondents were asked if a returnee had a positive, negative or no effect on the safety of their area. Over half of respondents indicated returnees had a positive impact (53.3%), 14.7% said negative, and 16.2% said returnees had "no effect" on the safety and security of their area. In addition, 15.1% said it "depends on who is returning and where he/she is returning from."

Moreover, 35.7% of host community members reported that returnees have a positive impact on crime in their area, 26.6% reported returnees have a negative impact, 19.0% said no effect, and 17.8% said it depends on who returnee is and where he/she is returning from.

On the impact of returnees on the communities' overall culture², a large number of host community

members perceived returnees to have a positive impact (44.1%). More than one-fifth (22.1%) believe returnees have a negative effect on culture of host communities, 17.7% said no effect, and a similar proportion, 15.5%, said it would depend on who the returnee is and where he/she is returning from.

Regarding cleanliness and maintenance of public areas, less than half of respondents (42.0%) reported returnees have a positive effect on cleanliness and maintenance, while 21.7% said returnees have a negative effect on cleanliness and maintenance, 18.5% said no effect and 16.7% said it would depend on who the returnee is and where he/she is coming from.

On the impact of returnees on employment opportunities, overall 34.5% said returnees had a positive effect on opportunities, while 31.4% cited a negative effect, 19.7% said no effect and 13.5% said it depends on who is returning or where he/she is returning from.

Related to the impact of returnees on available government services such as clinics, schools and universities, 39.0% reported a positive impact. One fifth (20.7%) reported returnees have a negative effect on available government resources, 25.1% said no effect at all, and 13.8% said it would depend on who the returnee is and where he/she is coming from.

ACCEPTANCE OF AND TRUSTING RETURNEES IN COMMUNITIES

The *Survey* asked host community respondents whether they favored or opposed a returnee moving next door to them. Overall 94.2% said they favored this idea, while only 5.7% opposed the idea.

Host community members were also asked whether they favored or opposed the idea of their siblings or children playing with children of a returnee. A majority of respondents (93.3%) said they favored the notion, and a small proportion (6.5%) opposed.

Host community members were asked whether they favored or opposed the idea of their children or siblings receiving an education from a returnee teacher at school or university, 92.5% were in favor, with a small proportion in opposition (7.2%).

Respondents were asked if they would favor or oppose a returnee working with them in the same workplace. A similar proportion (92.6%) favored the idea, with only 7.1% opposing. Urban respondents were more likely to say strongly favor for this idea than rural respondents (63.9% vs. 58.1%).

Overall, 92.8% of host community members agree their neighborhood was friendly and welcoming, while only 7.1% disagreed.

A majority, 89.0%, said they could comfortably refer to their neighbors for help. Only 11.8% said they could not refer to their neighbors for help.

Similarly, 89.1% said that neighborhood respected them. A similar percent (89.4%) indicated they had

been invited by returnees to their ceremonies such as weddings, khatam, etc.

Over half of respondents reported feeling very safe in their neighborhood (55.7%), and a third (33.7%) said somewhat safe. Urban respondents were more likely than rural respondents to report feeling very safe (60.2% vs. 54.0%).

Respondents were also gauged on their levels of trust for returnees in various capacities. Findings indicate host community members to a great extent trust returnees to be: a member of the community development council (54.8%), serve in ANDSF (47.5%); represent them in government (48.3%); deliver religious sermons (47.5%); and to rent their house or apartment (52.4%). Respondents who know returnees from Pakistan were more likely to report trust in returnees to deliver religious sermons (51.3%), compared to those who knew returnees from Iran (42.4%). Respondents in Nangarhar were more likely to say they trusted returnees to deliver religious sermons (58.6%) than those in Herat (28.7%).

RETURNEES PROBLEMS, RESOURCES AND SERVICES

Host community members were also asked about what they perceived to be problems experienced by returnees. According to over half of host community respondents, access to land and housing was a major problem for a returnee (66.0%).

Respondents in Nangarhar were likely to say access to land and housing was a major problem for returnees (85.3%), while this proportion is notably lower in Kandahar (44.3%).

Furthermore, 76.4% of respondents cite unemployment as a major problem for returnees. Unemployment/joblessness is more frequently cited as a major problem facing returnees by respondents in Kabul and Nangarhar (89.8%, and 87.7% respectively).

HOST COMMUNITY SITUATION COMPARED TO RETURNEES

More than one third of host community respondents said their household financial situation is better than returnees (37.6%); however, 28.7% said it is worse, and 33.1% said there is no difference. Respondents in Kabul (45.9%) were most likely to say their financial situation is better compared to respondents elsewhere.

Similarly, 34.6% said access to drinking water was better for them than for returnees, 20.4% report worsening access to drinking water compared to returnees in their areas, and less than half of respondents (44.7%) reported no difference. Around one third (29.2%) of host community respondents said quality of drinking water was better for them than for returnees, while 26.7% said it was worse for them than for returnees, and 43.6% noted no difference.

When asked about access to health care, host community respondents were more likely to report access to health care was about the same as it was for returnees (43.7%) while 28.6% said it was worse, and 27.0% reported it was better. Less than half (43.6%) of respondents reported no differences in the quality of health service received by them and returnees in their area, whereas 29.9% said it was worse, and 25.6% reported that the quality of health services was better for them in comparison to returnees.

Overall, 32.0% of host community respondents reported better access to education for children than for returnees, while 24.5% said it was worse and 42.8% reported no difference. Relatedly, 30.0% of respondents indicated the quality of education was better for them than for returnees, 26.8% reported that it was worse for them compared for returnees, and 42.4% reported no differences.

In continuation of access to services/quality of services, 41.7% reported no difference, 31.2% said access to electricity was worse for them than for returnees, and 26.3% reported better access to electricity than for returnees. When asked about quality of electricity supply, 41.1% said there was no difference, 35.3% said that it was worse for them than for returnees, and 22.8% said it was better for them compared to returnees.

Moreover, when asked about access to transportation, 45.2% reported no difference, while 27.2% said access to transportation was better for them, and 26.8% said it was worse for them than for returnees. Findings were consistent regarding the quality of transportation, respondents are most likely to say there are no differences (44.2%), while 28.7% said it was worse, and 26.2% reported having a better quality of transportation.

Less than half of community members (41.2%) said jobs and work opportunities were worse for them compared to returnees. Nearly one fourth, 24.0% reported that it was better, and 34.1% said that job opportunities was about the same.

Host community respondents more frequently said that the safety and security of their family was about the same relative to returnees (42.6%), while 32.1% said that it was better, and 24.9% said that it was worse for them than returnees.

When asked about access to housing and land, host community respondents were more likely to say that it was about the same (38.2%), while 32.4% of respondents said it was better, and nearly one third (28.9%) said it was worse for them compared to returnees.

In addition, differences also exist in the level of happiness within host communities and returnees' households. As indicated by host community respondents, 39.4% reported that their happiness is about the same relative to returnees. A similar percentage reported there were no differences, and 39.0% indicated that they were happier than returnees, and fewer (21.1%) said they were unhappier than returnees.

GAPS IN PRESENT AND FUTURE RETURNEE NEEDS

The *Survey* asked host community respondents to opine if returnees should receive more or less support from government. A agreed the government should provide support in terms of food for returnees (72.6%), and over half indicated returnees should receive housing support (67.4%), money (66.9%), skills or jobs (65.6%), free land (62.3%) and livestock (58.8%).

Additionally, a majority (63.5%) indicated returnees need more help, while 18.4% of respondents said returnees require less help, and a small proportion said they should continue to receive the same amount (15.4%).

Over half of respondents said returnees should receive housing/land (52.6%), money (33.1%), food (31.4%), employment opportunities (25.2%), home appliances (8.4%), educational opportunities (6.2%), clothes (5.9%), and healthcare services (3.5%).

Respondents were also asked who should provide such support to returnees. A majority of respondents said the Afghan government (82.0%). A smaller proportion cited the UN (17.3%), internal/external organizations (11.0%), charities (10.2%), international communities (4.5%), IOM (4.8%), foreigners (4.8%), international aids (4.7%) and NGOs (2.6%).

Findings show host community respondents perceive there is inadequate sources of support for returnees. For example, 20.3% said the government is helping returnees, a decrease from 24.5% in 2018. About 19.0% said the UN/IOM is assisting returnees, a decrease from 26.1% in 2018. And 18.9% cited community members are helping returnees, also slightly lower than last year's 22.8%. A small proportion said that foreign NGOs (9.7%) and Afghan NGOs (8.5%) are assisting returnees.

The decreased perception of receiving support here is also reflected in *Survey* findings among returnees. Recent returnees are notably less likely to say they received any type of support than those who returned earlier (for instance, 45.3% of returnees in 2019, compared with 57.3% of those who returned in 2014 said they received support).

In another series of questions, host communities are asked to identify the specific types of support returnees are provided by each institution. Across all entities, the provision of food increased from 2018 to 2019, with the exception of the UN/IOM where there is a decrease from 25.3% to 20.8%. The largest increase is with the Afghan government with a 12-percentage point increase from 25.2% to 37.1% from 2018 to 2019.

INTEGRATION AND CONFLICT

To understand returnees' integration into host communities, the latter group were provided a list of activities and asked whether returnees had engaged in any of them. Returnees were more likely to attend the mosque (60.5%), weddings (48.1%), neighbors during holidays (47.1%), interacting with

individuals in the community (44.4%), and, engaging in community activities and events (40.6%). Compared to 2018, the largest increase is among host communities interacting with returnees in community activities and events, an increase from 37.1% in 2018 to 40.6% in 2019.

The *Survey* asks host communities if there are any reasons why a returnee cannot integrate into their community. Less than one fifth (17.2%) said there were reasons for why the returnees could not integrate. In a follow up question about those reasons, almost one third (31.4%) cited “cultural problems”. The second most common response was “linguistic problems” at 22.0%, and almost the same proportion said “unemployment”. Poverty is cited by 17.1% of respondents, and religious problems cited by 9.2% of respondents.

The *Survey* asked host communities respondents if they knew any returnee who had difficulty integrating into the community. Less than one fifth (17.0%) said they knew such returnees. They were further asked why they think the returnee(s) had a difficult time, to which the most common reasons were; differences in language (50.2%), differences in customs/cultures (37.5%), poverty (29.7%), differences in accents (28.9%), and religious sects (Mazhab) (23.8%).

Roughly one tenth (11.1%) of host community members said they or a family member experienced conflict or a dispute with returnees (marginally lower than 12.9% in 2018). Compared to 2018, experiences of conflict have increased in Kabul (4.2% to 6.2%) and Herat (14.3% to 15.9%), with prominent decreases in Nangarhar (11.3% to 7.3%) and Kandahar (24.7% to 17.6%).

Among those who reported a conflict or dispute, a majority (70.6%) reported the conflict or dispute was in the form of a verbal argument or confrontation, 16.0% said a physical fight or attack, and 13.0% said it was a property dispute.

Among those who reported a conflict or dispute with returnees, the *Survey* inquired about the cause of dispute. The responses varied; 26.6% said the dispute was due to immorality, vandalism (19.9%), intimidation (16.6%), and harassment (14.0%). While the causes of dispute were mostly consistent with 2018, there is a notable decrease among those who cite intimidation, from 24.7% in 2018 to 16.6% in 2019.

Of those who reported a conflict or dispute, respondents were more likely to say the issue occurred at home (39.0%), followed by in the street (18.7%), workplace (16.2%), market (15.3%), school (3.8%), government office (2.6%), and restaurant (2.5%).

ENDNOTES

1. One jerib is equal to 2000 square meters
2. Culture here is defined as social behaviour, way of life and mindset of host communities.



3. METHODS

The Asia Foundation's 2019 *Survey of the Afghan Returnees* (SAR) follows the inaugural 2018 survey that studies the needs and challenges, as well as the resources and opportunities, for those who have returned to Afghanistan from other countries within the past five years. The *Survey* also studies the attitudes of the host communities where returnees had settled upon their return, including conflict and cooperation between returnees and their host communities.

The [REDACTED] conducted fieldwork for this project, while independent third-party monitoring of the trainings and fieldwork was carried out by [REDACTED]. Altogether, the total sample interviewed was n=8,044, equally distributed across five provinces, Balkh, Herat, Kabul, Kandahar, and Nangarhar, to capture three points of comparison: two groups that had mostly returned from Pakistan, and a third group mostly from Iran.

The same sample size was used at each sampling point (Balkh, Herat, Kabul, Kandahar, and Nangarhar) for returnees and host community interviews. The overall sample consisted of nearly 50% female and 50% male respondents (weighted), each with a minimum age of 18. To determine respondents within households, the Kish grid was used. Respondents and interviewers were gender-matched (males interviewed males and females interviewed females).

Roughly half of participants (n=4,073) were returnees who had returned to Afghanistan from abroad within the last five years, and the other half (n=3,971) were members of host communities (defined as persons who had been living in Afghanistan continually longer than five years). A randomized sample of returnees was determined using a frame of settlements from the International Organization for Migration's (IOM) Baseline Mobility Assessment Settlement Data (2019).

In 2018, two different questionnaires were developed, one for the returnee sample and one for the host community sample. This questionnaire was modified with a small number of changes in 2019. Within each sampling point, an interviewer would conduct five interviews with returnees using the returnee questionnaire, while another interviewer would start from a different location within the same settlement and conduct five interviews with host community members using the host community member questionnaire. Thus, a total of 10 interviews were conducted in each sampling point.

The sample design, field implementation, quality control, questionnaire design, and overall field experience are summarized briefly in this methodology section. Some highlights are presented below.

1. *The Survey of the Afghan Returnees* includes a sample of 8,044 men and women above 18 years of age residing in urban and rural areas of five provinces of Afghanistan: Balkh, Kabul, Herat, Kandahar, and Nangarhar provinces. Of these, 4,073 were returnees who had returned to Afghanistan from abroad within the last five years, while 3,971 were members of host

communities (those communities to which the returnees had returned).

2. The sample was disproportionately stratified by province so that each province had an equal share of interviews. This was done to maximize power to make comparisons between provinces. Because the frame used for this survey was not stratified by urbanicity, urban/rural designations were added in after the sample was drawn.
3. Considering the survey design with disproportionate stratification, the complex design and weighting should be taken into account when determining the Margin of Error (MOE). For the returnee sample, the estimated design effect is 2.3. Using this estimate of a design effect, the complex margin of error at the 95% C.I. with $p=.5$ is $\pm 2.33\%$. For the host community sample, the estimated design effect is 2.1. Using this estimate of a design effect, the complex margin of error at the 95% C.I. with $p=.5$ is $\pm 2.23\%$.
4. Disposition outcomes for all interviews were tracked using the American Association for Public Opinion Research's (AAPOR) standard codes, which have been adapted to the Afghan context. For the returnee sample, the response rate 3 is 74.57%, the cooperation rate 3 is 89.12%, the refusal rate 2 is 7.10%, and the contact rate 2 is 84.60%. For the host community sample, the response rate 3 is 77.68%, the cooperation rate 3 is 90.93%, the refusal rate 2 is 5.83%, and the contact rate 2 is 82.85%.
5. There were some provinces where security, transportation and other events impacted field work. These events are described in detail in this report. These types of events are common in Afghanistan, and safety of field teams is always a primary concern.
6. Fieldwork was conducted from October 30 – November 13, 2019. The field team consisted of 312 trained interviewers and 5 supervisors.
7. Several quality control procedures were employed throughout the project:
 - a. During fieldwork, interviewers were observed by supervisors or independent third-party validators. Supervisors and third-party validators also conducted back-checks of interviews. In total, 37% of interviews were subject to some form of back-check or quality control.
 - b. During the data entry phase, approximately 20% of interviews conducted underwent double data entry to reduce the number of discrepancies. During data entry, 13 interviews from the returnee sample were rejected due to missing or misprinted pages.
 - c. Finally, during the data cleaning phase, D3's (██████████'s parent company) *Valkyrie* program was used to search for patterns or anomalies in the data that may indicate an interview was not properly conducted by an interviewer. For the returnee survey, 48 cases were deleted from the data set for having over 95% similarities in responses to another interview (i.e., failing the duplicates test). For the host community survey, 5 cases were deleted for

having high overall similarity to other cases done by the same interviewer (i.e., failing the equality test), and 73 cases were deleted from the data set for having over 95% similarities in responses to another interview (i.e., failing the duplicates test). No cases were deleted for failing the non-response test (over 40% “don’t know” or “refused”).

- d. A further 66 cases from the returnee data set were deleted and 151 cases from the host community data set were deleted through client logic checks. A total of 127 cases from the returnee data and 229 from the host community data were deleted at all stages of cleaning and quality control.
8. Interviewers collected GPS coordinates for 821 out of 840 sampling points (98%) in all 5 provinces where the survey was fielded as a means of verification that fieldwork had been conducted at the correct locations specified in the sampling plan. These were compared to GPS coordinates for selected villages drawn from the IOM list, where available.
9. Two different versions of the questionnaire, one for returnees and one for host community members, developed in 2018, were slightly modified in 2019. The two versions of the *Survey* share common management and demographic sections, but different substantive questions, owing to the different populations being interviewed (returnees and host community members).

The questionnaires address experiences of returnees before and after returning to Afghanistan, skills learned abroad, reasons for returning, impact on communities upon return, and conflicts and cooperation between returnees and host communities. Both versions of the questionnaire included 29 management questions. The returnee questionnaire contained four screener questions for respondent selection, 93 substantive questions, and 23 demographics questions while the host community questionnaire contained 3 screener questions, 71 substantive questions, and 22 demographics questions. However, both questionnaires contained extensive filtering, so no respondent was asked all questions in either questionnaire.

10. Interviews with the returnee sample ranged from 20 to 65 minutes with the average interview taking 38 minutes. Interviews with the host sample ranged from 20 to 65 minutes with the average interview time of 36 minutes.

A more comprehensive reporting of the *Survey* methods, including sample design, field implementation, quality control, questionnaire design, and overall field experience, is offered in *Appendix 1: Methodology*.



4. FINDINGS

4.1 AFGHAN RETURNEES

RETURNEE PERCEPTIONS AND EXPERIENCES

In this second wave of the survey, *Survey of the Afghan Returnees* interviewed 4,073 returnees (52.9% males and 47.1% females, weighted to 50:50) who were above the age of 18 years. Covering five provinces, the sample is comprised of interviews conducted in Kabul (20.0%), Nangarhar (20.0%), Herat (20.0%), Kandahar (20.0%), and Balkh (20.0%). Overall, 73.0% of respondents were interviewed in rural areas while 27.0% in urban areas.

The analysis in this chapter covers the challenges returnees have faced since returning to Afghanistan, education or skills they acquired while abroad, pull and push factors for their return to the country, the economic situation of returnee households, and the social challenges faced while re-integrating into host communities in Afghanistan.

PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS, BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE

	RURAL	URBAN
	%	%
KABUL	64	36
NANGARHAR	90	10
BALKH	77	23
HERAT	62	38
KANDAHAR	71	29

Fig 1. M-3. Province. M-4b. CSO geographic code.

More than half of returnees surveyed returned to Afghanistan from Pakistan (58.9%), followed by Iran (33.9%), and Turkey (2.9%). In 2018, the proportion of returnees were 53.8% from Pakistan, 36.2% from Iran, and 4.1% from Turkey. There are variations across provinces in this regard, with a majority of returnees in Kabul, Nangarhar, and Kandahar (70.8%, 95.6%, and 75.7% respectively) returning from Pakistan, while those in Herat and Balkh (72.1%, and 48.4% respectively) had returned from Iran.

COUNTRY RETURNED FROM, BY PROVINCE

	PAKISTAN	IRAN	TURKEY	OTHER
	%	%	%	%
KABUL	71	27	1	1
NANGARHAR	96	3	0	1
BALKH	36	48	7	9
HERAT	16	72	5	6
KANDAHAR	76	19	1	5

Fig 2. M-3. Province. Q-1a. *In which countries have you lived outside of Afghanistan at any time during the past 26 years? For reference, 26 years ago was the fall of Dr. Najibullah’s government and the start of mujahedeen government. If you left Afghanistan before then but remained living abroad during any portion of that time, please count it.*

1. REASONS FOR RETURN TO AFGHANISTAN

KEY QUESTIONS

Q-1a. *In which countries have you lived outside of Afghanistan at any time during the past 26 years? For reference, 26 years ago was the fall of Dr. Najibullah’s government and the start of mujahedeen government. If you left Afghanistan before then but remained living abroad during any portion of that time, please count it.*

Q2c. *Why did you return?*

According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the most prevalent reasons for returning (voluntarily) to Afghanistan are varied and include the high cost of living/high rent in the host country, lack of employment opportunities, strict border entry control resulting in separation of families, fear of arrest/deportation, and uncertainty related to refugee documentation in the host country (mostly Pakistan and Iran)¹. The *Survey* asked returnees for the reasons prompting their return to Afghanistan. The most frequently cited reasons are unemployment in the host country (32.3%), deportation / forced removal (30.9%), and family reunification (20.0%). Compared to 2018, there are some variations in reasons with deportation / forced removal (37.1%) as the most common, followed by unemployment in the host country (34.0%), family reunification (24.4%), and 23.6% cited that “people of the host country were unwelcoming.”

REASONS FOR RETURN TO AFGHANISTAN




Fig 3. Q2c. Why did you return? Allow up to two responses.

Reasons also vary based on the former host country. Those returning from Pakistan or Turkey were more likely to say they were deported or forcibly removed (33.8%, and 33.1% respectively), and due to unemployment in the host country (30.3% and 29.6% respectively). Those returning from Iran more frequently cited unemployment in the host country (36.8%), and being deported (25.2%). Returnees from Pakistan more frequently mentioned poor security in the host country (13.3%), approximately two times higher than returnees returning from Iran (6.7%).

Compared to 2018, the reasons mentioned by returnees for coming back to Afghanistan were: deportation (Pakistan: 43.1%, and Iran 29.7%), and unemployment in the host country (Pakistan: 31.6%, and Iran: 39.4%). Interestingly, in 2019, 16.6% respondents said they love their country (as a reason for their return), compared to only 0.4% in 2018. This increment can be seen across all provinces and strata. Further qualitative research exploring the increase in patriotism as a reason for return could help shed light on this phenomenon.

2. SETTLEMENT CHOICE AND DECISION MAKING

KEY QUESTIONS

- Q-3.** *After returning, did you live in any other place inside Afghanistan for more than 3 months, before living in your current place of residence?*
- Q-6.** *Why did you decide to move to the place you are living now instead of some other place in Afghanistan?*
- Q-7.** *Over the next year, do you plan to settle here in your current district or city, or do you want to move somewhere else?*
- Q-8.** *(Ask if Q-7 is “move elsewhere”) You mentioned you want to move elsewhere. Where do you want to move?*
- Q-9.** *(Ask if Q-7 is “move elsewhere”) Why do you want to move there?*

A large number of returnees have been compelled to return home in 2019 not only following pressure in neighboring Iran and Pakistan, but also because of lower asylum acceptance rates for Afghan refugees internationally.² This subsequently has increased the proportion of those who had become secondarily displaced after returning to Afghanistan (72% reported their families having been displaced twice and almost a third were displaced three times).³ Lack of access to land, essential services, job opportunities, and violent conflicts are often cited as the reasons why returnees become displaced internally.⁴ Another study indicates that a majority of returnees (79.0%) choose their home province for settlement due to proximity to family and friends, shelter, safety, and employment opportunities. For those who settle in areas other than their home provinces, the reasons were found to be insecurity and lack of employment opportunities in those provinces.⁵

When asked whether returnees have lived in another place in Afghanistan since returning from abroad, 11.6% of the responses answered affirmatively. A subsequent question asked returnees why they have moved to their current location, the most frequent answers were “staying/living with family” (30.6%), and “to be around people of the same ethnicity” (17.2%). A lower number of returnees mentioned “because it is my own land/house” (10.8%), “better job opportunities here” (10.4%), “better security here” (8.5%), and “better services available here” (7.9%).

A related question asks returnees whether they are going to stay in their current location or have resettle elsewhere within Afghanistan. An overwhelming majority, 94.1%, indicated they planned to settle in their current place, while only 5.0% said they planned to move elsewhere within Afghanistan. The top cited reasons for relocating were; better employment opportunities (52.8%), better security situation (30.8%), and better standard of living (29.3%), educational opportunities (17.2%), and better environmental conditions (16.1%). In addition, returnees were asked if they had plan to leave alone or with their family, to which 15.3% answered alone, and 78.0% said they will leave with their family.

By province, returnees in Herat were more likely to want to move elsewhere (8.2%), compared to those in Kandahar (6.8%), Kabul (4.6%), Balkh (3.1%), and Nangarhar (2.4%). By strata within province, returnees in rural Herat are more willing to move elsewhere (9.0%) than their urban counterparts (6.7%).

SETTLEMENT DECISION, BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE AND YEAR

		2018	2019
		%	%
RURAL	KABUL	4	5
	NANGARHAR	5	2
	BALKH	5	3
	HERAT	14	9
	KANDAHAR	8	7
URBAN	KABUL	6	4
	NANGARHAR	8	2
	BALKH	5	5
	HERAT	6	7
	KANDAHAR	8	6

Fig 4. Q-7. Over the next year, do you plan to settle here in your current district or city, or do you want to move somewhere else? (Percent who say move elsewhere). **M-3.** Province. **M-4b.** CSO geographic code.

In Nangarhar, more respondents said they planned to move elsewhere in search of better employment opportunities (74.8%), compared to Balkh where fewer, 43.8%, indicated this was their intention. However, in Kandahar and Balkh returnees were more likely to indicate moving elsewhere because of improved security situation (38.5%, and 33.8% respectively), while in Kabul returnees mostly mentioned improved employment opportunities (47.2%), and standard of living (42.1%).

REASONS FOR RESETTLING, BY PROVINCE




Fig 5. Q-9. (Ask if Q-7 is “move elsewhere”) Why do you want to move there? (Percent who say better employment opportunities, better security situation, and better standard of living). **M-3.** Province.

Of those who reported they want to move elsewhere, 71.4% said they want to resettle within Afghanistan while 13.3% said they wanted to resettle in another country. Those who want to move to another country were more likely to mention better employment opportunities (79.3%) than those who planned to resettle within Afghanistan (50.1%).

Among those who want to resettle within Afghanistan, the most frequently cited reasons for relocating are educational purposes (21.2%), and better environmental conditions (17.2%). This is strikingly higher than among those who want to resettle in another country, where only 4.6% say for educational purposes, and 11.5% cite better environmental conditions. Consistent with these findings, an IOM study shows that lack of job opportunities, and insecurity are among the main push factors for migration.⁶

REASONS FOR RESETTLEMENT, WITHIN AND OUTSIDE OF AFGHANISTAN




Fig 6. Q-8. (Ask if Q-7 is “move elsewhere”) You mentioned you want to move elsewhere. Where do you want to move? **Q-9.** (Ask if Q-7 is “move elsewhere”) Why do you want to move there?

This year the level of optimism among returnees concerning their future has increased. More than one third (39.9%) of respondents believe their family’s living conditions would improve if they continued to stay at their present settlement, compared to 33.9% in 2018. The major reasons include: better security (2019: 56.6%, 2018: 43.0%), improvement in education (2019: 22.4%, 2018: 9.1%), more awareness of reconstruction (2019: 37.1%, 2018: 11.7%), and patriotism (2019: 13.7%, 2018: 6.5%).

Respondents in Kandahar and Nangarhar are more likely to mention better security (65.7% and 63.7% respectively), awareness of reconstruction (44.2%), or economic development (18.7%), than returnees in other provinces.

However, 30.8% believe that the living condition for their households would deteriorate in the future, lower than the 39.0% of respondents in 2018 who cited the same. Major reasons for pessimism are; unemployment (49.2%), insecurity (30.4%), poor economy (26.3%), weak government (21.6%), and high cost of living (16.1% asserted “everything is too expensive”).

REASONS FOR IMPROVEMENT IN LIVING CONDITIONS, BY PROVINCE

	KABUL	NANGARHAR	BALKH	HERAT	KANDAHAR	OVERALL
	%	%	%	%	%	%
SECURITY IS BETTER NOW	41	64	52	53	66	57
RECONSTRUCTION HAS TAKEN PLACE	40	44	42	34	28	37
DON'T KNOW	33	9	15	29	54	30
EDUCATION IS BEING IMPROVED	18	25	37	24	15	22
BECAUSE THERE IS PATRIOTISM	14	21	16	11	7	14
THE ECONOMY IS BEING IMPROVED	13	19	14	12	9	13
EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES ARE BETTER	16	9	11	22	6	12
THE LIVING CONDITION OF PEOPLE HAS IMPROVED.	20	9	12	12	6	11

Fig 7. Q-47a. *In general, in the future, if you continue to stay in your present location, do you feel your living conditions for your family would improve, deteriorate, or remain the same? Q-47b.* *Why do you say that? (Allow up to two responses).* **M-3.** Province.

Compared to 2018, differences emerge in 2019 as better security is more frequently mentioned by returnees this year (43.0% in 2018 compared to 56.6% in 2019). Other notable differences compared to last year include; awareness of reconstruction (2018: 11.7%, and 2019: 37.1%), and improvement in education (2018: 9.1%, and 2019: 22.4%). Returnees citing better employment opportunities has significantly decreased from 26.3% in 2018 to 11.6% in 2019.

REASONS FOR IMPROVEMENT IN LIVING CONDITION, BY YEAR

	2018	2019
	%	%
SECURITY IS BETTER NOW	43	57
DON'T KNOW	46	30
RECONSTRUCTION HAS TAKEN PLACE	12	37
EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES ARE BETTER	26	12
EDUCATION IS BEING IMPROVED	9	22
THE ECONOMY IS BEING IMPROVED	11	13

BECAUSE THERE IS PATRIOTISM	6	14
THE LIVING CONDITION OF PEOPLE HAS IMPROVED.	6	11
THERE IS BROTHERHOOD AMONG THE PEOPLE	4	0
PRESENCE OF FAIR GOVERNMENT	4	0
BECAUSE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY'S AID	3	0
MORE EXPECTATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT	3	0
AGRICULTURE IS IMPROVING	2	0
ELECTRICITY IS BETTER NOW	2	0
DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS ARE BEING IMPLEMENTED.	2	0
FREE OF CORRUPTION	2	0
REFUSED	1	1
PRESENCE OF GOOD NEIGHBORS	2	0
IMPROVEMENT OF CLEAN WATER	1	0
PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS ARE BEING HELD	1	0

Fig 8. Q-47a. *In general, in the future, if you continue to stay in your present location, do you feel your living conditions for your family would improve, deteriorate, or remain the same? Q-47b. Why do you say that? (Allow up to two responses).*

Returnees who reported feeling unsafe in their neighborhood were more likely to want to move elsewhere (10.8%) than those who felt safe (4.4%), or those who experienced a conflict since their return to Afghanistan. More than one tenth, 11.6% of respondents said they would move elsewhere compared to those who didn't report any case of conflict or violence with community (4.1%). Those who had lived somewhere else since their return were approximately five times more likely to want to resettle elsewhere, 14.7%, compared to only 3.7% of those who had lived in their current location since returning to Afghanistan.

3. EDUCATION/SKILLS ACQUIRED WHILE ABROAD

KEY QUESTIONS

Q-15a. *Have you received any formal education while abroad?*

Q-15b. *(Ask if yes at Q-15a) Which levels of education you received did you receive while abroad?*

Q-16. *Have you learned any new skills or learned a profession while abroad?*

Q-17. *(Ask if yes Q-16) What were the two most valuable skills you learned while abroad?*

Q-18. *(Ask if offered response in Q-17) How useful do you feel this skill was for finding a new job when you returned back to Afghanistan?*

Currently there are one million Afghan refugees in Iran, and 1.4 million in Pakistan, the majority of which were born in the host countries and have never been to Afghanistan.⁷ In addition to registered refugees, it is estimated that there are one and a half to two million undocumented Afghans in Iran and one million in Pakistan. Although many of these refugees would be eligible for international protection pursuant to the 1951 UN Convention on Refugees, they are unable to receive or maintain refugee status in the host countries.⁸ There is a lack of comprehensive data and information about Afghan refugees in both Iran and Pakistan, particularly regarding access to education at the primary, secondary and tertiary levels. Available data indicates an increase in school enrollment for Afghan refugees in Iran over the last three decades (420,000 in 2018 compared to 113,000 in 1998, and 90,000 in 1992 enrolled in government schools).⁹

According to studies in Pakistan, net primary enrollment was 39% for refugee males, and 18% for refugee females (overall 29%) in 2011 and 2012, far below the national average of 77% for males and 67% for females.¹⁰ Subsequent surveys found the enrollment figures among refugee children to be 26% in 2016 and 22% 2017. Fee restrictions prevent some refugee families from sending their children to schools in host countries. However, little information exists on secondary school attainment and higher levels of education.¹¹ Refugees lack of access to quality education have implications on their living conditions in their country of asylum, with long-term effects on their safe return and reintegration to Afghanistan.

When asked whether they received any formal education while abroad, 13.2% of *Survey* participants responded positively, while 86.8% reported they did not receive any formal education abroad. Single respondents were more likely to have acquired some formal education abroad (26.6%), compared to married (11.0%) or widowed/widower (7.5%) respondents.

A higher percentage of males (16.3%) acquired a formal education abroad, than females (9.7%).

Younger returnees were more likely than older respondents to have obtained a formal education abroad

(age categories 18–25 years: 19.9%, 26–35: 12.4%, 36–45: 11.0%, 46–55: 7.1%, Over 55: 6.9%). And, rural respondents were less likely than urban respondents to have obtained a formal education while abroad (12.3% compared to 15.5%).

EDUCATION RECEIVED ABROAD, BY DEMOGRAPHICS




Fig 9. Q-15a. Have you received any formal education while abroad? (Percent who say yes). **D-1.** Gender. **D-2.** How old are you? **D-3.** What is your marital status? Are you married or single?

The findings vary across the provinces: 18.3% of returnees in Nangarhar obtained a formal education abroad, while this proportion decreased to 6.4% in Balkh.

Among urbanites, returnees in Kandahar were most likely to have obtained a formal education abroad (22.4%) than urbanites in Herat and Balkh (10.4% each).

EDUCATION RECEIVED ABROAD, BY PROVINCE AND STRATA




Fig 10. Q-15a. Have you received any formal education while abroad? (Percent who say yes). **M-3.** Province. **M-4b.** CSO geographic code.

When considering levels of education obtained abroad, lower secondary education (38.1%) was most frequently cited. Elementary school (28.1%) and upper secondary high school (24.3%) were mentioned as the next most frequent responses. A smaller percentage, 4.6% of respondents, reported obtaining a university/bachelor's degree while abroad.

Another related question asked whether respondents learned any skills abroad, to which 28.1% of responses were positive. The number reporting this was highest amongst those who lived in Iran (31.8%) than those who lived in Pakistan (25.8%). In contrast, those who lived in Pakistan were more likely to have obtained a formal education, when compared against those who lived in Iran (15.0% compared to 10.3%).

SKILL OR EDUCATION ACQUIRED ABROAD, BY COUNTRY




Fig 11. Q-15a. *Have you received any formal education while abroad? (Percent who say yes). Q-1a. In which countries have you lived outside of Afghanistan at any time during the past 26 years? For reference, 26 years ago was the fall of Dr. Najibullah’s government and the start of mujahedeen government. If you left Afghanistan before then but remained living abroad during any portion of that time, please count it.*

When asked what useful skills they had acquired while abroad, 29.2% mentioned tailoring, 22.9% embroidery/handicrafts, and 14.3% masonry. Women were more likely to mention tailoring (49.0%), and embroidery/handicrafts (44.3%) than men (15.3% tailoring, and 7.9% handicrafts). On the other hand, men were more likely to say they learned masonry (21.8%), carpentry (11.8%), steel work (8.8%), and driving skills (8.5%) than women.

TYPE OF SKILLS ACQUIRED ABROAD, BY GENDER




Fig 12. Q-17. (Ask if yes in Q-16) What were the two most valuable skills you learned while abroad? D-1. Gender.

Returnees who lived in Pakistan were more likely to say tailoring (35.0%) than those who lived in Iran (22.2%), while returnees who lived in Iran more frequently mentioned masonry (22.3%) than those who lived in Pakistan (9.0%).

TYPE OF SKILLS ACQUIRED ABROAD, BY COUNTRY

	PAKISTAN	IRAN
	%	%
DON'T KNOW	79	75
TAILORING	35	22
EMBROIDERY/ HANDICRAFTS	27	19
MASON	9	22
CARPENTRY	6	9
STEEL WORKER	3	8
DRIVING SKILLS	5	4
MECHANIC	7	3

PAINTING	4	5
TILE LAYING	2	6
SHOP-KEEPING	4	2
ELECTRICITY	2	3
COOKING	2	3
PLUMBING	2	3
LINGUISTICS/LANGUAGE	2	1

Fig 13. Q-17. (Ask if yes in Q-16) What were the two most valuable skills you learned while abroad?
Q-1a. In which countries have you lived outside of Afghanistan at any time during the past 26 years? For reference, 26 years ago was the fall of Dr. Najibullah’s government and the start of mujahedeen government. If you left Afghanistan before then but remained living abroad during any portion of that time, please count it.

4. SERVICES

KEY QUESTIONS

- Q-19.** Thinking about when you last returned to Afghanistan, have you received the following types of support from any entity or organization: a) Your housing b) Food c) Employment/ Jobs d) Health care e) Cash and/or loans f) Training g) Other help such as clothes, kitchen materials, etc.
- Q-20.** (Ask if yes in Q-19) Who provided support to your family?
- Q-25.** Have you approached anyone in the government to ask for help with anything?
- Q-26.** (Ask if yes in Q-25) Which government offices/departments/ministries did you approach?
- Q-27.** (Ask if yes in Q-25) What were the issues you raised?
- Q-28.** (Ask if yes in Q-25) Did you have to give money, a gift or perform a favor while in that office?
- Q-29.** (Ask if yes in Q-25) Overall, did you receive the support you sought?
- Q-31.** Have you approached anyone in your neighborhood to ask for help on any issue?
- Q-32.** (Ask if yes in Q-31) What did you ask for from your neighbor?
- Q-33.** (Ask if yes in Q-31) Did you receive the help you asked for?
- Q-48.** When you returned to Afghanistan, did you register with any organization?
- Q-49.** (Ask if yes in Q-48) Which organization did you register with?

Various national and international NGOs, local entities, and communities provide assistance to returnees in Afghanistan. IOM is among the main assistance providers for voluntary return to Afghanistan, and in 2019 alone, IOM provided assistance to over 50,800 of among 496,500 returnees.¹² The UNHCR is also engaged in assisting returnees. Their reintegration support to host communities includes expansion of community infrastructure, such as building schools, clinics, youth and women’s centers, job creation and business development.¹³ Although there are minimal public social welfare services available in Afghanistan, the government does provide some support to returnees in the form of legal aid, job placement, land and shelter. However, there are no specialized organizations or well-developed support systems to assist returnees wishing to enter the job market. For the most part, returnees and vulnerable people need to rely on their own initiatives when looking for employment opportunities.¹⁴ According to one study, returnees are largely unaware of their rights, and pathway to claiming them.¹⁵ The same research in Nangarhar documented that returnees, even months after their return, remained “involuntarily immobile”, failing to navigate essential services beyond their immediate vicinity. According to the research, lack of access to information and necessary networks (community-wide or job related) hinders returnees’ ability to benefit from the resources of the city.¹⁶

The *Survey* asked participants about services received when returning to Afghanistan. Approximately 35.9% said they received food, followed by 27.3% who said cash/loan, 18.3% housing and healthcare, 15.0% employment/job, 14.4% other services such as clothes or kitchen materials, and 3.2% training. Overall, the proportion of respondents who received services in 2019 is lower than in 2018.




Fig 14. Q-19. Thinking about when you last returned to Afghanistan, have you received the following types of support from any entity or organization: a) Your housing. b) Food. c) Employment/ Jobs. d) Health care. e) Cash and/or loans. f) Training. g) Other help such as clothes, kitchen materials, etc.

Returnees in Kabul were more likely to have received cash/loan (32.8%), and in Kandahar they were more likely to mention food (59.6%). In Herat, other services such as clothes and kitchen material (25.7%), and in Balkh, returnees more often cited food (28.1%).

SUPPORT RECEIVED, BY PROVINCE

	KABUL	NANGARHAR	BALKH	HERAT	KANDAHAR
	%	%	%	%	%
HOUSING	10	21	14	10	37
FOOD	19	50	28	23	60
EMPLOYMENT/JOB	8	20	9	12	27
HEALTHCARE	14	28	4	8	38
CASH/LOAN	33	36	18	22	28
TRAINING	3	3	1	3	6
OTHER CLOTHES, KITCHEN MATERIALS	8	9	9	26	21

Fig 15. Q-19. Thinking about when you last returned to Afghanistan, have you received the following types of support from any entity or organization: a) Your housing. b) Food. c) Employment/ Jobs. d) Health care. e) Cash and/or loans. f) Training. g) Other help such as clothes, kitchen materials, etc. **M-3.** Province.

Rural respondents were more likely to mention receiving food assistance than urban returnees (37.7% versus 30.9%), while the latter more frequently mention job/employment assistance than the former (18.2% versus 13.8%). Married respondents were slightly more likely to mention having received food (36.3%) than single respondents (33.2%), while they both mentioned receiving training the least frequently (3.2% married, 2.5% single returnees).

SUPPORT RECEIVED, BY MARITAL STATUS

	SINGLE	MARRIED
	%	%
HOUSING	20	18
FOOD	33	36

EMPLOYMENT/JOB	16	15
HEALTH CARE	21	18
CASH/LOAN	31	27
TRAINING	3	3
OTHER HELP SUCH AS CLOTHES AND KITCHEN MATERIAL	13	15

Fig 16. Q-19. Thinking about when you last returned to Afghanistan, have you received the following types of support from any entity or organization: a) Your housing. b) Food. c) Employment/ Jobs. d) Health care. e) Cash and/or loans. f) Training. g) Other help such as clothes, kitchen materials, etc. **D-3.** What is your marital status? Are you married or single?

In a follow-up question, respondents were asked to identify the entity providing the named services. The government is most frequently mentioned as providing health care services (37.7%), while NGOs and UN agencies are most often reported to have provided training and cash/loan (70.1%, and 41.8% respectively), while family is most often cited for providing housing (33.9%), and neighbors for food (34.6%).

SUPPORT RECEIVED WHEN RETURNING TO AFGHANISTAN, BY PROVIDER




Fig 17. Q-19. Thinking about when you last returned to Afghanistan, have you received the following types of support from any entity or organization: a) Your housing. b) Food. c) Employment/ Jobs. d) Health care. e) Cash and/or loans. f) Training. g) Other help such as clothes, kitchen materials, etc. **Q-20.** (Ask if code yes in Q-19) Who provided support to your family?

Respondents were also asked whether they approached anyone in the government or their neighborhood for assistance. Findings indicate one fifth of returnees have approached the government for assistance (20.2%), and two fifths approached neighbors for assistance (41.3%). These results are broadly similar to those documented in the 2018 *Survey* (government: 21.5%, and neighbors: 44.5%).

SEEKING SUPPORT FROM GOVERNMENT OR NEIGHBORHOOD, BY YEAR




Fig 18. Q-25. *Have you approached anyone in the government to ask for help with anything? (percent who say yes).*

Furthermore, returnees were asked whom they approached in the government, to which, by some distance, the most frequently mentioned source was the Refugee Directorate (66.9%). The Ministry of Education (5.0%) and Provincial Government Office (4.7%) were the next most frequently reported.

GOVERNMENT OFFICES APPROACHED FOR ASSISTANCE




Fig 19. Q-26. (Ask if yes in Q-25) Which government offices/departments/ministries did you approach?

Respondents in Kandahar were most likely to approach the government for assistance (26.0%), whereas those in Balkh were least likely to do so (10.0%). Rural respondents (21.1%) are somewhat more likely to say they approached the government for assistance than urban respondents (17.9%) .

Interestingly, by strata within province, notable differences emerge: returnees in rural Herat were most likely to approach the government for assistance (30.6%), while returnees in rural Balkh were least likely to do so (8.9%). These differences between approaching government for help could be attributed to the disproportionate inflow of returnees with Herat and Kandahar receiving far more returnees than in Balkh,¹⁷ and thus potentially accounting for the delivery of government awareness and service delivery scales between Herat and Balkh.

And among urban returnees, those in Kandahar were most likely to approach government while returnees in urban Herat were least likely to approach the government for assistance (30.7% vs. 7.9% respectively).

APPROACHED GOVERNMENT FOR ASSISTANCE, BY PROVINCE AND STRATA




Fig 20. Q-25. *Have you approached anyone in the government to ask for help with anything? (Percent who say yes).* **M-3.** Province. **M-4b.** CSO geographic code.

Approaching neighbors for any assistance was more commonly reported among rural Kandahar returnees (50.3%) compared to rural Balkh returnees (32.4%). Among urban returnees, this was highest in Nangarhar (60.0%) and lowest in Herat (29.3%).

APPROACHED ANYONE IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD FOR ASSISTANCE, BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE




Fig 21. Q-31. Have you approached anyone in your neighborhood to ask for help on any issue? (percent who say yes). **M-3.** Province. **M-4b.** CSO geographic code.

Findings indicate that the returnees who approached any government offices for help, mostly did so for support in seeking housing and land (41.2%), food (19.0%) and economic opportunities (12.4%). Those approaching neighbors did so for obtaining a loan (35.7%), money/cash (34.3%), food (41.9%), employment (16.5%) and assistance in repairing their home (19.9%). A small percentage, (3.6%), approached neighbors for dispute resolution.

Survey respondents who approached government offices were also asked whether they had experienced corruption. More than three quarters (76.4%) said they had not encountered corruption, while 13.2% had. More returnees in Herat said they experienced corruption (16.1%) than those in Kabul (7.2%).

GIVING MONEY/GIFT TO RECEIVE SUPPORT FROM GOVERNMENT, BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE

	KABUL	NANGARHAR	BALKH	HERAT	KANDAHAR
	%	%	%	%	%
RURAL	9	14	11	18	14
URBAN	4	24	10	4	17
OVERALL	7	14	10	16	15

Fig 22. Q-28. (Ask if yes in Q-25) Did you have to give money, a gift or perform a favor while in that office? **M-3.** Province. **M-4b.** CSO geographic code.

5. ECONOMIC SITUATION

KEY QUESTIONS

- Q-11i.** Do female members of the family contribute to this household's income, or not?
- Q-13.** How did you finance your trip back to Afghanistan?
- Q-14.** Did you have any savings when you returned to Afghanistan?
- Q-45.** Since you moved back to Afghanistan, have the following services gotten better, gotten worse, or is there no difference for your household? a. Household financial situation. a) Jobs and work opportunities.
- D-11.** How many children in your household were old enough to attend school while abroad?
How many are boys and how many girls?
- D-12.** (Ask if greater than 0 in D-11) How many of them attended primary school while abroad?
- D-13.** (Ask if greater than 0 in D-11) How many of them attended secondary school while abroad?
- D-14.** (Ask if greater than 0 in D-11) How many of them attended high school while abroad?
- D-15.** (Ask if codes 1 or 2 in any of D-12, D-13, or D-14) Why didn't they go to school?
- D-16.** As of right now, how many children in your household are old enough to attend school?
How many are boys and how many girls?
- D-17.** (Ask if greater than 0 in D-16) How many of them attend or have completed primary school?
- D-18.** (Ask if greater than 0 in D-16) How many of them attended or have completed secondary school?
- D-19.** (Ask if greater than 0 in D-16) How many of them attend high school?
- D-20.** (Ask if codes 1 or 2 in any of D-12, D-13, or D-14) Why didn't they go to school?

In the context of already high poverty rates and decreasing employment opportunities, there is undoubtedly little capacity for Afghanistan to absorb the large influx of returnees. Many returnee households live below the poverty line (poverty line is estimated to be USD 1 per person per day) as do many host populations.¹⁸ Most post-2013 returnees live in households in which the breadwinners have very low education levels, and only a quarter have completed more than 6 years of formal education.¹⁹ This is reflected in the types of jobs returnees are engaged with-- they are more likely to work as daily wage laborers, which inherently results in increased economic vulnerability trends. Most returnees rely on networks (family, friends, or neighbors) or themselves to find jobs, and less than 2% use formal channels to do so.²⁰ Labor markets in provincial capitals, where many returnees live, are competitive and closed to outsiders, as most hiring is done through family and friends, and only 4% of jobs are publicly announced.²¹

Regarding the economic situation of returnee households, respondents were asked whether the financial situation of their households has gotten better or worse compared to their situation before returning to Afghanistan. Less than half (40.9%) said it had worsened, 31.1% said it had gotten better, and 27.9% reported no difference. The proportion who said it has worsened was highest in urban Kabul (61.2%) and lowest in rural Herat (19.3%).

FINANCIAL SITUATION OF HOUSEHOLDS, BY PROVINCE AND STRATA

		BETTER	WORSE	NO DIFFERENCE
		%	%	%
RURAL	KABUL	22	56	21
	NANGARHAR	30	39	31
	BALKH	16	44	40
	HERAT	62	19	19
	KANDAHAR	36	41	23
URBAN	KABUL	21	61	18
	NANGARHAR	41	35	24
	BALKH	23	38	39
	HERAT	16	44	40
	KANDAHAR	49	28	23

Fig 23. Q-45. *Since you moved back to Afghanistan, have the following services gotten better, gotten worse, or is there no difference for your household? a) Household financial situation. M-3. Province. M-4b. CSO geographic code.*

In response to a related question, returnees were asked about jobs and work opportunities for their household. More than half of respondents (54.1%) said employment opportunities have gotten worse, while 21.5% said the situation had improved. Returnees in rural Kabul were most likely to respond that the situation has gotten worse (74.7%), while this figure was lowest amongst respondents in urban Kandahar (34.5%).

EMPLOYMENT SITUATION OF HOUSEHOLDS, BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE

		BETTER	WORSE	NO DIFFERENCE
		%	%	%
RURAL	KABUL	12	75	13
	NANGARHAR	17	48	34
	BALKH	11	62	27
	HERAT	40	41	19
	KANDAHAR	34	38	28
URBAN	KABUL	15	72	12
	NANGARHAR	20	54	25
	BALKH	16	62	22
	HERAT	14	62	25
	KANDAHAR	36	35	30

Fig 24. Q-45. *Since you moved back to Afghanistan, have the following services gotten better, gotten worse, or is there no difference for your household? b) Jobs and work opportunities.*

When considering where returnees were returning from, respondents from Iran were more likely to say employment opportunities have gotten worse (57.1%) than those returning from Pakistan (52.1%). While the *Survey* does not explore the market demand for returnees' specific skills, the data does show that returnees from Iran are significantly less likely to say that they received some formal education in the host country compared to those returning from Pakistan. Those who received some level of formal education abroad were somewhat more likely to say the employment situation in Afghanistan worsened for them (56.3%), compared to those who had not acquired any formal education (53.7%). This is interesting as it challenges the notion that a formal education will provide greater chances of employment.

Returnees who registered with an organization when they returned were somewhat more likely to say the employment situation has worsened for them (56.4%), compared to those not registered (53.2%).

A smaller proportion of returnees (54.1%) said that their employment situation has worsened in 2019 when compared to 2018 (61.9%). With regards to a worsening financial situation, the number reporting that their financial situation worsened in 2019 (40.9%) is significantly lower than the 53.5% that was reported in 2018.




Fig 25. Q-45. Since you moved back to Afghanistan, have the following services gotten better, gotten worse, or is there no difference for your household? b) Jobs and work opportunities. (Percent who say worse). **M-3.** Province.

In order to gain a better understanding of returnees’ overall socio-economic status, the *Survey* added a new question this year about ownership of different assets. The findings show a large majority of returnee households own at least one mobile phone (90.7%), more than half own a TV (58.7%), and bicycle (50.4%), while a smaller proportion (10.6%) own a car.

OWNERSHIP OF HOUSEHOLD ITEMS




Fig 26. D-10. How many of the following items does your household currently own? a) Bicycle. b) Motorcycle. c) Car. d) TV. h) Jeribs of Land. i) Livestock (not poultry). j. Mobile phone.

Livestock and land ownership are higher in rural (46.2% and 33.9%) than urban areas (14.3% and 12.0% respectively). Conversely TV and mobile phone ownership are higher in the latter (75.2% and 94.0%) than in the former (52.6% and 89.4% respectively).

Returnees were asked if they had any savings while returning to Afghanistan. In 2019, more returnees had savings (63.8%) compared to 2018 (52.3%). In a related question, returnees were asked about sources of financing for their trip home. More than half (52.4%) mentioned savings, and 21.7% said loans from family and friends. Moreover, returnees mentioned support from UNHCR (6.8%), and sale of property (6.5%) as a way of financing their return. Both 2019 and 2018 findings on the matter are consistent.

SOURCE OF FINANCING FOR RETURN HOME, BY YEAR




Fig 27. Q-13. How did you finance your trip back to Afghanistan?

Returnees were also asked whether a female member of their family contributed to the household income, to which approximately one fifth (20.8%) responded affirmatively. This is an almost four percentage point drop when compared with 2018 (24.7%). The proportion saying a female family member contributed to household income was highest in Herat (31.9%) and lowest in Kabul (9.0%). Households in which a female member contributed to income were more likely to report a better financial situation (37.6%) compared to those in which they did not contribute (29.5%).

FEMALE CONTRIBUTION TO HOUSEHOLD INCOME, BY YEAR




Fig 28. Q-1ii. Do female members of the family contribute to this household's income, or not? (Percent who say yes). M-3. Province.

There is a notable drop among rural women in Herat. In 2018, nearly half (48.1%) contributed to the household income, and in 2019, this dropped to 36.5%.

FEMALE CONTRIBUTION TO HOUSEHOLD INCOME, BY PROVINCE, STRATA, AND YEAR

		2018	2019
		%	%
RURAL	KABUL	9	8
	NANGARHAR	18	23
	BALKH	22	22
	HERAT	48	37
	KANDAHAR	26	16

URBAN	KABUL	9	11
	NANGARHAR	17	20
	BALKH	23	21
	HERAT	35	24
	KANDAHAR	40	26

Fig 29. Q-11i. Do female members of the family contribute to this household's income, or not? (Percent who say yes). M-3. Province. M-4b. CSO geographic code.

6. REGISTRATION

The 2019 *Survey* does not ask participants about their status in their former country (e.g. as a refugee, economic migrant) however, the *Survey* does ask about their current status, and whether returnees have registered with any organization when they returned to Afghanistan. This year, almost one-third, (31.7%) reported they had indeed registered. This is slightly lower than 34.3% who said they had registered in 2018. As a follow-up, respondents are asked which organization they registered with, the most common responses were; government (39.5%), IOM (39.4%), UNHCR (24.1%), and the World Bank (1.7%).




Fig 30. Q-49. (Ask if yes in Q-48) Which organization did you register with?

Single respondents were less likely to be registered (29.9%) than married respondents (32.1%). Returnees in Nangarhar were more likely to have registered (40.0%) than those in Herat (17.4%). However these percentages are a decrease from 2018, when 59.6% returnees in Nangarhar were registered, and 20.2% in Herat.

Rural respondents (32.5%) were more likely than urban respondents (29.5%) to say they registered. The proportion is highest in urban Kandahar (49.4%) and lowest in rural Herat (17.5%) and urban Herat (17.4%).

REGISTRATION, BY PROVINCE AND STRATA

		RURAL	URBAN
		%	%
2019	KABUL	29	25
	NANGARHAR	40	40
	BALKH	28	26
	HERAT	17	17
	KANDAHAR	44	49
2018	KABUL	28	18
	NANGARHAR	61	45
	BALKH	14	9
	HERAT	22	17
	KANDAHAR	52	58

Fig 31. Q-48. *When you returned to Afghanistan, did you register with any organization? (Percent who say yes). M-3. Province. M-4b. CSO geographic code.*

Respondents returning from Iran (23.7%) were less likely to have registered than those who returned from Pakistan (36.4%): in 2018 the reported proportions were 22.9% (Iran) and 43.6% (Pakistan) respectively. By ethnicity, Pashtuns were more likely to have registered (39.0%), than Tajik (23.2%), Hazara (24.1%), Uzbek (19.0%) and others (24.6%).

REGISTRATION STATUS, BY ETHNICITY

	2018	2019
	%	%
PASHTUN	46	39
TAJIK	21	23
UZBEK	24	19
HAZARA	17	24
OTHER	21	25

Fig 32. Q-48. *When you returned to Afghanistan, did you register with any organization? (Percent who say yes).* **D-22.** *Which ethnic group do you belong to?*

More male respondents (36.3%) reported having registered, than female respondents (26.5%), a wider gap than in 2018 (male: 34.9%, and female: 33.6%). Age and education of a returnee had negligible impact on decisions to register (those aged 18 to 25 year were at 31.2%, somewhat less than 34.9% of those aged 55+ years).

The findings in both years of the *Survey* illustrate the benefits of registration: registered returnees were more likely to have received support than unregistered ones, as demonstrated in the below figure.

SUPPORT RECEIVED UPON RETURN TO AFGHANISTAN, BY REGISTRATION STATUS, AND YEAR




Fig 33. Q-19. Thinking about when you last returned to Afghanistan, have you received the following types of support from any entity or organization: a) Your housing b) Food c) Employment/ Jobs d) Health care e) Cash and/or loans f) Training g) Other help such as clothes, kitchen materials, etc. (Percent who say yes). **Q-48.** When you returned to Afghanistan, did you register with any organization?

There is a notable reverse in trend from 2018 data. In 2018, one fifth, 20.2%, of returnees interviewed approached government offices for assistance, and subsequently those who were non-registered were slightly more likely (25.5%) to receive the help they sought than the registered peers (23.0%). Last year, a reverse finding held true (registered: 30.5% versus non-registered: 26.1%).

By province, more registered returnees in Kabul (9.3%), and Herat (36.9%) reportedly received the help they sought than their non-registered peers (6.0% and 27.4% respectively), whereas in other province more non-registered returnees received support than registered ones, as illustrated in figure 34 below.

SUPPORT RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT, BY PROVINCE AND REGISTRATION STATUS




Fig 34. Q-29. (Ask if yes in Q-25) Overall, did you receive the support you sought? (Percent who say yes). **Q-48.** When you returned to Afghanistan, did you register with any organization? **M-3.** Province.

As previously stated, among registered returnees, 39.5% were registered with the government, followed by IOM (39.4%), UNHCR (24.1%), and the World Bank (1.7%). Registered returnees were more likely to cite UNHCR (11.1%), and IOM (6.5%) as providing them financial assistance for their trip home, than non-registered peers (UNHCR: 4.8%, and IOM: 3.7%).

7. ACCESS TO EDUCATION

The children of returnees continue to face challenges obtaining education in Afghanistan. According to UNHCR, comparing 2016 and 2017, 55% of returnee male children and 30% of female children were in school in 2017, compared to 6% and 44% in the case of returnee men and women in 2016 (contrasted to the national average of 64.7% and 47.6% male and female school attendance rates).²²

According to the UNHCR, obstacles to returnee men obtaining education include distance to school, the need for children to contribute to household income, and school fees. For returnee females, the most common obstacles to returning to school are distance to school and cultural barriers.²³ Overall, at the national level, distance to school, family disapproval, need for children to work, and the high expenses related to education are among the main reasons for school non-attendance.²⁴

Returnees were asked if they had school-age children while abroad and whether they attended school abroad.

Almost half (48.8%) of respondents said they had at least school-aged daughter in their household and 61.3% said they had a school aged son while abroad. Of those who were of appropriate age to attend school, 27.7% said some or none of their daughters attended primary school, 35.2% secondary school, and 45.2% high school. With regard to their sons, respondents indicated they were more likely to have attended school. Of those who said some or none them had not attended school, 17.2% would have been at the primary level, 23.1% at the secondary level and 34.0% high school.

SOME OR NONE OF CHILDREN ATTENDED SCHOOL WHILE ABROAD, BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION AND GENDER




Fig 35. D-12. a/b. (Ask if greater than 0 in D-11) How many of them attended primary school while abroad? (Percent who say some or none of them). **D-13. a/b.** (Ask if greater than 0 in D-11) How many of them attended secondary school while abroad? (Percent who say some or none of them). **D-14. a/b.** (Ask if greater than 0 in D-11) How many of them attended high school while abroad? (Percent who say some or none of them).

Those who reported that a school-aged child did not attend school were asked about the reasons why they did not attend school.

The most cited reasons were that returnees could not afford tuition fees (27.3%), and transportation difficulties (12.3%). With regard to male children who did not attend school abroad, the reasons were mostly they needed to work (males: 32.5%, compared to females: 6.0%), and could not afford tuition fees (males: 22.0%, compared to females: 27.3%).

REASONS FOR CHILDREN NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL WHILE ABROAD, BY GENDER




Fig 36. D-15. a/b. (Ask if answers in any of D-12, D-13, or D-14 is “some of them” or “none of them”) Why didn’t they go to school?

In another set of questions, respondents were asked about the number of school-aged children they had at the time of interview, whether they attended school, and the reasons why they did not attend school, if any. More than half (68.5%) of respondents said they had at least one school-aged daughter in their household, and 77.6% said they had at least one school-aged son at their household. Female were less likely to attend school (some or none of them attended school; 20.0% primary, 30.3% secondary, 40.1% high school) than males (some or none of them attended school; 11.9% primary, 15.0% secondary, and 22.2% high school).

Returnees are also asked about the reasons why their children did not attend school. The most frequent responses included, cannot afford school supplies (female: 12.1%, males: 11.1%), transportation difficulties (female: 12.8%, males: 7.8%), and they need to work (female: 11.8% males: 37.4%).

The low attendance rate is consistent with other studies in Afghanistan. According to a survey of returnees and internally displaced persons, 16% of 2017 and 18% of 2016 returnees have a child under 14 years old who work to support their households.²⁵ Another study shows that lack of identity documents such as Tazkera specifically precludes access to school and formal education for 33% of their respondents.²⁶ In addition to lack of formal documentation, dangers related to traveling to school and low quality of education are other reasons why children do not attend school. For example, parents in Jalalabad more often put their children to work than send them to schools, the situation is even worse for females.²⁷

REASONS FOR CHILDREN NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL, BY GENDER




Fig 37. D-20. a/b. (Ask if answer in any of D-12, D-13, or D-14 is "some of them" or "none of them")
Why didn't they go to school?

Rural school-aged females are significantly less likely to attend school than urban females, this trend is true across all school levels; primary school (rural: 21.7%, urban: 14.4%), secondary school (rural: 34.3%, urban: 18.2%), and high school (rural: 44.8%, and urban: 26.7% said some or none of them attended school).

Households who reported a worsening financial situation were also more likely to report that some or none of their school-aged females attended school; primary school (better: 19.6%, worse: 23.4%), secondary school (better: 30.7%, worse: 34.0%), and high school (better: 40.5%, worse: 45.4%).

FEMALE NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL, BY STRATA




Fig 38. D-17. a. (Ask if greater than 0 in D-16) How many of them attended or have completed primary school? (Percent who say some or none of them). **D-18. a.** (Ask if greater than 0 in D-16) How many of them attended or have completed secondary school? (Percent who say some or none of them). **D-19. a.** (Ask if greater than 0 in D-16) How many of them attended or have completed high school? (Percent who say some or none of them). **M-4b.** CSO geographic code.

Female participants who had some years of formal education were significantly less likely to report their female children not attending school compared to those who had no education.

Just over half (51.2%) of those females interviewed who did not have any education, said some or none of their female school-aged children attended school, whereas 32.6% of those who had up to 6 years of formal education, 30.0% of those having 7 to 9 years of education, 23.3% of those who had 10 to 12 years of education, and 11.2% of those who have over 12 years of education, said some or none of their female school-age children attended school. This is notably lower than compared to 40.9% of respondents who had informal education and reported their female school-age children did not attend school.

The findings show that security plays an important role in females' school attendance. Those who felt safe in their neighborhood were more likely to send their female children to school and less likely to say that "some" or "none" of their female children attend school. This is significantly different than those who reported feeling unsafe in their neighborhoods and are less likely to send their female children to school across all levels of schooling; primary school (reported feeling safe: 18.8%, feeling unsafe: 31.7%), secondary school (safe: 28.5%, unsafe: 48.2%), and high school (safe: 38.5%, and unsafe: 55.1%).

8. REINTEGRATION AND CONFLICT

KEY QUESTIONS

Q-34. *I am going to list a number of statements about your neighborhood. Please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with each of them. a) My neighborhood has been friendly and welcoming. b) I can comfortably go to any of my neighbors for help. c) My neighbors respect me and my family. d) My neighbors invite me to their ceremonies such as wedding and khatm. e) I feel safe in my neighborhood. f) I have felt discrimination from others in my neighborhood, because of my language or the way I speak.*

Q-37. *Since coming back to Afghanistan, where would you say you have had the most challenging experiences for your family?*

Q-39. *Since returning to Afghanistan, have you or family members personally experienced a dispute or conflict with a community member(s)?*

Q-40. *(Ask if yes in Q-39) What type of dispute or conflict was it?*

Q-41. *(Ask if yes in Q-39) What was the cause of the dispute or conflict?*

Q-43. *(Ask if yes in Q-39) Was the conflict resolved?*

Q-44. *(Ask if yes in Q-43) Did any of the following help with dispute resolution? 1. State court. 2. Huquq Department. 3. Shura or Jirga. 4. The parties themselves.*

According to OXFAM, a potential cause of conflict for returnees is lack of integration with host communities. Ethnic, tribal differences or in some instances cultural and social difference are factors related to conflict between returnees and host communities. Urban-rural adaptation may also create challenges that may lead to friction. There may also be economic factors such as competition for scarce resources in the form of increased demand for basic items such as food and water. Unequal access to humanitarian assistance for different individuals or groups and corruption linked to such programs are yet another reason for tensions and violent acts.²⁸ According to UNHCR, 58% of returnees in 2017 reported difficulties with host communities which was related to economic factors such as lack of jobs and cost of living rather than discrimination (fewer than 1% of returnees or IDPs reported ethnic discrimination).²⁹

In the *Survey*, respondents were also asked which locations were most challenging for them since returning to Afghanistan. One fifth, 20.8%, said returnee camp/shelter, 20.0% mentioned neighborhood, 16.0% mentioned Bazaar/Market, and 15.1% cited the workplace. Interestingly, there was a significant increase among those who say “nothing” was challenging, from 6.5% in 2018 to 30.3% in 2019. While this increase is noted across all provinces, the largest increase is in Balkh from 2.5% to 28.5% from 2018 to 2019 respectively.

MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES




Fig 39. Q-37. *Since coming back to Afghanistan, where would you say you have had the most challenging experiences for your family? (allow up to two responses).*

Returnees' experiences varied across provinces; in Kabul, the most frequent response for the most challenging place was identified as the home (27.3%). In Nangarhar, returnees camp/shelter (26.5%), in Balkh, neighborhood (22.8%), in Herat, neighborhood (35.6%), and in Kandahar, returnee camp/shelter (17.3%).

MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES, BY PROVINCE

	KABUL	NANGARHAR	BALKH	HERAT	KANDAHAR
	%	%	%	%	%
RETURNEES CAMP/SHELTER	22	27	17	21	17
NEIGHBORHOOD	11	18	23	36	12
BAZAAR/MARKETPLACE	8	16	21	20	15
WORKPLACE	18	17	20	12	9
AT HOME	27	3	16	16	10
HOSPITAL/CLINIC	10	10	14	12	7
GOVERNMENT OFFICES	5	11	9	5	4
SCHOOL	8	9	8	3	3

MOSQUE	1	5	2	1	3
PROBLEMS ON THE WAY TO AFGHANISTAN	4	0	0	0	0

Fig 40. Q-37. Since coming back to Afghanistan, where would you say you have had the most challenging experiences for your family? (allow up to two responses). **M-3.** Province.

Rural returnees are more likely to say they faced challenges than urban residents in almost all locations except with regards to the workplace (18.0% urban versus 14.0% rural), at home (17.9% versus 13.2%), or government offices (8.7% versus 6.2%).

Returnees in rural areas (21.8%) are more likely to mention the neighborhood as the most challenging place than urban returnees (15.3%), bazaar/marketplace (17.0% versus 13.3%), and returnee camp/shelter (21.1% versus 19.9% respectively).

MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES, BY STRATA

	RURAL	URBAN
	%	%
RETURNEES CAMP/SHELTER	21	20
NEIGHBORHOOD	22	15
BAZAAR/MARKETPLACE	17	13
WORKPLACE	14	18
AT HOME	13	18
HOSPITAL/CLINIC	11	9
GOVERNMENT OFFICES	6	9
SCHOOL	6	6
MOSQUE	3	2

Fig 41. Q-37. Since coming back to Afghanistan, where would you say you have had the most challenging experiences for your family? (allow up to two responses). **M-4b.** CSO geographic code.

Overall, in 2019, respondents were less likely to report facing challenges compared to 2018, details of which are presented in the following table.

MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES, BY SURVEY YEAR

	2018	2019
	%	%
RETURNEES CAMP/SHELTER	27	21
NEIGHBORHOOD	26	20
AT HOME	21	14
BAZAAR/MARKETPLACE	18	16
WORKPLACE	19	15
HOSPITAL/CLINIC	13	11
GOVERNMENT OFFICES	10	7

Fig 42. Q-37. *Since coming back to Afghanistan, where would you say you have had the most challenging experiences for your family? (Allow up to two responses).*

Support from family networks is identified as a valuable factor in reintegrating returnees into host communities, although it does not necessarily reduce all challenges returnees face. For example, returnees who live nearby immediate family are more likely to say their neighborhood is challenging compared to those who do not live nearby immediate family (20.8% compared to 17.0%).

MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES, BY NEIGHBORHOOD: IMMEDIATE FAMILY

	YES	NO
	%	%
RETURNEES CAMP/SHELTER	20	23
NEIGHBORHOOD	21	17
BAZAAR/MARKETPLACE	16	16
WORKPLACE	15	14
AT HOME	14	18
HOSPITAL/CLINIC	10	13
GOVERNMENT OFFICES	7	6

SCHOOL	6	8
MOSQUE	3	2

Fig 43. Q-37. Since coming back to Afghanistan, where would you say you have had the most challenging experiences for your family? (allow up to two responses). D-9. Do the following types of people live in your neighborhood? (select all that apply) (a) Your immediate family.

MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES, BY NEIGHBORHOOD: EXTENDED FAMILY

	YES	NO
	%	%
RETURNEES CAMP/SHELTER	21	20
NEIGHBORHOOD	20	19
BAZAAR/MARKETPLACE	16	15
WORKPLACE	15	14
AT HOME	13	18
HOSPITAL/CLINIC	11	11
GOVERNMENT OFFICES	8	5
SCHOOL	6	7
MOSQUE	2	3

Fig 44. Q-37. Since coming back to Afghanistan, where would you say you have had the most challenging experiences for your family? (allow up to two responses). D-9. Do the following types of people live in your neighborhood? (select all that apply) b) your extended family.

**MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES,
BY NEIGHBORHOOD: RETURNEES FROM A SIMILAR ETHNIC GROUP**

	YES	NO
	%	%
RETURNEES CAMP/SHELTER	21	21
NEIGHBORHOOD	20	20
BAZAAR/MARKETPLACE	16	17
WORKPLACE	17	12
AT HOME	14	15
HOSPITAL/CLINIC	10	11
GOVERNMENT OFFICES	8	5
SCHOOL	6	6
MOSQUE	3	2

Fig 45. Q-37. Since coming back to Afghanistan, where would you say you have had the most challenging experiences for your family? (allow up to two responses). **D-9.** Do the following types of people live in your neighborhood? (select all that apply). **c** Other returnees from your ethnic group.

**MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES,
BY NEIGHBORHOOD: RETURNEES FROM OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS**

	YES	NO
	%	%
RETURNEES CAMP/SHELTER	20	22
NEIGHBORHOOD	20	20
BAZAAR/MARKETPLACE	17	15
WORKPLACE	16	14
AT HOME	15	14
HOSPITAL/CLINIC	11	10
GOVERNMENT OFFICES	7	6

SCHOOL	6	7
MOSQUE	2	2

Fig 46. Q-37. Since coming back to Afghanistan, where would you say you have had the most challenging experiences for your family? (allow up to two responses). **D-9.** Do the following types of people live in your neighborhood? (select all that apply). d) Returnees from other ethnic groups.

MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES, BY NEIGHBORHOOD: NEIGHBORS FROM SIMILIAR ETHNIC GROUP

	YES	NO
	%	%
RETURNEES CAMP/SHELTER	20	22
NEIGHBORHOOD	20	21
BAZAAR/MARKETPLACE	16	16
WORKPLACE	16	13
AT HOME	14	15
HOSPITAL/CLINIC	11	10
GOVERNMENT OFFICES	7	7
SCHOOL	6	6
MOSQUE	3	2

Fig 47. Q-37. Since coming back to Afghanistan, where would you say you have had the most challenging experiences for your family? (allow up to two responses). **D-9.** Do the following types of people live in your neighborhood? (select all that apply). e) Neighbors from your ethnic group.

**MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES,
BY NEIGHBORHOOD: NEIGHBORS FROM OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS**

	YES	NO
	%	%
RETURNEES CAMP/SHELTER	21	21
NEIGHBORHOOD	19	23
BAZAAR/MARKETPLACE	17	15
WORKPLACE	15	16
AT HOME	15	13
HOSPITAL/CLINIC	11	10
GOVERNMENT OFFICES	7	7
SCHOOL	6	7
MOSQUE	2	3

Fig 48. Q-37. Since coming back to Afghanistan, where would you say you have had the most challenging experiences for your family? (allow up to two responses). **D-9.** Do the following types of people live in your neighborhood? (select all that apply). **f)** Neighbors from other ethnic groups.

**MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES,
BY NEIGHBORHOOD: NEIGHBORS FROM OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTRY**

	YES	NO
	%	%
RETURNEES CAMP/SHELTER	21	21
NEIGHBORHOOD	18	23
BAZAAR/MARKETPLACE	16	17
WORKPLACE	15	15
AT HOME	15	14
HOSPITAL/CLINIC	11	11
GOVERNMENT OFFICES	6	7

SCHOOL	6	6
MOSQUE	2	3

Fig 49. Q-37. Since coming back to Afghanistan, where would you say you have had the most challenging experiences for your family? (allow up to two responses). **D-9.** Do the following types of people live in your neighborhood? (select all that apply). **g)** Neighbors from other parts of the country.

MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES, BY NEIGHBORHOOD: WEALTHY NEIGHBORS

	YES	NO
	%	%
RETURNEES CAMP/SHELTER	21	19
NEIGHBORHOOD	19	22
BAZAAR/MARKETPLACE	16	16
WORKPLACE	16	14
AT HOME	15	14
HOSPITAL/CLINIC	11	11
GOVERNMENT OFFICES	6	8
SCHOOL	6	6
MOSQUE	3	2

Fig 50. Q-37. Since coming back to Afghanistan, where would you say you have had the most challenging experiences for your family? (allow up to two responses). **D-9.** Do the following types of people live in your neighborhood? (select all that apply). **h)** Wealthy neighbors.

MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES, BY NEIGHBORHOOD: IMPOVERISHED NEIGHBORS

	YES	NO
	%	%
RETURNEES CAMP/SHELTER	21	23
NEIGHBORHOOD	20	22
BAZAAR/MARKETPLACE	16	16
WORKPLACE	15	13
AT HOME	15	11
HOSPITAL/CLINIC	11	11
GOVERNMENT OFFICES	7	6
SCHOOL	6	5
MOSQUE	2	3

Fig 51. Q-37. *Since coming back to Afghanistan, where would you say you have had the most challenging experiences for your family? (allow up to two responses). D-9.* *Do the following types of people live in your neighborhood? (select all that apply). i) Impoverished neighbors.*

By registration status, registered returnees were slightly more likely to cite camp/shelter (23.8%), and hospital/clinic (8.0%) than non-registered peers as the most challenging places (non-registered: 19.5% camp/shelter, hospital/clinic 11.9%).

MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR RETURNEES, BY REGISTRATION STATUS



Fig 52. Q-37. *Since coming back to Afghanistan, where would you say you have had the most challenging experiences for your family? (allow up to two responses).*

For registered returnees, camp/shelter was mentioned as the most challenging place among more than a third (34.5%) of respondents in urban Kabul.

CAMP/SHELTER AS THE MOST CHALLENGING PLACE FOR REGISTERED RETURNÉES, BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE




Fig 53. Q-37. *Since coming back to Afghanistan, where would you say you have had the most challenging experiences for your family? (Percent who say camp/shelter). M-3. Province. M-4b. CSO geographic code.*

In addition to questions about the most challenging places for returnees, respondents were also asked whether they had experienced any direct or indirect conflict with community members. Disputes or conflicts were reported by 11.8% of respondents, marginally lower than last year's 12.7%. Reported disputes were most frequent in Kandahar (16.7%) and least frequent in Kabul (6.8%). Disputes were more likely to be reported in rural areas (12.8%), than in urban areas, (9.0%). In rural areas, disputes were the highest in Kandahar (16.9%), and lowest in Kabul (6.7%),.

EXPERIENCE OF CONFLICT OR DISPUTE, BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE




Fig 54. Q-39. *Since returning to Afghanistan, have you or family members personally experienced a dispute or conflict with a community member(s)?* **M-3.** Province. **M-4b.** CSO geographic code.

Returnees aged 18–25 years were more likely to report a dispute (12.4%), than those over the age of 25 (8.5%). Those who had some level of informal schooling at home or at literacy classes (25.1%), those who lacked any formal education (11.0%), or had less than 10 years of formal education (11.9%), were more likely to say they experienced a dispute or conflict than respondents who had more than 10 years of formal education (9.0%).

There are few variations in reporting cases of disputes with different neighborhood types. For instance, 11.9% of returnees who have an immediate family in their neighborhood are likely to report a case of dispute or conflict, while this figure is 12.0% for those returnees whom have neighbors from other ethnic groups or other parts of the country.

EXPERIENCE OF CONFLICT OR DISPUTE, BY TYPE OF NEIGHBORHOOD, AND YEAR




Fig 55. Q-39. Since returning to Afghanistan, have you or family members personally experienced a dispute or conflict with a community member(s)? **D-9.** Do the following types of people live in your neighborhood? (select all that apply). a) Your immediate family. b) Your extended family. c) Other returnees from your ethnic group. d) Returnees from other ethnic groups. e) Neighbors from your ethnic group. f) Neighbors from other ethnic groups. g) Neighbors from other parts of the country. h) Wealthy neighbors. i) Impoverished neighbors.

In a follow-up question, respondents were asked what type of dispute or conflict they experienced. The most common types reported were verbal arguments or confrontation (66.4%), physical attack or fight (20.2%), and property dispute (13.0%). Interestingly, fewer respondents report verbal arguments of confrontation when compared with 2018 (70.7%), while more respondents are reporting an increase in physical attacks when compared with 2018 (16.4%). Physical attack is reported more frequently among returnees in Kandahar (27.0%), and in Nangarhar (26.4%) compared to Balkh (5.5%).

TYPE OF CONFLICT OR DISPUTE, BY PROVINCE AND YEAR

	VERBAL ARGUMENT		PHYSICAL ATTACK		PROPERTY DISPUTE	
	2018	2019	2018	2019	2018	2019
	%	%	%	%	%	%
KABUL	62	58	23	20	15	22
NANGARHAR	69	66	16	26	15	7

BALKH	80	81	2	6	18	14
HERAT	63	64	21	15	16	22
KANDAHAR	77	66	16	27	8	7

Fig 56. Q-40. (Ask if yes in Q-39) What type of dispute or conflict was it? **M-3.** Province.

Urban respondents were more likely than rural respondents to have experienced a verbal argument (72.9% versus 64.7%); conversely, rural respondents were more likely to experience a physical attack or fight than urban (21.4% versus 15.6%); and property dispute were more prevalent among rural returnees (13.6% versus 10.8%).

TYPE OF CONFLICT OR DISPUTE, BY STRATA AND YEAR

	VERBAL ARGUMENT		PHYSICAL ATTACK		PROPERTY DISPUTE	
	2018	2019	2018	2019	2018	2019
	%	%	%	%	%	%
RURAL	72	65	15	21	14	14
URBAN	68	73	22	16	10	11

Fig 57. Q-40. (Ask if yes in Q-39) What type of dispute or conflict was it? **M-4b.** CSO geographic code.

The same question was asked of host communities' respondents, with 11.1% indicating they had experienced a dispute or conflict with one or more returnees. Results varied across provinces, the highest proportion in Kandahar (18.8%) and lowest in Kabul (6.2%).

EXPERIENCE OF CONFLICT OR DISPUTE, BY RESPONDENT AND PROVINCE




Fig 58. Q-39. in the Returnees, and Q-24. in the Host Community Questionnaire. Since returning to Afghanistan, have you or family members personally experienced a dispute or conflict with a community member(s)? M-3. Province.

By registration status, registered returnees were more likely to have experienced a dispute or conflict (15.2%) than non-registered returnees (10.1%). In 2018, the situation was reported to be even more contrasting with 22.3% of registered and 7.6% of non-registered participants saying they had experienced a conflict or dispute. Experience of physical attack was more prevalent among registered (24.2%) than non-registered peers (17.5%). This is also higher for both groups in comparison to 2018 (registered: 17.2%, non-registered: 14.2%)

EXPERIENCE OF CONFLICT OR DISPUTE, BY REGISTRATION STATUS, STRATA, AND PROVINCE

	RURAL		URBAN	
	REGISTERED	NOT REGISTERED	REGISTERED	NOT REGISTERED
	%	%	%	%
KABUL	5	7	10	6
NANGARHAR	14	14	12	6
BALKH	6	10	2	7
HERAT	36	14	14	7
KANDAHAR	24	10	21	12

Fig 59. Q-39. *Since returning to Afghanistan, have you or family members personally experienced a dispute or conflict with a community member(s)?* **Q-48.** *When you returned to Afghanistan, did you register with any organization?* **M-4b.** *CSO geographic code.*

Vandalism (24.8%), immorality (23.8%), intimidation (15.5%), harassment (12.8%), and discrimination (8.5%) were the top self-reported reasons related to disputes or conflicts. In 2018, the top cited reasons were somewhat different; intimidation (21.8%), harassment (19.4%), vandalism (18.9%), immorality (18.2%), and discrimination (11.1%).

By strata, vandalism is more prevalent in rural (27.7%) than in urban areas (13.7%). Conversely, immorality, and harassment are more common causes for a dispute in urban (immorality: 32.1%, harassment: 17.9%) than in rural areas (immorality: 21.6%, harassment: 11.4%).

CAUSE OF CONFLICT OR DISPUTE, BY STRATA




Fig 60. Q-41. (Ask if yes in Q-39) What was the cause of the dispute or conflict? **M-4b.** CSO geographic code.

Findings reveal that returnees who had lived elsewhere in the country after returning to Afghanistan were approximately twice as likely to report experiencing dispute or conflict (21.2%) than those who had not lived elsewhere (10.6%). A similar finding held true in 2018 (20.9% versus 11.4%). Respondents who reported an experience of violence or conflict were also considerably more likely to want to move elsewhere in the future (11.6%) compared to those who did not report such cases (4.1%).

Moreover, respondents who reported an experience of dispute or conflict were also asked where the conflict occurred. More than one quarter (27.8%) of respondents mentioned in the home, 19.5% at the workplace, 18.3% on the street, 17.1% said the market, and 7.4% mentioned government offices.

In a related question, respondents were asked about conflict resolution, to which 83.0% said the case was resolved (the remaining 16.0% were unresolved). Of those whose dispute or conflict was resolved, 52.2% said the parties themselves resolved it, 33.1% mentioned Shura/Jirga's intervention in the resolution, 7.4% named the Huquq department, and 6.0% cited state court. Compared to 2018, there were some variations in responses, the most noticeable difference in the case of Shura/Jirga resolutions (2018: 23.6%, and 2019: 33.1%).

DISPUTE RESOLUTION MECHANISM, BY YEAR




Fig 61. Q-44. (Ask if yes in Q-43) Did any of the following help with dispute resolution? (Multiple response, code all that apply). a). State court. b). Huquq Department. c). Shura or Jirga. d). The parties themselves.

By province, resolution through the parties themselves were most often cited in Balkh (73.5%), Shura/Jirga's resolution in Nangarhar (58.4%), the Huquq Department in Herat (12.0%), and state court in Kandahar (14.2%).

DISPUTE RESOLUTION MECHANISMS, BY PROVINCE

	KABUL	NANGARHAR	BALKH	HERAT	KANDAHAR
	%	%	%	%	%
PARTIES THEMSELVES	59	32	73	54	57
SHURA/JIRGA	30	58	27	29	17
HUQUQ DEPARTMENT	4	6	0	12	10
STATE COURT	4	4	0	4	14

Fig 62. Q-44. (Ask if yes in Q-43) Did any of the following help with dispute resolution? (Multiple response, code all that apply). a) State court. b) Huquq Department. c) Shura or Jirga. d) The parties themselves. **M-3.** Province.

The host communities were also asked about the causes of disputes or conflicts, and similar top cited reasons were found for both groups. However, there are some variation in proportions, for instance, more returnees (24.8%) mention vandalism than host community respondents (19.9%), conversely, the latter group mentioned immorality (26.5%) more frequently than the former (23.8%).

CAUSES OF DISPUTES AND CONFLICTS, BY RESPONDENT




Fig 63. Q-41. (Ask if yes in Q-39) What was the cause of the dispute or conflict? (Q-28)(Ask if yes in Q-26) What was the dispute or conflict about?

Aside from their experience of dispute or conflict, respondents are asked about their neighborhood. More than half, 56.2% of respondents felt discriminated against because of their language or way of speaking, while 9.0% say they cannot comfortably go to their neighbors for help, and 8.6% reported feeling unsafe in their neighborhood.

RETURNEE INTEGRATION INTO HOST COMMUNITY, BY NEIGHBORHOOD AND YEAR

		AGREE	DISAGREE
		%	%
2019	MY NEIGHBORHOOD HAS BEEN FRIENDLY AND WELCOMING	97	3
	I CAN COMFORTABLY GO TO ANY OF MY NEIGHBORS FOR HELP	91	9
	MY NEIGHBORS RESPECT ME AND MY FAMILY	94	6
	MY NEIGHBORS INVITE ME TO THEIR CEREMONIES SUCH AS WEDDING AND KHATM	93	7
	I FEEL SAFE IN MY NEIGHBORHOOD	91	9
	I HAVE FELT DISCRIMINATION FROM OTHERS IN MY NEIGHBORHOOD, BECAUSE OF MY LANGUAGE OR THE WAY I SPEAK	56	43
2018	MY NEIGHBORHOOD HAS BEEN FRIENDLY AND WELCOMING	95	5
	I CAN COMFORTABLY GO TO ANY OF MY NEIGHBORS FOR HELP	87	13
	MY NEIGHBORS RESPECT ME AND MY FAMILY	90	10
	MY NEIGHBORS INVITE ME TO THEIR CEREMONIES SUCH AS WEDDING AND KHATM	88	12
	I FEEL SAFE IN MY NEIGHBORHOOD	86	13
	I HAVE FELT DISCRIMINATION FROM OTHERS IN MY NEIGHBORHOOD, BECAUSE OF MY LANGUAGE OR THE WAY I SPEAK	57	43

Fig 64. Q-34. *I am going to list a number of statements about your neighborhood. Please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with each of them. a) My neighborhood has been friendly and welcoming. b) I can comfortably go to any of my neighbors for help. c) My neighbors respect me and my family. d) My neighbors invite me to their ceremonies such as wedding and khatm. e) I feel safe in my neighborhood. f) I have felt discrimination from others in my neighborhood, because of my language or the way I speak.*

Interestingly, among those who indicated they felt comfortable going to neighbors and asking for help, only 42.0% reported having actually asked for some assistance (58.0% have not approached anyone in their neighborhood, compared to 54.7% in 2018).

Among those who stated they felt unsafe in their neighborhood comprised 8.6% of respondents, which is a decrease over the 13.5% recorded in 2018. No broad distinction can be made based across the various neighborhood types, detailed below.

PERCEPTION OF SAFETY, BY NEIGHBORHOOD

DO THE FOLLOWING PEOPLE LIVE IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD?		I FEEL SAFE IN MY NEIGHBORHOOD	
		AGREE	DISAGREE
		%	%
YOUR IMMEDIATE FAMILY	YES	92	8
	NO	88	12
YOUR EXTENDED FAMILY	YES	92	7
	NO	88	12
OTHER RETURNEES FROM YOUR ETHNIC GROUP	YES	93	7
	NO	89	11
RETURNEES FROM OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS	YES	92	8
	NO	90	9
NEIGHBORS FROM YOUR ETHNIC GROUP	YES	92	8
	NO	88	11
NEIGHBORS FROM OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS	YES	92	8
	NO	90	10
NEIGHBORS FROM OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTRY	YES	93	7
	NO	89	11
WEALTHY NEIGHBORS	YES	92	8
	NO	89	10
IMPOVERISHED NEIGHBORS	YES	92	8
	NO	86	14

Fig 65. Q-34. I am going to list a number of statements about your neighborhood. Please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with each of them. e) I feel safe in my neighborhood. **D-9.** Do the following types of people live in your neighborhood? a) Your immediate family. b) Your extended family. c) Other returnees from your ethnic group. d) Returnees from other ethnic groups. e) Neighbors from your ethnic group. f) Neighbors from other ethnic groups. g) Neighbors from other parts of the country. h) Wealthy neighbors. i) Impoverished neighbors.

As previously stated, roughly three fifths of respondents reported they felt discrimination because of their language or way of speaking, however, there is no large variation found with regard to various neighborhood types, elaborated further in the following table.

EXPERIENCE OF LINGUISTIC DISCRIMINATION, BY NEIGHBORHOOD

DO THE FOLLOWING PEOPLE LIVE IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD?		I HAVE FELT DISCRIMINATION FROM OTHERS IN MY NEIGHBORHOOD, BECAUSE OF MY LANGUAGE OR THE WAY I SPEAK	
		AGREE	DISAGREE
		%	%
YOUR IMMEDIATE FAMILY	YES	56	44
	NO	58	41
YOUR EXTENDED FAMILY	YES	54	46
	NO	63	36
OTHER RETURNEES FROM YOUR ETHNIC GROUP	YES	53	46
	NO	62	38
RETURNEES FROM OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS	YES	55	44
	NO	60	40
NEIGHBORS FROM YOUR ETHNIC GROUP	YES	55	44
	NO	59	40
NEIGHBORS FROM OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS	YES	56	43
	NO	57	43
NEIGHBORS FROM OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTRY	YES	56	43
	NO	57	43
WEALTHY NEIGHBORS	YES	55	44
	NO	60	40
IMPOVERISHED NEIGHBORS	YES	53	46
	NO	78	22

Fig 66. Q-34. I am going to list a number of statements about your neighborhood. Please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with each of them. f) I have felt discrimination from others in my neighborhood, because of my language or the way I speak. D-9. Do the following types of people live in your neighborhood? a) Your immediate family. b) Your extended family. c) Other returnees from your ethnic group. d)

Returnees from other ethnic groups. e) Neighbors from your ethnic group. f) Neighbors from other ethnic groups. g) Neighbors from other parts of the country. h) Wealthy neighbors. i) Impoverished neighbors.

Notably more respondents in Kandahar (86.8%) reported experiencing discrimination because of their language and way of speaking, compared to the lowest, those in Kabul (37.5%). Within provinces, experiences of discrimination is more pronounced in rural than urban areas (58.2% and 50.6% respectively), with a notable difference observed in Herat (rural: 62.3%, urban: 28.0%). However, in Kabul (rural: 32.1%, urban: 47.2%) and Nangarhar (rural: 58.8%, and urban: 72.9%) the relationship is reversed.

EXPERIENCE OF LINGUISTIC DISCRIMINATION, BY PROVINCE AND STRATA




Fig 67. Q-34. I am going to list a number of statements about your neighborhood. Please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with each of them. f) I have felt discrimination from others in my neighborhood, because of my language or the way I speak. (Percent who strongly or somewhat agree). M-4b. CSO geographic code. M-3. Province.

9. CHANGE IN EXPERIENCE OVER TIME

The following section analyzes how returnee integration and perceptions vary with time. A key screening question for all returnees is whether they had returned to Afghanistan within the past five years. Among returnees surveyed in 2018 and 2019, a majority returned between 2015–2017.

Those who returned to Afghanistan in 2019 were more likely to cite poor economic condition in the host country as a push factor for their return than those who had returned the year before (21.8% and 15.6% respectively). Conversely, those who had returned in 2018 were more likely to say deported/forcibly removed from the host country (31.6%) than those who had returned in 2019 (26.4%). The number of those citing family reunification as a reason for return, has increased from 18.6% in 2014 to 23.4% in 2019.

REASONS FOR RETURN, BY YEAR

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
	%	%	%	%	%	%
UNEMPLOYMENT IN HOST COUNTRY	27	30	33	34	33	34
DEPORTED/FORCIBLY REMOVED FROM HOST COUNTRY	28	31	33	31	32	26
DON'T KNOW	20	22	18	22	29	25
FAMILY REUNIFICATION	19	19	20	20	21	23
POOR ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN THE HOST COUNTRY	17	16	18	17	16	22
I LOVE MY COUNTRY (PATRIOTISM)	26	17	16	20	12	12
COULD NOT GET VISA/PERMANENT RESIDENCY IN HOST COUNTRY	14	13	12	14	19	19
PEOPLE OF THE HOST COUNTRY WERE UNWELCOMING	16	14	16	14	14	12
POOR SECURITY CONDITIONS IN THE HOST COUNTRY	8	12	13	9	6	9
PEOPLE ARE BEING TREATED WELL IN AFGHANISTAN	6	7	5	7	6	3
SECURITY SITUATION IN AFGHANISTAN IMPROVED	4	5	5	3	2	2
ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN AFGHANISTAN IMPROVED	5	3	3	2	2	2
BECAUSE EDUCATION HAS RETURNED TO AFGHANISTAN	4	3	2	2	3	4
REFUGEES ARE BEING FORCIBLY TAKEN TO WAR IN THE HOST COUNTRY	4	3	2	2	2	1
I WAS ADDICTED TO DRUGS IN THE HOST COUNTRY	2	2	2	1	2	1

Fig 68. Q-2. *In which month and year did you return to Afghanistan? If you have returned multiple times, please list the date of your most recent return only. Q2c.* **Why did you return?**

Combining the 2018 and 2019 *Survey* responses, those who returned home in 2019 were less likely to say poor security conditions in the host country than those who had returned in 2013 (9.3% versus 16.8%). Those who returned in 2019 were also less likely to say people of the host country were unwelcoming compared to those who had returned in 2013 (12.1% versus 25.7%). Recent returnees were more likely to cite poor economic condition in the host country (for instance, 2018: 22.0%, and 2019: 21.8% versus 2013: 16.1%).

Among the methods of financing their trip home, savings was a more common response among those who had returned in 2019 (57.2%) when compared against those who returned in 2014 (52.2%). Loans from family and friends were frequently cited among those who had returned earlier (2013: 22.2%, and 2019; 16.8%). Sale of property as means of financing the trip had decreased from 6.0% in 2013 to 2.7% in 2019. A larger percentage of those returning in 2019 (70.2%) are reported to have used savings when compared against those who returned in 2014 (59.8%).

SOURCE OF FINANCING FOR RETURN TO AFGHANISTAN, BY YEAR

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
	%	%	%	%	%	%
SAVINGS	52	52	53	51	53	57
LOAN FROM FAMILY OR FRIEND	22	24	22	22	19	17
SUPPORT FROM UNHCR	5	6	7	8	8	7
GIFT/SUPPORT FROM FAMILY	6	6	4	5	4	6
SUPPORT FROM IOM	7	4	4	4	5	6
PAID FOR BY EMPLOYER	0	1	2	2	2	3
SELL PROPERTY	6	7	7	6	7	3

Fig 69. Q-2. *In which month and year did you return to Afghanistan? If you have returned multiple times, please list the date of your most recent return only. Q-13. How did you finance your trip back to Afghanistan? (includes SAR 2018 and 2019 data)*

Respondents who returned in 2018 and 2019 were less likely (11.4%, and 9.8%) to have earned formal education while living abroad than those who returned earlier (2014: 17.6% and 2015: 14.7%).

EDUCATION RECEIVED ABROAD, BY YEAR

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
	%	%	%	%	%	%
YES	18	15	14	12	11	10
NO	82	85	86	88	89	90

Fig 70. Q-2. *In which month and year did you return to Afghanistan? If you have returned multiple times, please list the date of your most recent return only. Q-15a.* Have you received any formal education while abroad? (includes SAR 2018 and 2019 data)

Survey findings show that those who had returned most recently were notably less likely to have received any type of support than those who returned earlier (for instance, 45.3% of returnees in 2019 and 57.3% of those who had returned in 2014 said they had received support).³⁰ Those who returned home recently were also somewhat more likely to say the employment situation had gotten worse for their households (2019: 57.2%) than those who returned earlier (2014: 54.1%).

With regard to major problems facing women, those who returned most recently were also very likely to mention unemployment (38.1%), domestic violence (13.2%), insecurity (11.5%), and presence of forced marriage (4.1%), compared to those had returned earlier (for instance 2014: 33.7% unemployment, 5.8% domestic violence, 2.4% insecurity, and 4.8% presence of forced marriage).

PROBLEMS FACING WOMEN IN RETURNEES' HOUSEHOLD, BY YEAR

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
	%	%	%	%	%	%
UNEMPLOYMENT	34	34	31	32	40	38
LACK OF EDUCATION	27	33	34	33	33	28
DON'T KNOW	32	29	28	26	25	26
ECONOMIC PROBLEMS	28	20	23	24	24	27
LACK OF HEALTH CARE	16	19	17	18	13	12
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	6	6	10	8	11	13
INSECURITY	2	4	6	7	10	11

THERE ARE NO WOMEN RIGHTS	3	4	5	6	6	4
PRESENCE OF FORCED MARRIAGE	5	4	5	5	3	4
LACK OF LITERACY COURSES	5	4	4	3	3	3
LACK OF SHELTER/LAND	4	4	3	2	2	5

Fig 71. Q-2. In which month and year did you return to Afghanistan? If you have returned multiple times, please list the date of your most recent return only. **Q-36.** What, if anything, is the biggest problem facing women in your household today? What is the next biggest problem?

Respondents who returned recently were also likely to mention neighborhood (25.1%) as a place where they had their most challenging experience, more than those who returned in earlier in 2014 (19.8%). Inversely those who mentioned “at home” have reduced from 18.6% to 22.8% in the same period.

SITE OF RETURNEES’ MOST CHALLENGING EXPERIENCE, BY YEAR

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
	%	%	%	%	%	%
DON'T KNOW	22	24	20	20	22	21
RETURNEES CAMP/SHELTER	20	20	23	22	19	21
NEIGHBORHOOD	20	18	18	21	22	25
BAZAAR/MARKETPLACE	20	14	15	16	19	19
WORKPLACE	15	13	15	15	16	17
AT HOME	19	17	14	11	14	12
HOSPITAL/CLINIC	11	10	9	11	14	10
GOVERNMENT OFFICES	8	7	7	8	5	5
SCHOOL	6	5	6	6	7	5

Fig 72. Q-2. In which month and year did you return to Afghanistan? If you have returned multiple times, please list the date of your most recent return only. **Q-37.** Since coming back to Afghanistan, where would you say you have had the most challenging experiences for your family?

Those who returned in recent years were also less likely (2018: 39.4%, 2019: 32.2%) to say the living conditions would improve for their households if they continued to stay in their current location, compared to those who returned earlier (2014: 45.2%, and 2015: 40.9%).


Of those who said their living condition would deteriorate in the future if they continued to stay at their present location, those who arrived in 2019 more often mentioned unemployment (56.5%), insecurity (40.4%), and lack of shelter (21.1%) as reasons, compared to those who arrived in 2014 (unemployment: 43.2%, insecurity: 16.6%, and lack of shelter: 18.9%). On the contrary, those who arrived in 2014, more frequently cited worse economy (27.6%), and government is weak (25.8%) than those who returned in 2019 (worse economy: 16.9%, and government is weak: 12.8%).

REASONS FOR PESSIMISM, BY YEAR

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
	%	%	%	%	%	%
THERE IS UNEMPLOYMENT	43	46	52	47	54	57
THERE IS INSECURITY	17	30	32	25	38	40
WORSE ECONOMY	28	30	24	30	24	17
GOVERNMENT IS WEAK	26	21	21	24	21	13
EVERYTHING IS TOO EXPENSIVE	18	14	16	19	14	11
LACK OF SHELTER	19	17	16	14	14	21
LACK OF ELECTRICITY	19	13	14	17	16	17
DON'T KNOW	18	16	14	15	13	6
LACK OF SCHOOL	6	7	4	5	3	8
LACK OF HEALTHCARE	7	4	4	4	3	8

Fig 73: Q-2. In which month and year did you return to Afghanistan? If you have returned multiple times, please list the date of your most recent return only. **Q-47a.** In general, in the future, if you continue to stay in your present location, do you feel your living conditions for your family would improve, deteriorate, or remain the same? (Percent who say it'll deteriorate). **Q-47b.** Why do you say that?

ENDNOTES

1. Afghanistan Voluntary Repatriation Update”, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), December, 2019, Retrieved from: <https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/download/74038>
2. Thomas Ruttig, & Jelena Bjelica, “Voluntary and Forced Returns to Afghanistan in 2016/17: Trends, statistics and experiences”, Afghan Analysts Network (AAN), May 19, 2017, Retrieved from: <https://www.afghanistan-analysts.org/en/reports/migration/voluntary-and-forced-returns-to-afghanistan-in-201617-trends-statistics-and-experiences/>
3. “Escaping War: Where to next? The Challenges of IDP Protection in Afghanistan”, Samuel Hall, Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) and International Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC), January, 24, 2018, Retrieved from: <https://www.nrc.no/resources/reports/escaping-war-where-to-next-the-challenges-of-idp-protection-in-afghanistan/>
4. Belquis Ahmadi & Sadaf Lakhani, “The Forces Return of Afghan Refugees and Implications for Stability”, United States Institute of Peace (USIP), January 13, 2016, Retrieved from: <https://www.usip.org/publications/2016/01/forced-return-afghan-refugees-and-implications-stability>
5. 
6. “Comprehensive Profile of Afghan Returnees”, International Organisation for Migration (IOM), 2016, Retrieved from: <https://migration.iom.int/system/tdf/reports/CMFS%20Afghans%20Returnees.pdf?file=1&type=node&id=6536>
7. Nicolle Hervé, “Inclusion of Afghan refugees in the national education systems of Iran and Pakistan”, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), 2018, Retrieved from: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000266055>
8. Ibid
9. Ibid
10. Ibid
11. Ibid
12. “Return of Undocumented Afghans: Weekly Situation Report 15-28 December 2019”, International Organisation for Migration (IOM), 2019, Retrieved from: https://afghanistan.iom.int/sites/default/files/Reports/iom_afghanistan-return_of_undocumented_afghans_situation_report_15-28_dec_2019_002.pdf
13. “Afghanistan: Fact Sheet”, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), December 31, 2019, Retrieved from: <http://reporting.unhcr.org/sites/default/files/UNHCR%20Afghanistan%20Fact%20Sheet%20-%20December%202019.pdf>
14. “Country Fact Sheet: Afghanistan”, International Organisation for Migration (IOM), 2019, Retrieved from: https://files.returningfromgermany.de/files/CFS_2019_Afghanistan_EN_.pdf
15. “Returning to what? The Challenges Displaced Afghans Face in Securing Durable Solutions”, Samuel Hall and Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), 2018, Retrieved From: https://www.nrc.no/globalassets/pdf/nrc-policy_brief-return-screen1.pdf

16. Ibid
17. IOM Displacement Tracker Matrix, https://displacement.iom.int/system/tdf/reports/AFG_DTM_June2019_District_Total_Inflow_Overview_By_District%26Villages.pdf?file=1&type=node&cid=6807
18. Haroon et al. (2019)
19. Ibid
20. Ibid
21. Samuel Hall and Norwegian Refugee Council, *Returning to What? The Challenges Displaced Afghans Face in Securing Durable Solutions* (2018)
22. "Returnee and Internally Displaced Persons Monitoring Report," The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), May 2018, Retrieved from: <https://data2.unhcr.org/fr/documents/download/64059>
23. Ibid
24. "Afghanistan Living Conditions Survey 2016-17", Islamic Republic of Afghanistan- Central Statistics Organization, 2018, Retrieved from: <https://washdata.org/sites/default/files/documents/reports/2018-07/Afghanistan%20ALCS%202016-17%20Analysis%20report.pdf>
25. UNHCR, *Returnee and Internally Displaced Persons Monitoring Report* (2018)
26. Samuel Hall and Norwegian Refugee Council, *Returning to What? The Challenges Displaced Afghans Face in Securing Durable Solutions* (2018)
27. Ibid.
28. Kamminga, Jorrit; Zaki, Akram, "Returning to Fragility: Exploring the link between conflict and returnees in Afghanistan", OXFAM, January 2018, Retrieved from: https://oi-files-d8-prod.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/file_attachments/rr-returning-fragility-afghanistan-310118-en.pdf. For more on this, see Fazl Rahman Muzhary. 2017. *Resettling Nearly Half a Million Afghans in Nangrahar: The consequences of the mass return of refugees.* <https://www.afghanistan-analysts.org/en/reports/migration/resettling-nearly-half-a-million-afghans-in-nangrahar-the-consequences-of-the-mass-return-of-refugees/>
29. UNHCR, *Returnee and Internally Displaced Persons Monitoring Report* (2018)
30. Support here includes any assistance they received with followings; their housing, food, employment/jobs, health care, cash/loan, training, or other help such as clothes, kitchen material etc.



گورنمنٹ ہائی اسکول
گورنمنٹ ہائی اسکول

4.2 HOST COMMUNITY PERCEPTIONS & EXPERIENCES

This chapter explores perceptions regarding reintegration experiences and challenges from the perspective of 3,971 host community members residing in Kandahar, Herat, Balkh, Nangarhar and Kabul (20.0% each respectively). An equal percentage of host community members were interviewed across the five provinces, of which 73.0% were rural and 27.0% urban overall. Respondents were 53.0% male and 47.0% female. Nearly half (47.4%) of host community respondents had no education and 47.0% had some formal education.

HOST COMMUNITY, BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE

	RURAL	URBAN
	%	%
KABUL	64	36
NANGARHAR	90	10
BALKH	77	23
HERAT	62	38
KANDAHAR	71	29

Fig. 74: M-3 Province. M-4b.CSO Geographic Code.

This year the *Survey* asked host community respondents about their professions that generate income. Overall, 17.1% reported that they are unemployed, 20.2% said housewife, 9.4% said they work in a kiosk or shop, 9.0% reported they farmed their own land, 7.5% reported tailor, 7.3% mentioned mason/brickmaker/bricklayer, 4.2% said handicrafts and 4.2% reported that they are taxi drivers. Urban respondents are significantly more likely to report that they are unemployed than rural respondents (22.9% vs. 15.0%) respectively. By gender, the data shows that the unemployment rate is higher among females (25.7%) than males (9.5%).

TYPE OF PROFESSION THAT GENERATES MONEY, BY STRATA AND GENDER




Fig. 75: Q-21. Now I need to ask some questions about the members of your household who currently work or used to work. Please tell us how they are related to you and their age, as well as their profession or job and whether they contribute to your household income at present. (self).

Among those who reported that they have a job, in a follow up question, the *Survey* asked them how difficult it was to get the job. Overall, 44.7% reported that it was very or somewhat difficult, while 11.7% reported not very difficult, and a small proportion, 5.4%, indicated that it was easy.

The *Survey* asked host community respondents about their ownership of different properties. Overall the findings show that the majority (89.8%) of host community households have at least one mobile phone, 65% have a television, 50.8% a bicycle, 44.0% a motorcycle, 43.4% own livestock, 36.3% own land(s) and 16.0% own a car. Significant differences emerged by strata.

OWNERSHIP OF HOUSEHOLD ASSETS, BY STRATA

		RURAL	URBAN	OVERALL
		%	%	%
BICYCLE	ZERO	51	44	49
	AT LEAST ONE	49	56	51

MOTORCYCLE	ZERO	57	55	56
	AT LEAST ONE	44	46	44
CAR	ZERO	85	81	84
	AT LEAST ONE	15	19	16
TV	ZERO	42	15	35
	AT LEAST ONE	58	85	65
JERIBS OF LANDS	ZERO	56	85	64
	AT LEAST ONE	44	15	36
LIVESTOCK	ZERO	46	84	57
	AT LEAST ONE	54	16	43
MOBILE PHONE	ZERO	12	5	10
	AT LEAST ONE	88	95	90

Fig. 76: D-10. How many of the following items does your household currently own? a) Bicycle, b) Motorcycle, c) Car, d) TV h) Jeribs of Land, i) Livestock (not poultry), j) Mobile phone.

1. PERCEPTIONS OF RETURNEES

KEY QUESTIONS

Q-4. Overall, how comfortable would you say you are interacting with them?

Q-5. Why are you uncomfortable interacting with them?

A significant number of Afghans are returning to Afghanistan with the expectation that support programs will provide basic needs support, financial support and employment placement. This pressure is at a time when Afghanistan is still relatively weak, experiencing high levels of poverty and clashes,¹ and with more people returning to Afghanistan tensions are likely to grow. Reintegration of returnees may also have direct or indirect impact on the different aspects of lives of host communities. For example, the influx of people can further strain already high demands for basic needs like food, water, electricity, and employment opportunities amongst others.²

The influx of returnees also impacts the limited resources for host community members who also require assistance.³ According to the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, almost a quarter of the population will need humanitarian assistance in 2020.⁴

In order to understand the impact of returnees on the host communities or society at-large and their

living conditions, host community respondents living in IOM identified returnee communities were interviewed using an essential screening question: “Do you personally know a returnee who has come back to Afghanistan?” Only those respondents who acknowledged knowing a returnee were interviewed. And among those, in their first response, 60.0% said that the returnee was a relative and 40.0% indicated that the returnee was unrelated.⁵

When asked about their neighborhood demographic, over half of respondents said that they lived among returnees from the same ethnic group (64.2%), and a similar proportion (64.3%) said they lived among different ethnic groups.

A greater number (84.2%) reported they are living among poor neighbors, and 64.5% said they are living among wealthy neighbors.

In another question, host community respondents were asked where the returnee had returned from.⁶ Over half of respondents said that returnee had come from Pakistan (53.9%, up from 49.1% in 2018), followed by Iran (35.0%) slightly lower than 2018 (38.1%), followed by Turkey (5.6%) and Germany (1.7%).

Not surprisingly, and given the geographical relationships, the majority of host community respondents in Nangarhar (94.9%), followed by Kandahar (72.6%) and Kabul (62.5%) reported returnees had come from Pakistan. Respondents in Herat (69.3%) and Balkh (51.2%) were more likely to report that returnees returned from Iran.

COUNTRY RETURNED FROM, BY PROVINCE




Fig.77: Q-2. Which country did they return from?

The majority (97.0%) of host community respondents reported feeling comfortable interacting with returnees, while only 2.5% said they felt uncomfortable. Feelings of comfort are consistent with the 96.4% reported in 2018.

Host community respondents who were related to a returnee are more likely to say they felt very comfortable interacting with a returnee than those who are not related (74.4% vs. 66.2%).

Afghan males (73.3%) are more likely to report feeling very comfortable while interacting with returnees than female respondents (68.7%).

There is also a positive correlation between age and level of comfort, with respondents 55+ years of age feeling more comfortable than younger respondents aged 18 to 25 years (82.9% compared to 71.1%).

Variations also emerged by strata; respondents living in rural areas (72.5%) were less likely to report feeling very comfortable interacting with returnees than host community respondents living in urban areas (67.5%).

By province, host community respondents in Kabul (83.2%) and Nangarhar (80.2%) were more likely to say they felt very comfortable interacting with a returnee while respondents in Kandahar (55.1%) and Herat (63.5%) were least likely to report feeling very comfortable when interacting with a returnee.

The reasons host community members reported feeling uncomfortable interacting with a returnee(s) are as follows; linguistic problems (23.8%), they bully us (17.0%), don't know (vol.) (15.3%), I don't know them (15.2%), cultural differences (6.1%), they are drug addicts (5.6%), they are corrupt (5.4%) and they have economic problems (3.3%).

Survey data shows a positive correlation between the level of comfort and working with a returnee in the same workplace. For instance, those who say they were very comfortable interacting with a returnee were more likely to say they strongly agree to work with a returnee in the same work place (66.0%). Those who say they felt very uncomfortable when interacting with a returnee were less likely to say they strongly agree working with a returnee in the same workplace (25.9%).

COMFORT WITH RETURNEE IN THE WORKPLACE




Fig. 78: Q-4 Overall, how comfortable would you say you are interacting with them? **Q-8.** How much would you favor or oppose each of the following? Would you say that you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose each of them? Work with a returnee in the same workplace.

2. PROVIDING/OFFERING ASSISTANCE TO RETURNEES

KEY QUESTION

Q-6a. Have they ever approached your household for any help? If yes, what were they asking for?

An Afghan study shows that returnees often felt that ‘no one helps them’ even if they have received assistance. Some returnees based their return decision on inaccurate information and later regretted doing so; they also may have had unrealistic expectations of a higher level of aid than they received upon their return to Afghanistan.⁷

To understand whether returnees have approached their neighbors or host community members for support, host community members were asked if a returnee had ever requested assistance. The findings show that in 2019, 21.6% of host community members were approached for help, slightly lower than in 2018 (24.4%). In a follow-up question, the most common request was for food assistance (27.4%), up from 22.6% in 2018. The second and third most commonly requested methods of support was financial aid (19.9%) and home appliances (12.4%). The remaining 8.5% asked for house/land, 3.5% for loan, 3.5% for clothes, 2.3% for water and electricity, 2.2% for seeking advice and 2.0% for job/work.

PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO A RETURNEE, BY YEAR




Fig. 79: Q-6a. Have they ever approached your household for any help? If yes, what were they asking for?

An analysis by strata shows that host community respondents living in urban areas (25.4%) were more likely than those in rural areas (20.2%) to report that returnees had been approached for help.

TYPE OF SUPPORT REQUESTED, BY STRATA WITHIN EACH PROVINCE

	KABUL/ RURAL	NANGARHAR/ RURAL	BALKH/ RURAL	HERAT/ RURAL	KANDAHAR/ RURAL	KABUL/ URBAN	NANGARHAR/ URBAN	BALKH/ URBAN	HERAT/ URBAN	KANDAHAR/ URBAN
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
FOOD STUFFS	23	34	39	32	19	18	27	35	24	26
HOME APPLIANCES	14	9	7	10	19	14	7	18	14	10
FINANCIAL AID	17	14	27	23	14	27	13	26	26	18
CLOTHES	3	4	4	2	4	3	0	2	4	7
SEEKING ADVICE	2	1	0	2	6	3	0	0	4	1

JOB/WORK	1	3	1	5	2	0	0	0	1	4
HOUSE/LAND	9	9	13	8	10	9	7	2	9	3
TRANSPORTATION	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	4
HEALTH CARE SERVICES	1	1	1	2	3	0	13	3	3	1
WATER & ELECTRICITY	1	0	0	0	7	0	13	0	1	9
LOAN	3	7	0	3	4	3	0	3	1	7
EDUCATION	1	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	1
TO GET IDENTITY CARD	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
FUEL	1	1	6	3	0	0	0	6	0	0
ASSISTANCE IN BUILDING	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
TO BORROW AGRICULTURE	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
DON'T KNOW	18	15	1	8	10	21	20	5	11	7

Fig. 80: Q-6a. *Have they ever approached your household for any help? If yes, what were they asking for?*

TYPES OF SUPPORT REQUESTED, BY STRATA

	RURAL	URBAN
FOOD STUFFS	29	25
HOME APPLIANCES	12	13
FINANCIAL AID	18	23
CLOTHES	3	4
SEEKING ADVICE	2	2
JOB/WORK	2	2
HOUSE/LAND	9	6
TRANSPORTATION	1	2
HEALTH CARE SERVICES	2	2
WATER & ELECTRICITY	2	4
LOAN	4	4

Fig. 81: Q-6a. *Have they ever approached your household for any help? If yes, what were they asking for?*

3. RETURNEES' IMPACT ON NEIGHBORHOOD

KEY QUESTION

Q-7. *Thinking about returnees settling in your area, what type of effect do you think they have on the following areas in your neighborhood? a) Safety, b) Crime, c) Culture, d) Availability of job opportunities, e) Cleanness and maintenance of public areas, f) Government services (such as clinics, schools and universities), g) Anything else?*

SAFETY AND CRIME

Studies have demonstrated mixed findings, while some show host communities generally have a positive view of returnees,^{8,9} other studies indicate that returnees had difficulties with the host communities.¹⁰

In order to understand the impact of returnees on host communities, respondents were asked if a returnee had a positive, negative or no effect on the safety of their area. Over half of respondents (53.3%) said, “positive impact”, 14.7% say “negative impact”, and 16.2% said returnees had no effect on the safety and security of their area. In addition, 15.1% said it would depend on who is returning and where they are returning from.

By strata, urban host community respondents (50.8%) were less likely to say returnees had a positive impact on the safety and security of their area than rural respondents (54.2%).

By gender, male respondents (55.6%) were more likely to indicate that returnees had a positive impact on the safety and security of their area than female respondents (50.7%). There are no differences by employment status and educational levels.

By province, there are notable differences. Respondents in Nangarhar (78.1%), followed by Kandahar (55.2%), and Balkh (53.1%), are more likely to report that a returnee had a positive effect on safety in their areas when compared to respondents in Kabul (40.9%) and Herat (39.2%).

RETURNEE EFFECT ON SAFETY OF HOST COMMUNITY, BY YEAR AND PROVINCE

		KABUL	NANGARHAR	BALKH	HERAT	KANDA HAR	OVERALL
		%	%	%	%	%	%
2018	POSITIVE EFFECT	38	76	64	52	46	55
	NEGATIVE EFFECT	12	12	5	13	32	15
	DEPENDS ON WHO IS RETURNING & WHERE THEY ARE RETURNING FROM	13	8	12	15	15	12
	NO EFFECT	37	4	19	19	6	17
	REFUSED	0	0	0	0	0	0
	DON'T KNOW	1	0	0	1	1	1
2019	POSITIVE EFFECT	41	78	53	39	55	53
	NEGATIVE EFFECT	18	5	7	16	27	15
	DEPENDS ON WHO IS RETURNING & WHERE THEY ARE RETURNING FROM	15	7	18	25	9	15
	NO EFFECT	24	10	21	18	9	16
	DON'T KNOW	2	0	1	1	0	1

Fig. 82: Q-7. Thinking about returnees settling in your area, what type of effect do you think they have on the following areas in your neighborhood? Safety.

Host community respondents were also asked about the effect of returnees on crime in their area. More than a third (35.7%) reported returnees have a positive impact, 26.6% reported returnees have a negative impact, and 19.0% said “no effect”. Less than one fifth, 17.8% reported that it depends on who is returning or where they are returning from.

**RETURNEE EFFECT ON CRIME IN HOST COMMUNITIES,
BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE**

		KABUL	NANGARHAR	BALKH	HERAT	KANDAHAR
		%	%	%	%	%
RURAL	POSITIVE EFFECT	24	62	33	32	38
	NEGATIVE EFFECT	24	14	16	26	43
	DEPENDS ON WHO IS RETURNING & WHERE THEY ARE RETURNING FROM	20	7	26	30	11
	NO EFFECT	30	17	25	12	9
URBAN	POSITIVE EFFECT	41	78	53	39	55
	NEGATIVE EFFECT	18	5	7	16	27
	DEPENDS ON WHO IS RETURNING & WHERE THEY ARE RETURNING FROM	15	7	18	25	9
	NO EFFECT	24	10	21	18	9
	DON'T KNOW	2	0	1	1	0

Fig. 83: Q-7. Thinking about returnees settling in your area, what type of effect do you think they have on the following areas in your neighborhood? Crime.

Host community respondents living in urban areas (34.1%) are significantly more likely to say returnees had a negative effect on crime compared to those who live in rural areas (23.8%).

By province, respondents in Kandahar (42.3%) are significantly more likely to say returnees had a negative impact on crime compared to respondents living elsewhere.

RETURNEE AS NEGATIVE EFFECT ON CRIME IN HOST COMMUNITIES, BY PROVINCE AND YEAR




Fig. 84: Q7b. Thinking about returnees settling in your area, what type of effect do you think they have on the following areas in your neighborhood? Crime (Percent who say negative effect).

CULTURE, CLEANLINESS AND MAINTENANCE OF PUBLIC AREAS

The Survey asked host community members about the impact of returnees on the communities' overall culture,¹¹ cleanliness, and maintenance of public areas. The findings show that host community members mostly perceived returnees to have a positive effect on culture (44.1%).

Only 22.1% believe that returnees had a negative effect on the culture of host communities. Furthermore, 17.7% said no effect, and a similar proportion, 15.5%, said it would depend on who the returnee is and where they are returning from.

RETURNEES AS NEGATIVE EFFECT ON CULTURE

By location, respondents in urban areas are slightly more likely to say that returnees had a negative impact on culture compared to rural respondents (urban 23.4% compared to rural 21.6%).

By province, respondents in Kandahar (31.0%) followed by respondents in Kabul (27.3%) are more likely to say that returnees had a negative effect on culture, while respondents in Nangarhar (13.7%) and Balkh (14.3%) are less likely to say returnees had a negative effect on culture.

CLEANLINESS AND MAINTENANCE

Regarding cleanliness and maintenance of public areas, less than half of respondents (42.0%) reported that returnees had a positive effect on cleanliness and maintenance, while 21.7% said that returnees had a negative effect on cleanliness and maintenance, 18.5% said no effect, and 16.7% indicated it would depend on who the returnee is and where they are coming from.

There is a small variation between urban and rural respondents; those who live in urban areas are slightly more likely to report that returnees have a negative effect on the cleanliness and maintenance of public areas than rural respondents (urban 24.2% compared to rural 20.8%).

By province, host community respondents living in Kabul (33.8%) were most likely to report that returnees have a negative effect on cleanliness and maintenance of the public areas compared to respondents living elsewhere.

By level of education, those who have 12+ years of formal education (26.2%) were most likely to say that returnees have negative impact on cleanliness and maintenance of public area compared to those who have no formal education. (21.0%) There are no significant differences by age.

RETURNEE EFFECT ON CLEANLINESS AND MAINTENANCE OF PUBLIC AREAS, BY YEAR

		KABUL	NANGARHAR	BALKH	HERAT	KANDAHAR	OVERALL
		%	%	%	%	%	%
2018	POSITIVE EFFECT	35	66	53	41	35	46
	NEGATIVE EFFECT	26	25	14	25	34	25
	DEPENDS ON WHO IS RETURNING & WHERE THEY ARE RETURNING FROM	13	3	11	15	17	12
	NO EFFECT	26	5	21	18	13	17
2019	POSITIVE EFFECT	29	56	40	44	40	42
	NEGATIVE EFFECT	34	13	13	18	31	22
	DEPENDS ON WHO IS RETURNING & WHERE THEY ARE RETURNING FROM	16	10	22	17	20	17
	NO EFFECT	19	21	24	21	9	19

Fig. 85: Q7. Thinking about returnees settling in your area, what type of effect do you think they have on the following areas in your neighborhood?... Cleanness and maintenance of public areas.

AVAILABILITY OF JOB OPPORTUNITIES AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES

Unemployment, poor economy and poverty in Afghanistan have increased over the years.¹² Poverty has also entrenched links with employment and economy;¹³ indeed, as many argue, the reintegration of returnees in the community will strain an already weak job market. Similar findings are also noted in the *Survey of the Afghan People* conducted by The Asia Foundation which indicated that more than half of Afghans (55.0%) believe that their employment opportunities have gotten worse over the past year.¹⁴

To understand the implications of this among host community respondents, the *Survey* asked host community members about their perception of the impact of the returnees on employment opportunities. Overall, 34.5% reported that returnees had a positive effect on job opportunities, while 31.4% cited a negative effect, 19.7% said no effect and 13.5% said it depends on who is returning or where they are returning from. By province, respondents in Kabul (51.2%) were more likely to say returnees had a negative effect on the availability of jobs followed by Herat (35.9%), Kandahar (31.5%), Balkh (19.5%), and the lowest is in Nangarhar (18.8%).

By strata, respondents in urban areas are more likely to say that returnees have a negative effect on employment opportunities compared to rural respondents (36.6% compared to 29.4%).

RETURNEES EFFECT ON JOB OPPORTUNITIES, BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE

		KABUL	NANGARHAR	BALKH	HERAT	KANDAHAR	OVERALL
		%	%	%	%	%	%
RURAL	POSITIVE EFFECT	20	49	35	35	37	36
	NEGATIVE EFFECT	48	18	19	36	32	29
	DEPENDS ON WHO IS RETURNING & WHERE THEY ARE RETURNING FROM	5	7	26	15	20	15
	NO EFFECT	26	25	20	14	10	19
URBAN	POSITIVE EFFECT	22	48	38	16	46	30
	NEGATIVE EFFECT	56	23	22	36	30	37
	DEPENDS ON WHO IS RETURNING & WHERE THEY ARE RETURNING FROM	6	7	15	8	15	10
	NO EFFECT	14	20	24	36	8	21

Fig. 86: Q7. Thinking about returnees settling in your area, what type of effect do you think they have on the following areas in your neighborhood?... Availability of job opportunities.

By gender, male respondents (32.9%) are slightly more likely to say that returnees have a negative impact on employment opportunities compared to female respondents (29.7%).

The level of education of host community respondents is negatively correlated with their understanding of the impact of returnees on employment opportunities. For example, those with a university education were more likely to say returnees have a negative impact on employment opportunities compared to those with 1–6 years of formal education (36.7% compared to 32.2%).

RETURNEES EFFECT ON JOB OPPORTUNITIES BY YEAR




Fig. 87: Q7b. Thinking about returnees settling in your area, what type of effect do you think they have on the following areas in your neighborhood?... Availability of job opportunities (Percent who say negative effect).

Figure 88 demonstrates *Survey* findings of host community respondents living in urban areas compared to those living in rural areas. The former more concerned with returnee impact on different aspects of integration, especially on job opportunities and crime.

RETURNEES AS NEGATIVE EFFECT ON HOST COMMUNITIES, BY STRATA




Fig. 88: Q-7. Thinking about returnees settling in your area, what type of effect do you think they have on the following areas in your neighborhood? a) Safety, b) Crime, c) Culture, d) Availability of job opportunities, e) Cleanness and maintenance of public areas, f) Government services (such as clinics, schools and universities), (Percent who say negative effect).

When asked about the impact of returnees on available government services such as clinic, school and universities, 39.0% reported a positive impact, a decrease from 42.5% in 2018. One fifth (20.7%), reported returnees have a negative effect on available government resources and one quarter (25.1%) said no effect at all, while 13.8% said it depends on who is returning or where they are returning from.

By province, respondents in Kandahar (32.2%) and Kabul (30.7%) were more likely to say returnees have a negative effect on government services, while respondents in Balkh (11.1%) and Nangarhar (12.7%) were least likely to say returnees have a negative impact on government services. There are no significant differences between rural and urban respondents, employment status or income.

RETURNEES EFFECT ON GOVERNMENT SERVICES, BY PROVINCE




Fig. 89: Q-7. Thinking about returnees settling in your area, what type of effect do you think they have on the following areas in your neighborhood? f) Government services (such as clinics, schools and universities).

The perception that returnees have a positive effective on availability of government services (such as clinics, schools and universities) increases with age. Host community respondents aged 18–25 were less likely to report that returnees have a positive impact on government services such as clinic, school and universities compared to older respondents 55+ (36.7% vs. 47.4%) respectively.

RETURNEE EFFECT ON GOVERNMENT SERVICES, BY AGE




Fig. 90: Q-7. Thinking about returnees settling in your area, what type of effect do you think they have on the following areas in your neighborhood? f) Government services (such as clinics, schools and universities). (Percent who say positive effect).

4. ACCEPTANCE OF & TRUSTING RETURNEES IN THE COMMUNITY

KEY QUESTION

Q-8. How much would you favor or oppose each of the following? Would you say that you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose each of them? a) A returnee moving next door to you, b) Your children/sibling playing with returnees' children, c) Your children/sibling receiving education from a returnee teacher in school/university, d) Work with a returnee in the same workplace.

RETURNEES MOVING NEXT DOOR

To better understand the acceptance of returnees in the host community, the *Survey* asked host community respondents whether they favored or opposed a returnee moving next door to them. Overall, 94.2% said they strongly or somewhat favored this idea, and only 5.7% said they strongly or somewhat oppose the idea, consistent with last year's findings of 95.5% and 4.4% respectively.

By province, respondents in Herat (10.6%) were more likely to say they oppose the idea of a returnee moving next to door to them, followed by Kandahar (7.6%), Kabul (5.6%), Balkh (3.0%), and Nangarhar (1.5%).

Some variation also emerges by gender with males (70.8%) slightly more likely to say they strongly agree with a returnee moving next door than female respondents (66.6%).

By age, respondents aged 18–25 (69.7%) were less likely to strongly agree with the idea of moving a returnee next to door to them compared to older (55+ years old) respondents (80.0%).

Among those who opposed a returnee moving next door, a follow-up open-ended question asked about the reasons. The most frequently cited reasons are that returnees are “creating security problems” per 29.9%, notably up from 20.4% in 2018. The next most frequent responses include; “I don’t know him/her” (28.2%), he/she is rude (17.8%), “they are addicted to drugs” (13.8%), and, linguistic problems (6.9%).

Urban respondents (31.9%) are slightly more likely to cite their opposition is due to returnees “creating security problems” than those in rural areas (29.1%).

REASONS FOR OPPOSING A RETURNEE MOVING NEXT DOOR, BY YEAR




Fig. 91: Q9a. Why would you oppose a returnee moving next door to you?

HOST COMMUNITY & RETURNEE CHILDREN PLAYING TOGETHER

The *Survey* asked host community members whether they favored or opposed the idea of their children playing with children of a returnee. The majority of respondents (93.3%) said they favored the notion and a small proportion (6.5%) said they opposed the idea of returnee children playing with theirs.

Some variation exists by province; for example, respondents in Herat (13.5%) and Kandahar (11.1%)

were most likely to oppose the idea of their children playing with children of returnees.

The figures are significantly lower among respondents from Nangarhar (1.6%) and Kabul (2.8%). There are no significant differences by rural and urban status.

Host community members who perceived returnees to have a negative impact on their neighborhood's safety (94.7%) were less likely to favor this opinion when compared to those who said returnees had no effect on safety (89.7%).

In addition, host community members who perceived returnees to have a negative effect on the cleanness and maintenance of public areas were less likely to favor this opinion when compared to those who said returnees had no effect on cleanness and maintenance of public areas (96.0% versus 91.7%).

FAVORING HOST COMMUNITY CHILDREN OR SIBLINGS TO PLAY WITH RETURNEE CHILDREN, BY PERCEPTION OF RETURNEES' EFFECT ON LOCAL SAFETY




Fig. 92: Q-7. Thinking about returnees settling in your area, what type of effect do you think they have on the following areas in your neighborhood? a) Safety. Q-8 How much would you favor or oppose each of the following? Would you say that you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose each of them? b) Your children/sibling playing with returnees' children.

WORKING WITH AND RECEIVING AN EDUCATION FROM A RETURNEE

Host community members were asked whether they favored or opposed the idea of their children or siblings receiving an education from a returnee teacher at school or university. The majority of

respondents (92.5%) were in favor with a small proportion in opposition (7.2%).

When considered by province, there are significant differences between respondents in Kabul (81.2%), Nangarhar (68.9%), Balkh (56.6%), Kandahar (45.5%) and Herat (39.7%).

In an open-ended response, host community members who opposed the idea, mentioned the following reasons: “I don’t trust him/her” (32.6% up from 24.2% in 2018), “he/she is implementing foreign culture” (19.3% significantly lower than last year 30.2%), “he/she is illiterate” (18.5%), “he/she is rude” (7.8%), he/she is corrupted (7.8%), and almost 10.3% of respondents said “because of linguistic problem”.

REASONS FOR OPPOSING CHILDREN OR SIBLINGS RECEIVING EDUCATION FROM A RETURNEE, BY YEAR




Fig. 93: Q9. Why would you oppose your children/sibling receiving education from a returnee teacher in school/university?

By province, host community respondents in Nangarhar (68.5%) were more likely to say they do not trust returnees as teachers higher than other provinces, as demonstrated in figure 94 below.

REASONS FOR OPPOSING THE CHILDREN OR SIBLINGS RECEIVING EDUCATION FROM A RETURNEE, BY PROVINCE

	KABUL	NANGARHAR	BALKH	HERAT	KANDAHAR	OVERALL
	%	%	%	%	%	%
I DON'T TRUST HIM/HER	38	69	48	25	29	33
HE/SHE IS IMPLEMENTING FOREIGN CULTURE	21	0	9	30	13	19
HE/SHE IS ILLITERATE	10	19	12	14	28	18
HE/SHE IS CORRUPTED	0	6	0	9	11	8
HE/SHE IS RUDE	11	0	10	12	3	8
BECAUSE OF LINGUISTIC	21	0	20	10	6	10
DON'T KNOW	0	6	0	0	10	4

Fig. 94: Q9. *Why would you oppose your children/sibling receiving education from a returnee teacher in school/university?*

Those citing linguistic problems as a reason for not being in favor of returnees as teachers was highest among respondents in Kabul (21.2%), compared to Kandahar (2.6%).

Variation also emerged by strata; urban respondents (31.7%) were significantly more likely to say “he/she is implementing foreign culture” when compared to rural respondents (14.6%).

REASONS FOR OPPOSING CHILDREN OR SIBLINGS RECEIVING EDUCATION FROM A RETURNEE, BY PROVINCE

	KABUL	NANGARHAR	BALKH	HERAT	KANDAHAR	OVERALL
	%	%	%	%	%	%
I DON'T TRUST HIM/HER	38	69	48	25	29	33
HE/SHE IS IMPLEMENTING FOREIGN CULTURE	21	0	9	30	13	19
HE/SHE IS ILLITERATE	10	19	12	14	28	18
HE/SHE IS CORRUPTED	0	6	0	9	11	8
HE/SHE IS RUDE	11	0	10	12	3	8
BECAUSE OF LINGUISTIC	21	0	20	10	6	10
DON'T KNOW	0	6	0	0	10	4

Fig. 95: Q9c. *Why would you oppose your children/sibling receiving education from a returnee teacher in school/university?*

Host community respondents were also asked if they would favor or oppose a returnee working with them in the same workplace. The majority of respondents (92.6%) were in favor of the idea, with only 7.1% opposing.

By province, respondents living in Kabul (82.7%), Nangarhar (66.2%), and Balkh (61.1%) were more likely to be in favor of working alongside a returnee compared to respondents living in Herat (43.2%) and Kandahar (45.2%).

Surprisingly, respondents living in urban areas (63.9%) were more likely than rural (58.1%) to strongly favor this idea.

A host community's level of education is positively correlated with their support of working with a returnee in the same workplace. For example, those with over 12 years of formal education were most likely to say they favor the notion compared to those with 1–6 years of formal education.

FAVOURING RETURNEES IN THE SAME WORKPLACE, BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION




Fig. 96: Q-8. How much would you favor or oppose each of the following? Would you say that you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose each of them? Percent who say (strongly favor).

Those who oppose the idea of working with a returnee in the same work place, mentioned the following reasons: I don't trust him/her (29.0%), he/she is impolite (23.9%), don't know (10.3%), he/she does not know how to work (9.8%), creating security problem (9.4%), because of language problems (8.5%), he/she is bringing foreign culture (5.8%), and he/she is addicted to drugs (3.3%).

REASONS FOR OPPOSING WORK ALONGSIDE A RETURNEE, BY STRATA




Fig. 97: Q9d. Why would you oppose working with a returnee in the same workplace?

PERCEPTION OF RETURNEES AS A NEIGHBOR

KEY QUESTIONS

Q-10. I am going to list a number of statements about your neighborhood. Please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with each of them. a) My neighbors are friendly and welcoming, b) I can comfortably go to any of my neighbors for help, c) My neighbors respect me and my family, d) My neighbors invite me to their ceremonies such as wedding and khatm, e) I feel safe in my neighborhood.

FRIENDLY AND WELCOMING

To better understand how host community members report feeling towards their returnee neighbors, the *Survey* asked respondents whether they agree or disagree that their neighborhood is friendly and welcoming. The findings show that 92.8% agree their neighborhood was friendly and welcoming, while only 7.1% disagreed.

Urban respondents (91.7%) are slightly more likely to agree when compared with respondents living in rural areas (95.8%). There are no significant differences by province.

Those with over 12 years of formal education (72.7%) were more likely to strongly agree that their neighborhood was friendly and welcoming compared to those who have 1–6 years of formal education (63.1%).

The *Survey* also asked respondents whether or not they could comfortably refer to their neighbors for help. The majority (88.1%) said they could, which is a similar figure to that reported in 2018 (89.0%). Only 11.8% said that could not refer to their neighbors for help. Urban and rural respondents reported the same percentages (urban 88.2%, rural 88.1%) in being able to refer to their neighbours for assistance.

Respondents in Nangarhar (96.6%) were most likely to say they could refer to neighbors for help, with the lowest in Herat (81.4%).

The majority of host community respondents (89.1%) said that their neighbors respected them. Respondents in Kabul (97.4%) and Nangarhar (96.5%) were most likely to say that their neighbors respected them compared to respondents in Kandahar (81.2%), Herat (81.7%) and Balkh (88.6%).

Respondents were also asked if they had been invited by their returnee neighbors to ceremonies, such as wedding(s) and khatam, the majority (89.4%) indicated that they had been invited to such ceremonies.

When asked about feeling safe in the neighborhood, over half of respondents (55.7%) mentioned very safe, 33.7% said somewhat safe, 8.1% somewhat not safe, and 2.1% strongly not safe.

Respondents in Kabul (73.1%) and Nangarhar (65.6%) were more likely to express feeling very safe while respondents in Kandahar (41.3%) and Herat (46.4%) are least likely to express feeling very safe.

Urban respondents (60.2%) were slightly more likely to report feeling very safe than rural respondents (54.0%). As demonstrated in the figure below, an analysis by strata within province shows that urban respondents in Nangarhar are more likely to express feeling very safe compared to rural respondents in Kandahar. No notable differences emerge by gender.

FEELING SAFE IN NEIGHBORHOOD, BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE




Fig. 98: Q-10. I am going to list a number of statements about your neighborhood. Please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with each of them. (e) I feel safe in my neighborhood (Percent who say strongly agree)

TRUSTING RETURNEES

KEY QUESTION

Q-II. To what extent would you trust a returnee to [INSERT ITEM]. Would you trust a returnee to do this to a great extent, a moderate extent, a small extent, or not at all? a) Be a member of your community development council, b) Serve in the ANDSF, c) Represent you in government, d) Deliver religious sermons, e) Rent your house or apartment.

The *Survey* asked host community respondents about the extent to which they trusted returnees in different positions or engaging in activities.

Overall, the findings indicate that host community members trust returnees. For example, respondents indicated that returnees would be trusted to be a member of the community development council to a great extent (54.8%); to serve in ANDSF (47.5%); to represent you in government (48.3%); to deliver religious sermon (47.5%); and to rent your house or apartment (52.4%).

Findings also demonstrate varying levels of trust among urban and rural respondents towards specific

roles or activities. For example, urban respondents are less likely to say a returnee should be a member of the community development council compared to rural respondents (46.5% vs. 57.8%).

TRUSTING RETURNEES IN DIFFERENT ACTIVITIES AND ROLES, BY STRATA




Fig. 99: Q-II. To what extent would you trust a returnee to [INSERT ITEM]. Would you trust a returnee to do this to a great extent, a moderate extent, a small extent, or not at all? a) Be a member of your community development council, b) Serve in the ANDSF, c) Represent you in government, d) Deliver religious sermons, e) Rent your house or apartment. (Percent who say to a great extent).

Men (57.8%) are more likely than women (51.4%) to trust returnees in their community to hold certain positions or conduct activities.

Respondents who reported knowing one or more than one returnees from Pakistan were more likely to report that they trusted returnees to deliver religious sermons (51.3%), compared to those who knew returnees from Iran (42.4%). Those who say they do not trust returnees to represent them in government mentioned the following reasons: I don't know him/her (20.3%), I don't trust him/her (13.1%), he/she is spy (11.7%), he/she is not an Afghan (10.1%), he/she is illiterate (9.6%), he/she makes their own law (8.2%), he/she cause destruction in the country (3.7%), and he/she is rude (2.2%).

REASONS FOR NOT TRUSTING RETURNEES TO BE A REPRESENTATIVE IN THE GOVERNMENT, BY YEAR




Fig. 100: Q12c. Why would you not trust a returnee to represent you in government?

Those who said they had no trust or less trust in a returnee to be a member of community development council, mentioned the following reasons: I don't know them (52.2%), he/she is not from our village (11.8%), he/she cause insecurity (8.6%), he/she is criminal (6.3%), he/she is working for other countries (3.6%), and he/she is corrupt (5.9%).

REASONS FOR NOT TRUSTING A RETURNEE TO SERVE IN ANDSF, BY YEAR




Fig. 101: Q12b. Why would you not trust a returnee to serve in the ANDSF?

Those who reported less or no trust in a returnee to serve in ANDSF cited the following reasons: I don't trust him/her (27.8%), creating problems (17.7%), he/she is working for foreigners (15.6%), he/she is not a real Afghan (13.2%), he/she works for anti-government elements (6.4%), he/she is addicted to drugs (2.4%), and, he/she is not being recruited in ANDSF (2.2%).

5. RETURNEES PROBLEMS, RESOURCES AND SERVICES

KEY QUESTION

Q-14. Now I will read out some problems. Please tell me if each of these is a major problem, a minor problem, or not a problem for the returnees in this neighborhood. a) Access to land and housing, b) Unemployment/ Joblessness, c) Not enough food, d) Not enough electricity, e) Not enough health care/services, f) Not enough education.

To understand the problems faced by returnees, the *Survey* provided a list of problems and asked host community members to specify what could be a major problem for returnees, a minor problem or not a problem at all.

Unemployment and access to housing are the most prevalent problems, however, differences emerge by strata and province, as demonstrated in the figures below.

PERCEPTION OF RETURNEES' MAJOR PROBLEMS, BY STRATA




Fig. 102: Q-14. *Now I will read out some problems. Please tell me if each of these is a major problem, a minor problem, or not a problem for the returnees in this neighborhood.*

Unemployment/joblessness were more likely to be cited as a major problem facing returnees by respondents living in Kabul (89.8%) and Nangarhar (87.7%). Host community respondents in Nangarhar were more likely to cite a lack of health care services (68.0%), education (69.0%), electricity (74.7%), food (64.4%) and access to land and housing (85.3%) as major problems faced by returnees than other provinces.

PERCEPTION OF RETURNEES' MAJOR PROBLEMS, BY PROVINCE




Fig. 103: Q-14. Now I will read out some problems. Please tell me if each of these is a major problem, a minor problem, or not a problem for the returnees in this neighborhood. a) Access to land and housing, b) Unemployment/ Joblessness, c) Not enough food, d) Not enough electricity, e) Not enough health care/services, f) Not enough education.

Over half of respondents (66.0%) said access to land and housing was major problem for a returnee. Respondents in Nangarhar (85.3%) more likely to say access to land and housing was a major problem for returnees, followed by Kabul (80.6%), Herat (60.8%), Balkh (58.8%) while this proportion is notably lower, in Kandahar (44.3%).

Not surprisingly, 76.4% of host community respondents reported that unemployment is a major problem for returnees. By location, respondents in urban areas (79.4%) were more likely to report unemployment is major problem for returnees when compared to those who live in rural areas (75.3%).

By province, those who live in Kabul (89.8%) are most likely to say unemployment is major problem for returnees than respondents who live elsewhere (Nangarhar (87.7%), Balkh (70.7%), Herat (68.2%), Kandahar (65.5%).

UNEMPLOYMENT AND JOBLESSNESS AS PROBLEM IN NEIGHBORHOOD, BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE

		KABUL	NANGARHAR	BALKH	HERAT	KANDAHAR	OVERALL
		%	%	%	%	%	%
RURAL	MAJOR PROBLEM	90	87	68	68	62	75
	MINOR PROBLEM	9	11	27	19	28	18
	NOT A PROBLEM	1	2	6	12	10	6
URBAN	MAJOR PROBLEM	90	92	82	69	74	79
	MINOR PROBLEM	6	6	15	22	21	15
	NOT A PROBLEM	2	2	2	9	5	5

Fig. 104: Q-14. *Now I will read out some problems. Please tell me if each of these is a major problem, a minor problem, or not a problem for the returnees in this neighborhood. b) Unemployment/ Joblessness.*

Half of respondents (50.9%) believe that not having enough food is major problem for a returnee. Rural respondents were more likely than urban respondents to say not having enough food is a major problem for returnee (52.7% compared to 46.0%).

Respondents in Nangarhar (64.4%) and Kabul (61.5%) more likely to say a lack food is a major problem for returnees than compared to respondents living in Balkh (45.8%), Herat (41.5%), Kandahar (41.3%).

LACK OF FOOD AS PROBLEM IN NEIGHBORHOOD, BY PROVINCE




Fig. 105: Q-14. Now I will read out some problems. Please tell me if each of these is a major problem, a minor problem, or not a problem for the returnees in this neighborhood? c) Not enough food.

LACK OF FOOD AS PROBLEM IN NEIGHBORHOOD, BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE

		KABUL	NANGARHAR	BALKH	HERAT	KANDAHAR	OVERALL
		%	%	%	%	%	%
RURAL	MAJOR PROBLEM	59	66	46	46	42	53
	MINOR PROBLEM	33	26	38	37	43	35
	NOT A PROBLEM	7	8	16	16	15	12
URBAN	MAJOR PROBLEM	65	46	44	34	40	46
	MINOR PROBLEM	28	39	41	47	45	40
	NOT A PROBLEM	4	14	14	18	15	13

Fig. 106: Q-14. Now I will read out some problems. Please tell me if each of these is a major problem, a minor problem, or not a problem for the returnees in this neighborhood? c) Not enough food.

Regarding access to electricity, just over half of host community respondents (51.9%) said that not having enough electricity is a major problem for returnees. Not surprisingly, respondents living rural areas (55.6%) were more likely to say not having enough electricity is a major problem for returnees compared to those who live in urban areas (41.9%). Analysis by province also highlights differences; for example, 74.7% of respondents in Nangarhar and 57.8% in Kabul said not having enough electricity is a major problem for returnees while this proportion is lower than fifty percent among the other provinces.

When asked about health care/services, 52.5% of respondents said it is a major problem for returnees, which is slightly higher than the 49.3% recorded in 2018. Returnees in rural areas (55.2%) were more likely to say not having access to health care/service is major problem for returnees than those living in urban areas (45.3). Respondents in Nangarhar (68.6%) were more likely to say not having access to health care is a major problem for returnees, while respondents in Kandahar (43.4%) were least likely to say so.

When asked about education, around half of respondents (51.0%) said a lack of access to education is a major problem, which is higher than in 2018 (46.2%). Rural respondents (54.1%) were more likely than urban respondents (42.7%) to report not having enough access to education is major problem for returnees. Host community respondents in Nangarhar (69.0%) were most likely to a lack of education is a major problem for returnees, compared to respondents living in Kabul (58.0%), Balkh (46.0%), Kandahar (42.7%), and Herat (39.5%).

HOST COMMUNITY SITUATION COMPARED TO RETURNEES

KEY QUESTION

Q-13. *Thinking now about the overall situation of your household in comparison with returnees in this community, would you say that the following things are better for your household than they are for returnees, worse for your household than they are for returnees, or about the same relative to returnees? a) Household financial situation, b) Access to drinking water, c) Quality of drinking water, d) Access to health care, e) Quality of health services, f) Access to education for children, g) Quality of education for children, h) Access to electricity, i) Quality of electricity supply, j) Access to transportation, k) Quality of transportation, l) Jobs and work opportunities, m) Safety and security for your family, n) Access to housing/land, o) Your overall happiness.*

For a better understanding regarding the situation of returnees in comparison to host community members, the *Survey* provided a list of basic needs and asked host community members to specify whether, relative to returnees, their provision of resources is better, worse or about the same.

HOUSEHOLD FINANCIAL SITUATION

When asked about host community's household financial situation compared to returnees, 37.6% of host community respondents reported their situation is better for them than for returnees, while 28.7% indicated it was worse for them than for returnees. One third, 33.1% said there is no difference. By strata, urban host community respondents (41.2%) were more likely to indicate that their financial situation was better than urban returnees (41.2% vs. 36.3%). Variations emerge by province too, for example, host community respondents in Kabul (45.9%) were most likely to say their financial situation is better compared to respondents elsewhere.

HOUSEHOLD FINANCIAL SITUATION, BY PROVINCE

	KABUL	NANGARHAR	BALKH	HERAT	KANDAHAR	OVERALL
	%	%	%	%	%	%
BETTER	46	38	40	33	31	38
WORSE	23	25	27	25	44	29
NO DIFFERENCE	31	37	33	40	25	33

Fig. 107: Q-13. *Thinking now about the overall situation of your household in comparison with returnees in this community, would you say that the following things are better for your household than they are for returnees, worse for your household than they are for returnees, or about the same relative to returnees? a) household financial situation.*

ACCESS TO DRINKING WATER AND QUALITY OF DRINKING WATER

When asked about access to drinking water, more than a third (34.6%), indicated the quality of drinking water was better for them than for returnees, while 20.4% said it is worse, and less than half of respondents (44.7%) said there is no difference. By location, urban respondents (40.9%) were more likely to believe access to drinking water were better for them than returnees (32.2%).

ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF DRINKING WATER, BY PROVINCE

		KABUL	NANGARHAR	BALKH	HERAT	KANDAHAR	OVERALL
		%	%	%	%	%	%
ACCESS TO DRINKING WATER	BETTER	42	25	35	29	42	35
	WORSE	14	20	18	27	24	20
	NO DIFFERENCE	44	55	47	44	34	45
QUALITY OF DRINKING WATER	BETTER	34	26	32	31	24	29
	WORSE	19	20	24	28	44	27
	NO DIFFERENCE	47	54	44	41	33	44

Fig. 108: Q-13. *Thinking now about the overall situation of your household in comparison with returnees in this community, would you say that the following things are better for your household than they are for returnees, worse for your household than they are for returnees, or about the same relative to returnees? b Access to drinking water, c) Quality of drinking water.*

The *Survey* also asked about the quality of drinking water. Nearly one third of host community respondents (29.2%) reported the quality of drinking water was better for them than for returnees, while a just over a quarter (26.7%) said it was worse for them than for returnees. Less than half (43.6%) said there was no difference .

Further differences exist by strata, with host community respondents in urban areas (34.8%) more likely to report that quality of drinking water was better for them than for returnees than host community respondents in rural areas (27.2%).

ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE AND QUALITY OF HEALTH SERVICES

When asked about access to health care, host community respondents (43.7%) were more likely report that health care was about the same for them and returnees, while 28.6% said it was worse for them than for returnees, and around the same proportion (27.0%) reported that it was better for them than for returnees. Urban host community respondents (34.0%) were more likely than rural host community respondents (24.5%) to indicate that access to health care was better for them than for returnees.

ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF HEALTH SERVICES, BY PROVINCE

		KABUL	NANGARHAR	BALKH	HERAT	KANDAHAR	OVERALL
		%	%	%	%	%	%
ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE	BETTER	30	20	29	29	27	27
	WORSE	21	26	27	30	38	29
	NO DIFFERENCE	48	53	43	40	35	44
QUALITY OF HEALTH SERVICES	BETTER	22	23	26	29	27	26
	WORSE	30	25	31	28	36	30
	NO DIFFERENCE	48	51	42	41	37	44

Fig. 109: Q-13. *Thinking now about the overall situation of your household in comparison with returnees in this community, would you say that the following things are better for your household than they are for returnees, worse for your household than they are for returnees, or about the same relative to returnees? d) Access to health care, e) Quality of health services.*

When asked about quality of health services, less than half of host community respondents (43.6%) reported there is no differences, nearly one third (29.9%) said it was worse, and one quarter (25.6%) reported that the quality of health services was better for them in comparison to returnees.

ACCESS TO EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN AND QUALITY OF EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN

When asked about access to education for children, 32.0% of host community respondents reported that it was better for them than for returnees, while 24.5% said worse, and 42.8% indicated there was no difference.

Significant differences emerged by strata; urban respondents (42.0%) were more likely than rural respondents (28.4%) to say access to education was better for them than for returnees.

Differences exist also across provinces, for example, host community respondents in Kabul (43.1%) were more likely to say access to education was better for them than for returnees.

ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN, BY PROVINCE

		KABUL	NANGARHAR	BALKH	HERAT	KANDAHAR	OVERALL
		%	%	%	%	%	%
ACCESS TO EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN	BETTER	43	25	30	35	27	32
	WORSE	12	25	25	23	38	25
	NO DIFFERENCE	44	51	44	40	35	43
QUALITY OF EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN	BETTER	34	21	31	32	32	30
	WORSE	19	27	25	27	35	27
	NO DIFFERENCE	46	51	43	39	33	42

Fig. 110: Q-13. *Thinking now about the overall situation of your household in comparison with returnees in this community, would you say that the following things are better for your household than they are for returnees, worse for your household than they are for returnees, or about the same relative to returnees? f) Access to education for children. g) Quality of education for children.*

When asked about the *quality* of education, one third of respondents (30.0%) indicated that it was better for them than for returnees, somewhat fewer reported that it was worse for them compared to returnees (26.8%), while the greater proportion reported no difference (42.4%).

Significant differences emerged by strata; urban respondents (38.9%) were more likely than rural respondents (29.6%) to say that the quality of education was better for them than for returnees.

ACCESS TO ELECTRICITY AND QUALITY OF ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

The *Survey* also asked host community respondents to identify whether access to electricity was better for them than for returnees, worse for them than for returnees or relatively the same. More than a quarter, 26.3% reported better access to electricity, 31.2% said access to electricity was worse for them than for returnees, and 41.7% said no difference. Analysis by strata shows that urban respondents (35.1%) were more likely than rural respondents to indicate access to electricity was better for them than for returnees. When asked about quality of electricity supply, 22.8% of respondents said it was better for them compared to returnees, 35.3% said it was worse for them than for returnees, and 41.1% said no difference.

Host community respondents living in urban areas (27.4%) were more likely than those in rural areas (21.1%) to say the quality of electricity was better for them than for returnees.

ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF ELECTRICITY SUPPLY, BY PROVINCE

		KABUL	NANGARHAR	BALKH	HERAT	KANDAHAR	OVERALL
		%	%	%	%	%	%
ACCESS TO ELECTRICITY	BETTER	29	15	28	32	27	26
	WORSE	27	34	27	30	38	31
	NO DIFFERENCE	43	50	44	38	34	42
QUALITY OF ELECTRICITY SUPPLY	BETTER	16	14	29	26	28	23
	WORSE	40	35	29	34	39	35
	NO DIFFERENCE	42	51	41	39	32	41

Fig. 111: Q-13. Thinking now about the overall situation of your household in comparison with returnees in this community, would you say that the following things are better for your household than they are for returnees, worse for your household than they are for returnees, or about the same relative to returnees? h) Access to electricity, i) Quality of electricity supply.

ACCESS TO TRANSPORTATION AND QUALITY OF TRANSPORTATION

Another *Survey* question asks host community respondents whether access to transportation is better for them than for returnees, worse for them than for returnees or relatively the same. Findings show that 27.2% believe that access to transportation was better for them than for returnees, while 26.8% said it was worse, and 45.2% reported no difference.

Urban respondents (36.2%) are more likely than rural respondents (23.9%) to report that access to transportation is better for them than returnees.

Respondents in Balkh (39.1%), Kabul (34.1%), and Kandahar (28.7%) were more likely to say access to transportation was better for them than for returnees, while host community respondents in Nangarhar (17.3%) were least likely to say so.

ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF TRANSPORTATION, BY PROVINCE

		KABUL	NANGARHAR	BALKH	HERAT	KANDAHAR	OVERALL
		%	%	%	%	%	%
ACCESS TO TRANSPORTATION	BETTER	34	17	29	27	29	27
	WORSE	20	26	24	28	36	27
	NO DIFFERENCE	45	57	46	44	35	45
QUALITY OF TRANSPORTATION	BETTER	28	17	30	23	32	26
	WORSE	27	26	27	32	32	29
	NO DIFFERENCE	44	56	43	43	36	44

Fig. 112: Q-13. *Thinking now about the overall situation of your household in comparison with returnees in this community, would you say that the following things are better for your household than they are for returnees, worse for your household than they are for returnees, or about the same relative to returnees? j) Access to transportation, k) Quality of transportation.*

When asked about the quality of transportation, 44.2% of respondents say there are no differences, nearly a third (28.7%) said it was worse for them than for returnees, and just over one quarter (26.2%) reported having better quality of transportation than for returnees.

Significant differences emerged by strata; for example, those who live in urban areas (33.1%) are significantly more likely than those in rural areas (23.7%) to report that the quality of transportation is better for them than for returnees.

JOBS AND WORK OPPORTUNITIES

Host community respondents were asked about their jobs and work opportunities in comparison to returnees. Host community respondents (41.2%) were most likely to report that jobs and work opportunities was worse for them than compared to returnees, while 24.0% reported that it was better, and 34.1% indicated that job opportunities were about the same as for returnees.

Differences emerge by province. Host community respondents in Kabul (46.0%), Balkh (45.9%) and Herat (42.4%) are more likely to report jobs and work opportunities were worse for them than compared to returnees when compared to those in Kandahar (37.4%) and Nangarhar (34.4%). There are no significant differences by strata.

JOBS AND WORK OPPORTUNITIES, BY PROVINCE




Fig. 113: Q-13. Thinking now about the overall situation of your household in comparison with returnees in this community, would you say that the following things are better for your household than they are for returnees, worse for your household than they are for returnees, or about the same relative to returnees)? 1) Jobs and work opportunities.

SAFETY AND SECURITY FOR YOUR FAMILY

Host community respondents were also asked about the safety and security of their family, and whether it was better, worse or about the same as for returnees. Respondents were most likely to say that it was about the same (42.6%) as for returnees, while 32.1% said that it was better for them than returnees, and 24.9% reported that it was worse for them than compared to returnees.

Differences exist across strata, where rural host community respondents (26.7%) were more likely to say that safety and security for their family was worse than for returnees when compared to urban host community respondents (19.9%).

Significant differences also emerged by province, for instance, host community respondents living in Kandahar (35.6%), and Balkh (29.4%), were more likely to believe safety and security was worse for them than compared to returnees.

SAFETY AND SECURITY FOR FAMILY, BY PROVINCE




Fig. 114: Q-13. Thinking now about the overall situation of your household in comparison with returnees in this community, would you say that the following things are better for your household than they are for returnees, worse for your household than they are for returnees, or about the same relative to returnees? m) Safety and security for your family.

ACCESS TO HOUSING OR LAND

When the Survey asked about access to housing and land, findings show that host community respondents were most likely to say that it was about the same (38.2%), while 32.4% of respondents said it was better, and nearly one third (28.9%) said it was worse for them compared to returnees.

By province, having better access to housing or land in comparison to returnees were more likely to be pronounced by host community respondents in Kabul (46.4%), followed by Balkh (34.3%), Kandahar (31.1%), Herat (26.6%) and Nangarhar (23.4%). There are no significant differences by strata.

ACCESS TO HOUSING OR LAND, BY PROVINCE




Fig. 115: Q-13. Thinking now about the overall situation of your household in comparison with returnees in this community, would you say that the following things are better for your household than they are for returnees, worse for your household than they are for returnees, or about the same relative to returnees? n) Access to housing/land.

SELF REPORTED HAPPINESS

Respondents were asked to report on their own happiness in comparison to returnees. More than one third (39.4%) of host community respondents reported their happiness is about the same relative to returnees. A similar percentage (39.0%) reported there were “no differences” while the same proportion indicated that they were happier than returnees, and fewer (21.1%) said they were unhappier than returnees.

SELF REPORTED HAPPINESS, BY PROVINCE




Fig. 116: Q-13. Thinking now about the overall situation of your household in comparison with returnees in this community, would you say that the following things are better for your household than they are for returnees, worse for your household than they are for returnees, or about the same relative to returnees? o) Your overall happiness.

Analysis by strata showed that urban respondents (43.5%) were more likely than rural respondents (37.3%) to report they are happier than returnees.

Female respondents (40.8%) were slightly more likely than male respondents (37.3%) to say that they are happier than returnees. Host community respondents with an income of 10,000 to 15,000¹⁵ Afghanis per month (47.3%) were significantly more likely than those who earned 1000 to 2000 Afghanis (29.7%) to report that they were happier than returnees.

6. GAPS IN PRESENT AND FUTURE RETURNEE NEEDS

KEY QUESTIONS

Q-15. Do you think returnees should receive the following benefits from the government to help them resettle in Afghanistan? a) Food support, b) Housing support, c) Free land, d) Livestock, e) Money, f) Skills or job training.

Q-16. Currently, which of the following groups help returnees in your community? a. Elders

in your community) Community members, c) The government, d) The United Nations / IOM, e) Afghan NGOs, f) Foreign NGOs.

Q-18. Thinking about the amount of help returnees in your community receive, would you say that they need more help, less help, or about the same amount of help that they have been receiving?

Q-19. What types of help do you think it is most important that they provide more of?

To ascertain what the government could do to accommodate returnees settling in Afghanistan, the *Survey* asked host community respondents to identify whether returnees should receive more or less support from government. The majority of respondents (72.6%) agreed that the government should provide support in terms of food for returnees, while well over half of respondents indicated that returnees should receive housing support (67.4%), followed by money (66.9%), skills or jobs (65.6%), free land (62.3%) and livestock (58.8%).

WHAT GOVERNMENT SHOULD PROVIDE RETURNEES ACCORDING TO HOST COMMUNITIES, BY YEAR




Fig. 117: Q-15. Do you think returnees should receive the following benefits from the government to help them resettle in Afghanistan? a) Food support, b) Housing support, c) Free land, d) Livestock, e) Money, f) Skills or job training.

Host community respondents were also asked whether returnees should receive more, less, or about the same amount of help. A majority (63.5%) indicated that they need more help, while 18.4% of respondents said returnees receive less help and a small proportion said they should receive that same amount (15.4%).

ASSISTANCE FOR RETURNEES, BY PROVINCE




Fig. 118: Q-18. Thinking about the amount of help returnees in your community receive, would you say that they need more help, less help, or about the same amount of help that they have been receiving?

By province, host community respondents in Kabul (86.0%) were more likely to say returnees should receive more help followed by Nangarhar (69.7%), Herat (66.3%), Balkh (61.3%) and the Kandahar (34.1%).

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE RETURNEES REQUIRE, BY YEAR

	2018	2019
HOUSE/LAND	56	53
MONEY	34	33
FOOD STUFFS	27	31
EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES	31	25
DON'T KNOW	16	17
HOME APPLIANCES	6	8
EDUCATION OPPORTUNITY	8	6
CLOTHES	3	6
HEALTH CARE SERVICES	6	3
FUEL/BLANKET	4	5
WATER AND ELECTRICITY	3	3
LITERACY COURSES	1	2
SECURITY	1	1
AGRICULTURAL EQUIPMENT	1	1

Fig. 119: Q-19. *What types of help do you think it is most important that they provide more of? (Allow up to two responses).*

Host community respondents were also asked about the type of help that returnees should receive. Over half (52.6%) said returnees should receive house/land, followed by money (33.1%), food assistance (31.4%), employment opportunities (25.2%), home appliances (8.4%), education opportunities (6.2%), clothes (5.9%), health care services (3.5%).

Variations also emerged by strata: host community respondents in urban areas (58.5%) were more likely to say returnees need house/land when compared to rural respondents (50.3%). Urban respondents (27.5%) are also slightly more likely to say returnees should receive employment opportunities when compared to rural respondents (24.4%).

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE RETURNEES REQUIRE, BY PROVINCE

	KABUL	NANGARHAR	BALKH	HERAT	KANDAHAR	OVERALL
	%	%	%	%	%	%
HOUSE/LAND	59	48	46	61	41	53
MONEY	36	32	34	29	35	33
FOOD STUFFS	29	25	48	32	20	31
EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES	32	32	14	19	29	25
DON'T KNOW	12	13	12	24	37	17
HOME APPLIANCES	6	11	10	7	10	8
EDUCATION OPPORTUNITY	4	9	5	6	7	6
CLOTHES	6	2	9	9	4	6
FUEL/BLANKET	6	1	13	5	0	5
HEALTH CARE SERVICES	2	8	1	1	6	3
WATER AND ELECTRICITY	2	7	1	0	5	3
LITERACY COURSES	2	1	4	3	0	2
AGRICULTURAL EQUIPMENT	1	2	0	3	1	1
SECURITY	2	2	1	1	1	1

Fig. 120: Q-19. *What types of help do you think it is most important that they provide more of? (Allow up to two responses).*

When asked who should provide support to returnees the majority of host community respondents (68.3%) said the Afghan government. Smaller proportions cited the United Nations (17.3%), refugees' directorate (16.9%), internal/external organization (11.0%), charity organization (10.2%), international communities (4.5%), IOM (4.8%), foreigners (4.8%), international aid (4.7%) and only 2.6% cited NGOs.

There is a notable increase in those who cited the United Nations, from 8.3% in 2018 to 17.3% in 2019. Interestingly, and when compared to 2018, there is a notable decrease among respondents who say NGOs (14.6% down to 2.6% in 2019) and the international community (down from 9.6% in 2018 to 4.5% in 2019).

ENTITIES RESPONSIBLE FOR PROVIDING SUPPORT FOR RETURNEES, BY YEAR

	2018	2019
	%	%
AFGHAN GOVERNMENT	73	68
REFUGEES DIRECTORATE	14	17
UNITED NATIONS	8	17
INTERNAL/EXTERNAL FOUNDATIONS	12	11
CHARITY ORGANIZATIONS	11	10
NGOS	15	3
INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY	10	5
IOM	5	5
FOREIGNERS	4	5
ELDERS	4	3
UNHCR	4	2
INTERNATIONAL AID ORGANIZATIONS	1	5
TRADERS	4	2

Fig. 121: Q-20. *Which groups or organizations do you think should be responsible for providing this help? (Allow up to two responses).*

Host community respondents were asked about their awareness of formal and informal institutions providing support to returnees. Overall, the findings reflected less awareness across all formal and informal institutions providing support to returnees. This decrease in awareness of support could be attributed to the increasing economic concerns and influx of returnees in 2019 and the burden placed on already stretched humanitarian support.

For example, this year only 20.3% said the government is helping returnees, a decrease from 24.5% in 2018. About one fifth (19.0%) said the United Nation/IOM is assisting returnees, a notable decrease from 26.1% in 2018. And, 18.9% cited community members are helping returnees, which is a slight decrease on last year's 22.8%. A small proportion said that foreign (9.7%) and Afghan NGOs (8.5%) are assisting returnees, which is a notable decrease on the 15.7% and 14.6% reported respectively in 2018.

HOST COMMUNITIES AWARENESS OF RETURNEE SUPPORT NETWORKS, BY YEAR




Fig. 122: Q-16. Currently, which of the following groups help returnees in your community? a) Elders in your community, b) Community members, c) The government, d) The United Nations / IOM, e) Afghan NGOs, f) Foreign NGOs.

In another series of questions, host communities are asked to identify the specific types of support returnees are provided by each institution.

Across all entities, the provision of food has increased from 2018 to 2019, with the exception of the UN/IOM where we see a decrease from 25.3% to 20.8%. The largest increase from 2018 to 2019 is demonstrated with the Afghan government where we see a 12% increase, from 25.2% to 37.1%.

**TYPE OF SUPPORT FOR EACH ENTITY PROVIDES TO RETURNEES,
BY YEAR**

		2018	2019
		%	%
ELDERS IN YOUR COMMUNITY	FOOD STUFFS	31	37
	SHELTER/ LAND	17	11
	CLOTHES	5	4
	MONEY (CASH)	17	15
	FUEL/BLANKET	2	1
	HOME APPLIANCES	6	6
COMMUNITY MEMBERS	FOOD STUFFS	36	43
	SHELTER/ LAND	14	6
	CLOTHES	3	7
	MONEY (CASH)	13	14
	FUEL/BLANKET	2	1
	HOME APPLIANCES	7	7
THE GOVERNMENT	FOOD STUFFS	25	37
	SHELTER/ LAND	21	7
	CLOTHES	3	4
	MONEY (CASH)	29	22
	FUEL/BLANKET	1	1
	HOME APPLIANCES	5	7
THE UNITED NATIONS / IOM	FOOD STUFFS	25	21
	SHELTER/ LAND	5	5
	CLOTHES	3	5
	MONEY (CASH)	43	45
	FUEL/BLANKET	2	3
	HOME APPLIANCES	9	8

AFGHAN NGOS	FOOD STUFFS	25	36
	SHELTER/ LAND	9	5
	CLOTHES	5	6
	MONEY (CASH)	31	20
	FUEL/BLANKET	2	1
	HOME APPLIANCES	8	7
FOREIGN NGOS	FOOD STUFFS	25	32
	SHELTER/ LAND	6	7
	CLOTHES	3	6
	MONEY (CASH)	36	21
	FUEL/BLANKET	3	3
	HOME APPLIANCES	11	9

Fig. 123: Q-17. *what kind of help do they give?*

7. INTEGRATION AND CONFLICT

INTEGRATION

KEY QUESTIONS

Q-22. *How well do you think returnee families integrate into your community, would you say that in general, they do the following things often, sometimes, rarely, or never. a) Attend mosque b) Attend weddings, c) Interact with people from the community on the street/market, d) Engage in community activities and events, e) Visit neighbors during Eid holidays.*

Q-23. *In your opinion, what are the reasons that a returnee would not integrate into your community? (allow two responses).*

Q-23A. *Do you think there is any reason why a returnee would not integrate into your community?*

Q-23B. *In your opinion, what are the reasons that a returnee would not integrate into your community?*

Returnee integration with host communities is essential. To gauge how returnees integrated into host communities, respondents were provided a list of activities and asked whether returnees have engaged in

any of them. Findings show that returnees were most likely to attend the mosque (60.5%), followed by attending weddings (48.1%), visiting neighbors during holidays (47.1%), interactions with people from community (44.4%), and engaging in community activities and events (40.6%).

Compared to 2018, the largest increase is among host communities interacting with returnees in community activities and events, where an increase from 37.1% to 40.6% in 2019 is noted.

PERCEPTION OF RETURNEES' INTEGRATION, BY YEAR




Fig. 124: Q-22. How well do you think returnee families integrate into your community, would you say that in general, they do the following things often, sometimes, rarely, or never. a) Attend mosque b) Attend weddings, c) Interact with people from the community on the street/market, d) Engage in community activities and events, e) Visit neighbors during Eid holidays. (Percent who say often).

The *Survey* also asks host communities if they think there are any reasons why a returnee cannot integrate into their community. Less than one fifth (17.2%) believed that there were reasons for why the returnees could not integrate. In a follow up question, when asked about those barriers, nearly one third (31.4%) cited “cultural problems.” The second most common response was “linguistic problems” (22.0%), and a similar proportion said “unemployment.” Poverty is cited by 17.1% of respondents, and religious problems (9.2%) are mentioned by a lesser proportion.

Respondents in Kabul (45.7%) and Herat (43.8%) were more likely to say cultural problems are

obstacles for returnees to integrate. These figures are significantly higher in Nangarhar (9.7%) and Kandahar (13.4%).

Linguistic problems (22.0%) are also among the top cited barriers for returnees to integrate into communities, most frequently cited by respondents in Herat (34.3%) and Kabul (25.0%). Further differences by province are shown below.

BARRIERS TO INTEGRATION, BY PROVINCE

	KABUL	NANGARHAR	BALKH	HERAT	KANDAHAR	OVERALL
	%	%	%	%	%	%
CULTURAL PROBLEMS	46	10	20	44	13	31
LINGUISTIC PROBLEMS	25	9	13	34	7	22
UNEMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES	9	69	23	4	31	22
POVERTY	17	37	40	6	7	17
RELIGIOUS PROBLEMS	8	2	6	14	9	9
BAD BEHAVIOR TOWARDS PEOPLE	13	3	3	10	6	8
UNAVAILABILITY OF HOUSE/LAND	6	12	18	0	9	6
TRIBALISM	7	2	7	6	10	6
STAYING AWAY FROM THE COMMUNITY	8	3	5	6	1	5
INSECURITY	3	8	5	2	9	4
LACK OF ELECTRICITY	1	7	1	0	16	4
ADDICTED TO DRUGS	0	0	0	5	3	2
THEY ARE CRIMINALS	4	1	0	3	0	2
LACK OF WATER	1	3	2	0	9	2

Fig. 125: Q-23. *In your opinion, what are the reasons that a returnee would not integrate into your community? (Allow up to two responses).*

The *Survey* asks host community members if they knew any returnee at that time who had a difficult time integrating into the community. Less than one fifth (17.0%) reported they did know a returnee(s). Participants were further asked why they thought the returnees had a difficult time, to which differences

in language (50.2%) were cited among half of the cases ; 37.5% cited differences in customs/cultures; 29.7% cited poverty; 28.9% cited differences in accents; and 23.8% cited religious sects (Mazhab).

Responses vary by strata. For instance 44.9% of urban respondents mentioned differences in customs/ culture, compared to 32.2% in rural areas. Further differences can be found in the following table.

REASONS WHY RETURNEES EXPERIENCES CHALLENGES WHEN INTEGRATING, BY STRATA

	RURAL	URBAN	OVERALL
	%	%	%
DIFFERENCES IN LANGUAGE	51	49	50
DIFFERENCES IN CUSTOMS/CULTURE	32	45	36
POVERTY/CLASS DIFFERENCES	28	33	30
DIFFERENCE IN ACCENT	27	34	29
RELIGIOUS SECT (MAZHAB)	25	21	24
UNEMPLOYMENT	1	1	1
ADDICTION TO DRUGS	0	1	1

Fig. 126: Q-25. Why do you think they might have a more difficult time?

CONFLICT

KEY QUESTIONS

- Q-26.** Have you or family members personally experienced a dispute or conflict with a returnee(s)?
- Q-27.** What type of dispute or conflict was it?
- Q-28.** What was the dispute or conflict about?
- Q-29.** Where did the issue occur?
- Q-30.** Was the conflict resolved?
- Q-31.** Did any of the following help with dispute resolution? 1. State court, 2. Huquq Department, 3. Shura or jirga, 4. The parties themselves.

Reintegration can often lead to challenges between returnees and host communities. The challenges can emerge as a result of scarcity of resources or other tensions between returnees and host communities.

Host community members were asked if they or their family members had experienced conflict or dispute with returnees. Overall, 11.1% conceded that they or a family member had experienced conflict or a dispute with returnees (marginally lower than 12.9% in 2018). By province host community respondents in Kandahar (17.6%) were more likely to say they had experienced conflict or dispute with returnees, followed by Herat (15.9%), a lower percentage in Balkh (8.8%), Nangarhar (7.3%), and Kabul (6.2%).

Compared to 2018, while experiences of conflict have increased in Kabul (4.2% to 6.2%) and Herat (14.3% to 15.9%), prominent decreases are seen in Nangarhar (11.3% to 7.3%) and in Kandahar (24.7% to 17.6%).

EXPERIENCES OF DISPUTE, BY PROVINCE AND YEAR

	2018	2019
	%	%
KABUL	4	6
NANGARHAR	11	7
BALKH	10	9
HERAT	14	16
KANDAHAR	25	18

Fig. 127: Q-26. *Have you or family members personally experienced a dispute or conflict with a returnee(s)?*

Some variations emerge by strata and province. For example, rural host community respondents living in Herat (17.7%) were more likely to say they had experienced a dispute or conflict with returnees than respondents living in urban areas of Herat (12.8%). But in Kandahar, those who live in urban areas (23.5%) were more likely to say they had experienced a dispute or conflict with returnees, than those in rural areas (15.1%). There are no significant differences between rural and urban respondents across Kabul, Nangarhar and Balkh province.

EXPERIENCES OF DISPUTE, BY STRATA WITHIN PROVINCE

	RURAL	URBAN
	%	%
KABUL	6	6
NANGARHAR	7	8
BALKH	9	7
HERAT	18	13
KANDAHAR	15	24

Fig. 128: Q-26. Have you or family members personally experienced a dispute or conflict with a returnee(s)?

And by gender, male respondents (11.5%) were marginally more likely to say they or one of their family members had experienced a dispute or conflict with returnees than female respondents (10.7%).

Among those who reported a conflict or dispute, in a follow-up question, the *Survey* inquires about the type of dispute. A majority (70.6%) reported verbal argument or confrontation, 16.0% said physical fight or attack, and 13.0% said property dispute. There is no significant variation between rural and urban respondents in the type of dispute experienced.

By gender, female respondents (73.9%) were more likely to say they had a verbal argument or confrontation with returnees than male respondents (67.9%). And males (19.3%) were more likely to say they had physical fight or attacks with returnees than female respondents (11.9%). There are marginal differences between rural and urban residents in this regard. For instance, property dispute is only marginally more often reported among rural respondents than urban (13.7% compared to 11.1%).

TYPE OF DISPUTE, BY STRATA

	RURAL	URBAN	OVERALL
	%	%	
VERBAL ARGUMENT OR CONFRONTATION	70	72	71
PHYSICAL FIGHT OR ATTACK	16	17	16
PROPERTY DISPUTE	14	11	13

Fig. 129: Q-27. What type of dispute or conflict was it?

Among those who reported a conflict or dispute with returnees, the *Survey* also inquired about the cause of dispute. Overall, more than one fourth (26.6%) said the dispute was due to immorality, 19.9% cited vandalism, while 16.6% indicated intimidation, and a smaller proportion said harassment was the cause of conflict (14.0%). The causes of dispute were mostly consistent with 2018, with the exception of those who cited intimidation. Incidents of intimidation decreased from 24.7% in 2018 to 16.6% in 2019.

CAUSE OF DISPUTE OR CONFLICT, BY YEAR



Fig. 130: Q-27. What was the dispute or conflict about?

Some differences do emerge by strata. Harassment was more frequently cited among urban host community respondents (19.3%) compared to those who live in rural areas (11.9%).

Significant differences also emerge from by province. For instance, those who cite “intimidation” as a cause of dispute or conflict was more frequently cited by host community respondents in Nangarhar (38.2%) and Kandahar (22.4% respectively).

Discrimination was more likely reported by respondents living in Kabul (15.4%), Balkh (14.0%) and Herat (13.5%). Vandalism was also mentioned as cause of conflict by host community respondents, most frequently by respondents in Balkh (26.4%).

Not surprisingly, host community respondents in Kabul (20.6%) followed by Herat (18.1%) were more likely to report harassment as cause of conflict with returnees than respondents living other provinces.

CAUSES OF DISPUTE OR CONFLICT, BY PROVINCE

	KABUL	NANGARHAR	BALKH	HERAT	KANDAHAR
	%	%	%	%	%
INTIMIDATION	4	38	7	10	22
DISCRIMINATION	15	7	14	14	10
VANDALISM	20	10	26	20	21
IMMORALITY	20	21	38	29	23
CRIMINAL ACTIVITY	0	5	3	3	5
NAMOOS/HONOR	0	5	3	5	4
HARASSMENT	21	7	9	18	14
LIVESTOCK	2	0	0	0	0
CHILDREN'S DISPUTES/ BULLYING/ FIGHTING/ HARASSMENT AMONG CHILDREN	10	2	0	0	0

Fig.131: Q-28. What was the dispute or conflict about?

Top cited responses settings where the conflict occurred were; at home (39.0%), street (18.7%), workplace 16.2%), market (15.3%), school (3.8%), government office (2.6%), and restaurant (2.5%).

WHERE DID THE ISSUE OCCUR? BY STRATA




Fig. 132: Q-29. Where did the issue occur?

ENDNOTES

1. “Afghan returnees face economic difficulties, unemployment”, World Bank, July 14, 2019, Retrieved from: <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2019/07/14/afghan-returnees-face-economic-difficulties-unemployment>
2. Mixed Migration Center (2019)
3. Kamminga, Jorrit; Zaki, Akram (2018)
4. “Humanitarian Needs Overview: Afghanistan”, United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), 2020, Retrieved From: https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/afg_humanitarian_needs_overview_2020.pdf
5. Up to three responses can be provided to Q1-Q6. Here, only the first responses are noted.
6. Up to three responses can be provided to this question, here, only the first responses are noted.
7. Mixed Migration Center (2019)
8. Kamminga, Jorrit; Zaki, Akram (2018)
9. “Examining Return and Reintegration in Afghanistan: Why Psychosocial Interventions Matter”, SEEFAR Afghanistan, July 2018, Retrieved from: <https://seefar.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Seefar-Afghanistan-Reintegration-Study.pdf>
10. UNHCR. Returnee and Internally Displaced Persons Monitoring Report (2018)
11. Culture here is defined as social behaviour, way of life and ideas of host communities.
12. Chaudhuri, Shubham, “The latest poverty numbers for Afghanistan: a call to action, not a reason for despair”, World Bank (blog), May 7, 2018, Retrieved from: <https://blogs.worldbank.org/endpovertyinsouthasia/latest-poverty-numbers-afghanistan-call-action-not-reason-despair>
13. Central Statistics Organisation (2018)
14. Tabasum Akseer et al, “A Survey of the Afghan People: Afghanistan in 2019”, The Asia Foundation, 2019, Retrieved from: https://asiafoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/2019_Afghan_Survey_full-Report.pdf
15. 10,000 AFN is equivalent to \$128.76USD in October 2019



APPENDIX 1: DETAILED METHODOLOGY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The Asia Foundation's 2019 *Survey of Afghan Returnees* follows the successful inaugural 2018 quantitative survey that studies the needs and challenges, as well as the resources and opportunities, for those who have returned to Afghanistan from other countries. It also studies the attitudes of the host communities where returnees had settled upon their return, and conflict and cooperation between returnees and their host communities. The [REDACTED] conducted fieldwork for this project, and [REDACTED] led the independent third-party verification of the central training, provincial trainings and the fieldwork of the interviewing teams.

Roughly half of those interviewed (n=4,073) were returnees who had returned to Afghanistan from abroad within the last five years, and the other half (n=3,971) were members of host communities (defined as persons who had been living in Afghanistan continually longer than five years). The total sample size was n=8,044.

In 2018, two different questionnaires were developed, adapted in 2019, one for the returnee sample and one for the host community sample. Within each sampling point, an interviewer would conduct five interviews with returnees using the returnee questionnaire, while another interviewer would start from a different location within the same settlement and conduct five interviews with host community members using the host community member questionnaire. Thus, a total of 10 interviews were conducted in each sampling point.

The Survey was conducted in the provinces of Kabul, Balkh, Kandahar, Nangarhar, and Herat. For sampling, a frame of settlements from the International Organization for Migration (IOM) was used. Because the frame had estimates of the returnee population within each settlement on the list, the returnee sample is therefore a PPS (Population Proportional to Size) sample within each province based on the number of returnees in each settlement. Findings can be taken as representative of returnees and host communities where said returnees live in the provinces where the Survey was fielded. However, because of the nature of the sample, the findings are not projectable onto the national returnee or host community populations.

In total, a national sample of 8,044 Afghan citizens were surveyed face-to-face across the five provinces included in the study. All households were selected by random walk, and respondents were selected through a combination of screener questions and Kish grid among eligible household members. Respondents were 18 years and older: returnees had to have returned to Afghanistan within the past five years, and host community respondents had to know at least one returnee personally. Because of

accessibility challenges, the final sample was 53% male and 47% female. The final sample consisted of 34% urban households and 66% rural households in the unweighted sample. Interviews with the returnee sample ranged from 20 to 65 minutes with the average interview taking 38 minutes. Interviews with the host sample ranged from 20 to 65 minutes with the average interview taking 36 minutes.

1.2 QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

Two different versions of the questionnaire, one for the returnee sample and one for the host community sample were developed in 2018 and adapted slightly in 2019. The two versions share common management and similar demographic sections, but different substantive questions, owing to the differing research goals in surveying each target population. Questions were reviewed in order to ensure that questions met international standards, which included ensuring that questions are not double-barreled or overly complex, do not contain double negatives, are not threatening or leading, and that response scales match question wording. In total, the questionnaire went through six iterations before being approved for translation.

STANDARD PRACTICES COUNTS QUESTIONS IN THAT:

- (1) Each item in battery equals a third of a question
- (2) A question preceding a question with the same response option is counted as a third of a question
- (3) All open-ended questions are considered one full question

Using this method, both versions of the questionnaire included 29 management questions. The returnee questionnaire contained four screener questions for respondent selection, 93 substantive questions, and 23 demographics questions while the host community questionnaire contained 3 screener questions, 71 substantive questions, and 22 demographics questions. However, both questionnaires contained extensive filtering, so no respondent was asked all questions in either questionnaire.

SAMPLE DESIGN

The sample was allocated disproportionately by province and was drawn using a Population Proportional to Size (PPS) sample of the returnee population. Returnee population lists compiled by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) were used. The IOM releases population estimates by settlement roughly quarterly. The sample was drawn using the Summer 2019 figures.

1.3 SAMPLING METHODOLOGY

Target Population:	Afghan returnees and host community members in urban and rural areas of 5 provinces (Kabul, Nangarhar, Herat, Kandahar, and Balkh) ages 18+
Target Sample:	8,000 total Afghan adults in 5 provinces - Returnee Sample: 4,000 Afghan adults in 5 provinces - Host Community Sample: 4,000 Afghan adults in target districts of 5 provinces
Achieved Sample:	8,044 Afghan adults in 5 provinces (main sample) - Returnee Sample: 4,073 Afghan adults in 5 provinces - Host Community Sample: 3,971 Afghan adults in target districts of 5 provinces

1. **Step 1:** For the main sample, a base sample was first stratified disproportionately by province based on client specifications, desired margin of error and power estimates, and a desire for equal sample size by province to optimize comparisons between provinces. A total of 800 interviews (400 returnee and 400 host community) were allocated to each province.
2. **Step 2:** Because the IOM frame lacked urban/rural designations, the sample was not stratified by urban/rural status. It was drawn as a simple probability proportional to size (PPS) systematic sample based on the returnee population present in each settlement per the frame. Settlement is the Primary Sampling Unit (PSU) for this survey. The urban/rural designations present in the achieved sampling plan, and subsequently in the data set, were assigned based on comparison of the IOM frame with information available from the National Statistics and Information Authority (NSIA), formerly the Central Statistics Office (CSO), as well as observation and local knowledge for villages, settlements, and camps not in the NSIA frame. This approach differs from the Survey of the Afghan People (also implemented by [REDACTED] and D3 on behalf of the Asia Foundation), where District is the PSU: the reason for this is that population counts of returnees at the settlement level are available from the IOM sample frame, but we only have accurate population data at the district level for the national population.
 - a. Each selected sampling point included five returnee interviews and five host community interviews to maximize comparability between the two samples. This also meant that each version of the Survey could use the same sampling plan. Two interviewers worked in each sampling point, one interviewing returnees using the returnee questionnaire and the other interviewing host community members using the host community questionnaire.
 - b. In compliance with Afghan culture, interviewing is gender-specific with female interviewers interviewing only females and males interviewing only males.

- c. Prior to fieldwork, field team managers and provincial supervisors reviewed the sampling plan for inaccessible sampling points, and then sent the list back to D3 so that replacements could be selected. The efficient and current frame from the IOM allowed the replacement of sampling points in an informed manner. D3 Statisticians selected replacement sampling points based on proximity to the original replaced sampling point using GPS coordinates. Due to the nature of the sampling frame, D3 [REDACTED] only provided replacements for sampling points that were inaccessible in the initial draw, rather than providing full replicate sample draws. D3 provided three replacement villages for each inaccessible sampling point. Supervisors then determined which of those three were accessible, and selected a replacement sampling point from fieldwork from among the accessible replacement points. In cases where all three replacement villages were inaccessible, three more replacement villages were provided.
 - d. Where possible, inaccessible female sampling points were replaced with accessible female ones. In districts that were accessible to male interviewers but not to female ones, inaccessible female sampling points had to be replaced with male ones, resulting in a slightly more male-heavy sample.
 - e. During fieldwork, 11 sampling points were replaced: eight were replaced because no returnees at all were found there, and three were replaced because they were under Taliban control, and the field team had not been aware of this during the earlier phases. These were again replaced in an informed manner using proximity based on GPS coordinates: in each case, D3 statisticians selected a list of potential replacements for each sampling point where no returnees were found, and the [REDACTED] field team randomly selected a replacement sampling point from among these.
3. **Step 3:** Field managers then used maps generated from several sources to select starting points within each PSU. In both rural and urban areas, two starting points were selected within each sampling point to begin random walks to select households, one for returnees and one for the host community.
- a. In rural areas, we use a system that requires interviewers to start in one of five randomly selected locations (Northern, Southern, Eastern, or Western edges of the rural settlement and Center).
 - b. In urban areas, because it is more difficult to differentiate neighborhood borders, a random location (Northern, Southern, Eastern, Western, or Center) is provided to the interviewer, and they are to start from an identifiable landmark in the vicinity (ex: school, mosque, etc.)

4. **Step 4:** To bolster the randomization process, each sampling point was also randomly assigned a different first contacted house, either the first, second, or third house the interviewer arrived at following the start of the random walk. The household start number was assigned randomly for both the returnee and host community starting point. After approaching the first contacted house, the interviewer then followed a set interval to select all other households for inclusion in the sample. For example, selecting every third house on the right in rural areas and every fifth house on the right in urban areas.
5. **Step 5:** After selecting a household, interviewers were instructed to utilize a combination of a Kish grid and screener questions to select an appropriate target respondent¹ within the household.
 - a. For the returnee sample, the first screener question asked if the household had any returnees in it (defined as persons who have returned to Afghanistan within the last 5 years after living in another country). Internally displaced persons were included as returnees only if they had also returned to Afghanistan from another country within the past 5 years. If the household had at least one returnee, the interviewer then asked for consent to continue the screening and conduct the interview. If consent was given, the interviewer then asked how many returnees were in the household. If the household contained only one returnee, the interviewer would then conduct the interview with that person. If the household contained more than one returnee of the appropriate age and gender, the interviewer would then administer the Kish grid to select among the eligible returnees within the household.
 - b. For the host community sample, the interviewer would first administer the Kish grid to randomly select a household member. He or she would then ask two screener questions to determine their eligibility: the first asked whether or not they were a returnee according to the study's definition (if so, they were ineligible to take the host community study, so the interview would be terminated and the interviewer would proceed to the next household), and then if they personally knew or had known anyone who had returned to Afghanistan from another country in the past 5 years to resettle or work in their neighborhood. If they knew or had known at least one returnee, the interviewer could then proceed with the interview. This was done to determine that, as per the Asia Foundation's research objectives, the host community sample included only persons within the host communities who personally knew returnees but were not returnees themselves.

WEIGHTING & POST STRATIFICATION

Two weights, one for the returnee sample and one for the host community sample, were created for *The Survey of Afghan Returnees*.

Returns Dataset

Weighting was created for *the Survey of Afghan Returnees* Wave 2:

PoststratWeight: The overall weight is composed of a base weight post-stratified by Province sample size by Urban/Rural status, and scaled back down to the sample size.

The base weight, also referred to as the probability of selection weight or design weight, is computed simply as the inverse of the probability of selection for each respondent. However, a few assumptions are made in the sampling design that results in treating the sample as approximately EPSEM (equal probability of selection method).

Assumptions are as follows:

1. **The random route procedure is equivalent to a SRS of households and respondents.**

Household enumeration is too time-consuming, cost-prohibitive, and dangerous to be completed in Afghanistan. Random route and Kish grid procedures are used instead for respondent selection. We assume that these procedures are equivalent to performing a SRS of households and respondents at the settlement level.

A fully EPSEM method results in a self-weighting design, or rescaled base weights of 1. However, base weights are still needed to correct for any disproportionate stratification that may be the result of oversampling, rounding for the cluster design, or removal of interviews due to quality control. The base weights are thus computed as follows:

The base weights are thus computed as follows:

$$B_i = \left(\frac{n_i}{N_i}\right)^{-1}$$

B_i = probability of selection for a respondent

w_i = base weight for respondents

n_i = sample size in strata i

N_i = total population in strata i

¹Interviewers are not allowed to substitute an alternate member of a household for the respondent selected by the Kish grid and screener questions. If the respondent refused to participate or was not available after callbacks, then the interviewer must move on to the next household according to the random route.

Post Stratification

A post-stratification adjustment was performed on the resulting adjusted base weight to match the target population's distribution by urban and rural in each province. This target was calculated by taking the proposed sample size for each province (800) and splitting it into an urban and rural share. The population totals represent the sum of total returnees in the IOM Baseline Mobility Assessment Settlement Data (August 2019). Urbanicity was determined by reviewing each village and determining if it is in an urban district or a rural district according to the 2019 Afghanistan population estimates published by the National Statistics and Information Authority (NSIA), or based on observation and local knowledge in cases where information from the NSIA was not available.

TABLE 1: POPULATION BY PROVINCE AND TARGETS FOR WEIGHTING

Province	Urbanicity	Population	% by Province	% of Sample by Province	Target
Balkh	Rural	293136	94.49%	755.9386504	18.90%
Balkh	Urban	17086	5.51%	44.06134961	1.10%
Herat	Rural	105611	66.48%	531.8711757	13.30%
Herat	Urban	53241	33.52%	268.1288243	6.70%
Kabul	Rural	600432	56.16%	449.3023987	11.23%
Kabul	Urban	468660	43.84%	350.6976013	8.77%
Kandahar	Rural	158591	66.49%	531.8811416	13.30%
Kandahar	Urban	79945	33.51%	268.1188584	6.70%
Nangarhar	Rural	2215443	90.29%	722.2805483	18.06%
Nangarhar	Urban	238388	9.71%	77.71945175	1.94%

The resulting targets produce a weight which will maintain the uniform stratification by province while weighting the sample to urban rural share within each province. This weight will allow for maximum power when statistics between provinces.

The final step is to take the weight and scale it to the sample size, $n=3,988$:

$$W_{\text{Final_scaled}} = w_i^{\text{FinalWgt}} * [n / \sum w_i^{\text{FinalWgt}}]$$

HOST COMMUNITY DATASET

The host community dataset is weighted in the same manner as the returnee dataset. It must be noted that there are no population figures for the population which was sampled from for the host community.

The central statistics office of Afghanistan does not release accurate figures for village populations. As a result, the population of total returnees is used as a proxy for the population of the host community. The assumption being that the ratio between returnees and host communities does not vary between villages.

Aside from the above assumption, the host community weights follow the description stated above.

MARGIN OF ERROR AND DESIGN EFFECT

The added variance from a multi-stage stratified cluster design can be estimated via a design effect estimates for the Survey's variables, and in turn, used to estimate the complex margin of sampling error. Design effect estimates provided in this section account for both the complex sample design, as well as the weights.

For the returnee sample, assuming simple random sample with $n=4,073$, $p=.5$, at the 95% CI level, the margin of error for the survey is 1.54%. However, when accounting for the complex design through the design effect estimate of 2.1, $p=.5$ at the 95% CI level, the complex margin of error (MOE) is 2.23%.

For the host community sample, assuming simple random sample with $n=3,971$, $p=.5$, at the 95% CI level, the margin of error for the survey is 1.56%. However, when accounting for the complex design through the design effect estimate of 2.3, $p=.5$ at the 95% CI level, the complex margin of error (MOE) is 2.33%.

1.4. FIELD IMPLEMENTATION

FIELD TEAM

A description of the field team composition by gender and experience is listed in Table 2. The number of supervisors and male and female interviewers by province appears in Table 3.

TABLE 2: DESCRIPTION OF FIELD TEAM BY GENDER AND EXPERIENCE LEVEL

	Female	Male	Total
Number of female/male interviewers	151	161	312
Number of interviewers previously used in █████ project	142	155	297
Number of interviewers new to a █████ project	9	6	15

**TABLE 3: DESCRIPTION OF FIELD TEAM
AND GENDER OF INTERVIEWERS BY PROVINCE**

	Number of Supervisors	Number of Female Interviewers	Number of Male Interviewers	Total Number of Interviewers
Kabul	1	29	31	60
Nangarhar	1	18	21	39
Balkh	1	49	51	100
Herat	1	26	24	50
Kandahar	1	39	24	63
Total	5	161	151	312

TRAINING

The central training for provincial supervisors was held in Kabul on October 27 and was led by [REDACTED] project managers and field manager [REDACTED]. Administrative Director [REDACTED] also supervised and observed the training. A representative of [REDACTED] attended the training, as did representatives from the Asia Foundation.

Topics that were covered during the training include:

1. Background and purpose of the project, and the reason for the two samples and different questionnaires
2. Definitions of returnees and host community members
3. Correct use of the contact sheet to record the result of all contact attempts
4. Selection of two starting points within the same settlement: one for returnees and one for host community members
5. Proper household and respondent selection, including random walk procedure to select households, and correct use of screener questions and Kish grid to select respondents.
6. Full review of the questionnaire content for both questionnaires.
7. Proper recording of questions.
8. Appropriate interviewing techniques.
9. Mock interviews were conducted to get a better understanding of the logic and concept of the questions.
10. Validation protocols
11. Back-check and quality control procedures
12. GPS coordinates and devices

Provincial supervisors were tested to confirm their understanding of correct procedure for Random Walk, the Contact Sheet, and Kish Grid. Following the Kabul training, provincial trainings were led by the supervisors in their respective provinces. Third-party monitors attended the trainings in order to ensure that trainings met the standards of The Asia Foundation and [REDACTED].

The supervisors then returned to their respective provinces and held the interviewer trainings. All provincial trainings were observed by [REDACTED], a third-party validator.

TABLE 4: PROVINCIAL TRAINING SCHEDULE

Province	Date	Location
Kabul	October 29-30	Kabul
Nangarhar	October 29	Jalalabad
Balkh	October 29	Mazar-e-Sharif
Herat	October 30	Herat City
Kandahar	October 30-31	Kandahar City

VILLAGE REPLACEMENTS

Settlements were selected by PPS of the returnee population within each province. Prior to drawing the sample, field team managers and provincial supervisors reviewed the list of villages in the sampling plan for villages that were known to be inaccessible, and then sent the list back to D3 so that replacements could be selected. In most cases, inaccessibility was due to security.

The efficient and current frame from the IOM allowed D3/[REDACTED] to replace the points in an informed manner. D3 Statisticians selected replacement sampling points based on proximity to the original replaced sampling point using GPS coordinates. Due to the nature of the sampling frame, D3/[REDACTED] only provided replacements for sampling points that were inaccessible in the initial draw, rather than providing full replicate sample draws. D3 provided three replacement villages for each inaccessible sampling point. Supervisors then determined which of those three were accessible, and selected a replacement sampling point from fieldwork from among the accessible replacement points.

During fieldwork, 11 sampling points were replaced: eight were replaced because no returnees at all were found there, and three were replaced because it was under Taliban control, and the field team had not been aware of this during the earlier phases. These were again replaced in an informed manner using proximity based on GPS coordinates: in each case, D3 statisticians selected a list of six potential replacements for each sampling point where no returnees were found, and the [REDACTED] field team randomly selected a replacement sampling point from among these.

TABLE 5: VILLAGE REPLACEMENTS

Reason	Main Draw		
	Number	Percentage of Replaced Sampling Points	Percentage of Total Sampling Points
Security Issues/Taliban/ISIS	3	27.3%	0.3%
Accessibility/Weather	0	0%	0%
No Returnees Found in Village	8	72.7%	1.0%
TOTAL	11	100.0%	1.3%

CONTACT PROCEDURES

After selecting a household, interviewers were instructed to utilize a combination of screener questions and Kish grid for randomizing the target respondent within the household. Members of the household were listed with their names and age in descending order. The Kish grid provides a random selection criteria based on which visit the household represents in his or her random-walk and the number of inhabitants living in the household. Column numbers in the Kish grid that accompanies the questionnaire are pre-coded in order to help prevent fraud or convenience selection based on available people.

For the returnee sample, the first screener question asked if the household has any returnees in it (defined as persons who have returned to Afghanistan within the last 5 years after living in another country). If the household had at least one returnee, the interviewer then asked for consent to continue the screening and conduct the interview. If consent was given, the interviewer then asked how many returnees were in the household. If the household contained only one returnee, the interviewer would then conduct the interview with that person. If the household contained more than one returnee of the appropriate age and gender, the interviewer would then administer the Kish grid to select among the eligible returnees within the household.

For the host community sample, the interviewer would first administer the Kish grid to randomly select a household member. He or she would then ask two screener questions to determine their eligibility: the first asked whether or not they were a returnee (the interview was terminated and the interviewer was to proceed to the next household in the case of an affirmative response), and then if they personally knew or had known anyone who had returned to Afghanistan from another country in the past 5 years to resettle or work in their neighborhood. If they knew or had known at least one returnee, the interviewer could then proceed with the interview. This was done to determine that, as per the Asia Foundation’s research objectives, the host community sample included only persons within the host communities who personally knew returnees but were not returnees themselves.

Under no circumstances were interviewers allowed to substitute an alternate member of a household for the selected respondent. If the respondent refused to participate or was not available after three call-backs, the interviewer then moved on to the next household according to the random walk.

As with most projects, interviewers were required to make two call-backs before replacing the household. These call-backs are made at different times of the same day or on different days of the field period, in order to provide a broader schedule in which to engage the respondent. Due to security-related concerns, the field force has had difficulty meeting the requirement of two call-backs prior to substitution, particularly in many rural areas.

During the returnee fieldwork, while interviewers were able to complete some call-backs, the majority of the interviews were completed on the first attempt:

- First contact 99.7%
- Second contact 0.2%
- Third contact 0.0%

Within the host community sample, the vast majority of interviews were also completed on the first attempt:

- First contact 99.6%
- Second contact 0.2%
- Third contact 0.0%

Due to the high rate of unemployment, and choosing the appropriate time of day for interviewing, completion on the first attempt is common in Afghanistan.

SAMPLE DISPOSITION

The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) publishes four different types of rate calculations used in AAPOR reporting (response rates, contact rates, cooperation rates, and refusal rates).

██████ Surveys use AAPOR's Response Rate 3, Cooperation Rate 3, Refusal Rate 2, and Contact Rate 2 as their standards.

Acronyms used in the formulas;

I	=	Complete Interview
P	=	Partial Interview
R	=	Refusal and break-off
NC	=	Non-contact
O	=	Other
UH	=	Unknown if household/occupied household unit
UO	=	Unknown, other
e	=	Estimated proportion of cases of unknown eligibility that are eligible

$$\text{Response Rate 3} = \frac{I}{(I + P) + (R + NC + O) + e(UH + UO)}$$

$$\text{Cooperation Rate 3} = \frac{I}{(I + P) + R}$$

$$\text{Refusal Rate 2} = \frac{R}{(I + P) + (R + NC + O) + e(UH + UO)}$$

$$\text{Contact Rate 2} = \frac{(I + P) + R + O}{(I + P) + R + O + NC + e(UH + UO)}$$

1.5 QUALITY CONTROL

FIELD LEVEL

Five supervisors observed interviewer's work during field. Approximately 37% of the interviews were subject to some form of back-check.

Counting both samples, the back-checks consisted of:

- Direct observation during the interview (394 interviews, 4.9%),
- A return visit to the residence where an interview took place by the supervisor (1,590 interviews, 19.8%), or
- Quality control by an external validator (995 interviews, 12.4%).

The Survey of Afghan Returnees included third-party validation by [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] supervisors provided the fieldwork schedule to the validation team following the training briefings. Asia Foundation personnel also participated in validation for some sampling points. Validators and/or Asia Foundation personnel met with [REDACTED] interviewers during the field period and observed fieldwork to verify the correct administration of the survey, including of the starting point, the random walk, and the use of the Kish grid to select respondents in 94 sampling points. They also conducted back-checks of selected interviews.

GPS COORDINATES

In order to improve accuracy and verify fieldwork, [REDACTED] interviewers collected GPS data using phones in 808 out of 820 (99%) of sampling points. Due to security concerns, [REDACTED] was not able to

collect GPS coordinates in every sampling point. As an extra level of verification, GPS coordinates are then compared against the GPS coordinates of villages from the IOM frame. For this study, the median distance from the selected villages was 1.59 km.

CODING, DATA ENTRY, AND DATA CLEANING

When the questionnaires are returned to the [REDACTED] central office in Kabul they are sorted and open-end questions are coded by a team of coders familiar with international standards for creating typologies for codes. During data entry, 13 cases were removed from the returnee sample because of missing or misprinted pages.

The questionnaires are then sent for data entry. [REDACTED] key-punched all questionnaires on-site to protect the data and closely control the quality of the data entry process. During this process, the keypunching team utilizes logic checks and verifies any errors inadvertently committed by interviewers.

Following the data cleaning process and logic checks of the dataset, [REDACTED] uses a program called Valkyrie that searches for additional patterns and duplicates that may indicate that an interview was not properly conducted by an interviewer.

The *Valkyrie* program includes three tests:

1. Equality test – compares interviews for similarities, grouped by interviewer, within sampling point, province, or any other variable. Typically, interviews with an interviewer average of %90 or higher are flagged for further investigation.
2. Non-response test – determines the percentage of ‘Don’t Knows’ and refusals for each interviewer’s cases. Typically, interviews with %40 or higher DK responses are flagged for further investigation.
3. Duplicates test – compares cases across all interviewers and respondents to check for similarity rates. This test will flag any pair of interviews that are similar to each other. Typically, any cases that have a similarity of %95 or higher are flagged for further investigation.

Any interview that does not pass Valkyrie is pulled out for additional screening. If the interview does not pass screening, it is removed from the final database before delivery.

For the returnee sample, 48 cases were deleted from the data set for having over 95% similarities in responses to another interview (i.e., failing the duplicates test). For the host community sample, 5 cases were deleted for having high overall similarity to other cases done by the same interviewer (i.e., failing the equality test), and 73 cases were deleted from the data set for having over 95% similarities in responses to another interview (i.e., failing the duplicates test). No cases were deleted for failing the non-response test (over 40% “don’t know” or “refused”).

DOUBLE ENTRY

During the data entry process, as entry of questionnaires was completed, 20.1% of all questionnaires from the returnee sample (840 out of 4,187) and 19.9% from the host community sample (835 out

of 4,200) were randomly selected by data entry managers. These questionnaires were then given to a different team for re-entry. Data results from this independent entry were then compared to the primary data set. Discrepancies and errors were identified by data coders. Key-punchers with high error rates are disciplined and provided with additional training. For all errors, questionnaires were then reviewed, and the correct data is included in the final data set. The error rate for data entry for the returnee sample was 0.23%, while the error rate for the host community sample was 0.28%. These rates are comparably low and acceptable for quality control standards.

REVIEW AND CLEANING

A full review of the data set was conducted, including analyzing the data for irregularities and data processing errors. To achieve this, the statistical software packages SPSS, R and Stata were used to:

1. Identify incorrect coding
2. Verify filtering instructions were followed correctly
3. Address any logical inconsistencies
4. Identify outliers in the data
5. List questionnaires and interviewers for further review.

An additional series of logic checks to test data for interviewer error, logical consistency, and detect any possible patterns of falsification or poor performance were also applied.

Based on the results of these tests, a total of 66 cases were removed from the returnee data set and 151 were removed from the host community data set for failing multiple logic tests across multiple interviews, particularly in areas where field validation noted suspected problems with fieldwork. If an interviewer was flagged multiple times, all interviews conducted by this interviewer were then removed from the data.

In total, 2.6% of all successful interviews (those in the initial data file prior to quality control) were removed at some stage of the quality control process.

TABLE 6: SUMMARY OF REMOVED CASES

	n-size at each stage of QC	Total Removed	Percentage Removed at Each Stage
Total Successful Interviews	8,400	--	NA
n-size post-█ QC	8,261	139	1.7%
n-size post-Asia Foundation QC	8,044	151	1.8%



APPENDIX 2: RETURNEE QUESTIONNAIRE

SCREENING QUESTIONS

S-1. *Have you or a member of your household returned to Afghanistan in the past 5 years after migrating to or living in another country?*

[Same as Wave 1]

1. Yes	[Go to S-2]
2. No	[End interview and go to next household]
98. Refused	[End interview and go to next household]
99. Don't know	[End interview and go to next household]

S-2. *[Ask if 1 in S1] We are conducting a survey to learn more about the views, skills, and needs of people who have returned to Afghanistan. Your household's input will be very helpful. Can we interview you or the household member who is a returnee?*

[Same as Wave 1]

1. Yes	[Go to S-3]
2. No	[End interview and go to next household]
98. Refused	[End interview and go to next household]
99. Don't know	[End interview and go to next household]

S-3. *[Ask if 1 in S2] How many people in this household have returned to Afghanistan from another country in the past 5 years?*

[Same as Wave 1]

Write number: _____	
[If 1, ask to speak with that person. If greater than 1, go to Kish grid in S-4]	
98. Refused	[End interview and go to next household]
99. Don't know	[End interview and go to next household]

S-4. *(If more than 1 returnee in household at S-3) Please use the Kish below only for returnee household members. DO NOT INCLUDE ANYONE WHO HAS NOT RETURNED IN THE LAST 5 YEARS IN THE KISH GRID:*

[Same as Wave 1]

		Pre-Selected Number									
HH Members		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1
	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2
	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
	6	4	3	2	1	6	5	4	3	2	1
	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3
	8	5	4	3	2	1	8	7	6	5	4
	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1
	10	6	5	4	3	2	1	10	9	8	7

Proceed with questionnaire with respondent selected in S-3 or S-4

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION AND MIGRATION

<p>Q-1a. In which countries have you lived outside of Afghanistan at any time during the past 26 years? For reference, 26 years ago was the fall of Dr. Najibullah's government and the start of mujahedeen government. If you left Afghanistan before then but remained living abroad during any portion of that time, please count it.</p> <p>[Same as Wave 1]</p>	<p>Q-1b. How long in years did you live in this country? (Write number of years. If less than one year, write 1).</p> <p>[Same as Wave 1]</p>
<p>1. First mention: _____</p> <p>98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)</p>	<p>1. First mention: _____</p> <p>98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)</p>
<p>2. Second mention: _____</p> <p>98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)</p>	<p>2. Second mention: _____</p> <p>98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)</p>
<p>3. Third mention: _____</p> <p>98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)</p>	<p>3. Third mention: _____</p> <p>98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)</p>
<p>4. Fourth mention: _____</p> <p>98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)</p>	<p>4. Fourth mention: _____</p> <p>98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)</p>

5. Fifth mention: _____	5. Fifth mention: _____
98. Refused (vol.)	98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)	99. Don't know (vol.)

Q-2. In which month and year did you return to Afghanistan? If you have returned multiple times, please list the date of your most recent return only.

[Same as Wave 1]

Q2a. Month
98. Refused
99. Don't know

Q2b. Year: _____

9998. Refused (vol.)
9999. Don't know (vol.)

Q2c. Why did you return? (Open-ended with pre-codes, DO NOT READ OUT)

[Similar to Wave 1, added pre-codes from previous wave]

Q2c_1. First response: _____

Q2c_2. Second response: _____

add pre codes if necessary]
1. Poor security conditions in the host country
2. Poor economic conditions in the host country
3. Unemployment in host country
4. Family reunification
5. Could not get visa/permanent residency in host country
6. Deported/forcibly removed from host country
7. People of the host country were unwelcoming
8. Security situation in Afghanistan improved
9. Economic conditions in Afghanistan improved
10. People are being treated well in Afghanistan.
11. Drug addiction in the host country.
12. There was no one to lead or look after our family in the host country
13. I love my country (Patriotism)
14. Because of natural disasters in the host country.

15. Refugees are being forcibly taken to war in the host country
16. Because education has returned to Afghanistan.
96. Other (vol. – specify): _____
98. Ref. (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

Q-3. *After returning, did you live in any other place inside Afghanistan for more than 3 months, before living in your current place of residence?*

[Same as Wave 1]

1. Yes	Go to Q4
2. No	Skip to Q6
98. Refused (vol.)	Skip to Q6
99. Don't Know (vol.)	Skip to Q6

Q-4. *[Ask if code 1 in Q-3] In which city/district and province did you live?*

[Same as Wave 1]

Q4a. *District/Town/city Name:* _____

97. Not Asked
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't Know (vol.)

Q4b. *Province:* _____

97. Not Asked
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't Know (vol.)

Q-5. *[Ask if code 1 at Q-3] when did you move to that place?*

[Same as Wave 1]

Q5a. *Month*

97. Not Asked
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't Know (vol.)

Q5b. Year: _____

97. Not Asked
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't Know (vol.)

Q-6. (Ask All) Why did you decide to move to the place you are living now instead of some other place in Afghanistan? **(Open-ended with precodes, DO NOT READ OUT)**

[Same as Wave 1, added pre-codes from previous wave]

Write Response: _____

Pre-codes:

1. Better job opportunities here
2. Better services available here
3. To be around people of the same ethnicity
4. To be around people who speak the same language
5. Staying/living with family
6. Better access to electricity
7. Better access to clean water
8. Better quality of housing
9. Quality of transportation here
10. Better security here
11. Because it is my own land/house
12. Because of economic conditions
96. Other (Specify): _____
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

Q-7. Over the next year, do you plan to settle here in your current district or city, or do you want to move somewhere else?

[Same as Wave 1]

1. Settle here in this district/city	[Skip to Q-11]
2. Move somewhere else.	[Go to Q-8]
98. Refused (vol.)	[Skip to Q-11]
99. Don't know (vol.)	[Skip to Q-11]

Q-8. [Ask if code 2 at Q-7] You mentioned you want to move elsewhere. Where do you want to move?

[Same as Wave 1]

Write Response: _____	
97. Not Asked	
98. Refused (vol.)	[Skip to Q-11]
99. Don't know (vol.)	[Skip to Q-11]

Q-9. [Ask if code 2 at Q-7] Why do you want to move there? (DO NOT READ OUT)

[Same as Wave 1]

Q-9a. First response: _____
Q-9b. Second response: _____
██████ add codes as needed]
1. Better security situation
2. Better employment opportunities
3. Better standard of living
4. Be with people of the same ethnicity
5. Be around people who speak the same language
6. For education
7. To stay with family/friends
8. Sightseeing/vacation
9. Better environmental conditions
10. Better access to electricity
11. Better access to clean water
12. Better transportation
97. Not Asked
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

Q-10. [Ask if code 2 at Q-7] Would you want to move with your family, or alone?

1. Alone
2. With family
96. Other (vol): _____
97. Not Asked
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't Know (vol.)

SECTION 2: ECONOMY

Q-11. *[Ask All] Now I need to ask some questions about the members of your household who currently work or used to work. Please tell us how they are related to you and their age, as well as their profession or job and whether they contribute to your household income at present. (Record information for up to 10 household members. If respondent is unwilling to provide information about opposite-sex household members, record information about HH members of the same sex as the respondent)*

[Similar to Wave 1 with revised filtering instructions]

	Q-11a. Relationship to respondent	Q-11b. Current Age (If not known, please estimate)	Q-11c. Gender	Q-11d. Has this person returned to Afghanistan from another country in the last five years?	Q-11e (if yes at Q-11d). Professions that generated money abroad (list first two mentioned)	Q-11f. Professions that generate money Now	Q-11g. [if offered response in Q-11f] Current monthly income (in Afs)	Q11h. [if offered response in Q-11f] How difficult was to get this job?
1	01 SELF	_____ 98. Ref (vol.)	1. Male 2. Female 98. Ref (vol.)	1. Yes 2. No 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)	a. _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol) b. _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)	a. _____ 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol) b. _____ 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)	_____ 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)	1. Very difficult 2. Somewhat difficult 3. Not very difficult 4. Easy 97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)

2		<p>— — — — —</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Male 2. Female</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Yes 2. No</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>a. — — — — —</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p> <p>b. — — — — —</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>a. — — — — —</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p> <p>b. — — — — —</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Very difficult 2. Somewhat difficult 3. Not very difficult 4. Easy</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>
3		<p>— — — — —</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Male 2. Female</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Yes 2. No</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>a. — — — — —</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p> <p>b. — — — — —</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>a. — — — — —</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p> <p>b. — — — — —</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Very difficult 2. Somewhat difficult 3. Not very difficult 4. Easy</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>
4		<p>— — — — —</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Male 2. Female</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Yes 2. No</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>a. — — — — —</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p> <p>b. — — — — —</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>a. — — — — —</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p> <p>b. — — — — —</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Very difficult 2. Somewhat difficult 3. Not very difficult 4. Easy</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>

5		<p>_____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Male 2. Female</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Yes 2. No</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>a. _____</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p> <p>b. _____</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>a. _____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p> <p>b. _____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Very difficult 2. Somewhat difficult 3. Not very difficult 4. Easy</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>
6		<p>_____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Male 2. Female</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Yes 2. No</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>a. _____</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p> <p>b. _____</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>a. _____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p> <p>b. _____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Very difficult 2. Somewhat difficult 3. Not very difficult 4. Easy</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>
7		<p>_____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Male 2. Female</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Yes 2. No</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>a. _____</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p> <p>b. _____</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>a. _____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p> <p>b. _____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Very difficult 2. Somewhat difficult 3. Not very difficult 4. Easy</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>

8		— 98. Ref (vol.)	1. Male 2. Female 98. Ref (vol.)	1. Yes 2. No 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)	a. ————— 97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.) b. _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)	a. ————— 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.) b. _____ 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)	98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)	1. Very difficult 2. Somewhat difficult 3. Not very difficult 4. Easy 97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)
9		— 98. Ref (vol.)	1. Male 2. Female 98. Ref (vol.)	1. Yes 2. No 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)	a. ————— 97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.) b. _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)	a. ————— 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.) b. _____ 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)	98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)	1. Very difficult 2. Somewhat difficult 3. Not very difficult 4. Easy 97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)
10		— 98. Ref (vol.)	1. Male 2. Female 98. Ref (vol.)	1. Yes 2. No 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)	a. ————— 97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.) b. _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)	a. ————— 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.) b. _____ 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)	98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)	1. Very difficult 2. Somewhat difficult 3. Not very difficult 4. Easy 97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)

CODE LIST FOR HOUSEHOLD ROSTER IN Q11

[Same as Wave 1]

Q11a. Relationship to Respondent	Q11e & f. Occupation –
01 = SELF	01 = Unemployed / Without Income
02 = Spouse (wife or husband)	02 = Retired
03 = Child (son or daughter)	03 = Student
04 = Son-in-law or Daughter-in-law	04 = Housewife
05 = Parent	05 = Farmer on own land
06 = Father-in-law or Mother-in-law	06 = Farmer or agricultural worker on someone else's land
07 = Brother or Sister	07 = Animal Breeding or shepherd
08 = Adopted/foster/step child	08 = Fisherman
99 = Refused (vol.)	09 = Peddler/Street vendor/selling of food, vegetables, or small items on the street
99 = Don't Know (vol.)	10 = Working in your own kiosk or shop
	11 = Working in someone else's kiosk or shop
	12 = Bicycle/Motorbike repair person
	13 = Car repair/mechanic
	14 = Professional driver (taxi or rideshare)
	15 = Tailor
	16 = Miner
	17 = Factory worker
	18 = Weaver
	19 = Handicrafts
	20 = Mason/brickmaker/bricklayer
	21 = Carpenter/joiner
	23 = Painter
	24 = Blacksmith, Steelworker, Welder
	25 = Salon/Barbershop employee
	26 = Baker/Butcher/Food Preparation & Sales
	27 = Electrician
	28 = Plumber
	29 = Heating/AC/Boiler repair/maintenance

	30 = Cobbler/ Shoe repair
	31 = Cook/chef
	32 = Doctor
	33 = Veterinarian
	34 = Nurse
	35 = Midwife
	36 = School teacher
	37 = Public employee
	38 = Religious teacher/scholar/ mullah
	39 = Social or NGO worker
	40 = Soldier, Policeman, Policewoman, or Guard
	41 = Bodyguard
	42 = Employee in a company or firm
	43 = government official / political/ administrative position
	44 = Trader/ Small Business
	45 = Money Lender (Hawala)
	96 = Other (specify): _____
	97 = Not Asked
	98 = Refused (vol.)
	99 = Don't know (vol.)

Q-11i. (ASK ALL) Do female members of the family contribute to this household's income, or not?

[Same as Wave 1]

1. Yes
2. No
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

Q-12. (ASK ALL) When you traveled back to Afghanistan for your return, how much money in total did you spend on the trip? **(Enter amount; if respondent is not sure, please ask them to estimate)**

[Same as Wave 1]

Q-12a. Amount: _____

98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)
Q-12b. Currency _____
1. Afs
2. U.S. Dollars
3. Euros
4. Pakistani Rupees
5. Iranian Tomans
96. Other (specify): _____
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

Q-13. How did you finance your trip back to Afghanistan? (DO NOT READ OUT)

[Same as Wave 1]

Write Response: _____

1. Savings
2. Loan from family or friends
3. Gift/support from family or friends
4. Sell property
5. Support from UNHCR
6. Support from IOM
7. Paid for by employer or business
8. Loan from bank, broker, or other institution
96. Other (vol. – specify): _____
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

Q-14. Did you have any savings when you returned to Afghanistan?

[Same as Wave 1]

1. Yes
2. No

98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

SECTION 3: SKILLS

Q-15a. [Ask All] *Have you received any formal education while abroad?*

[Same as Wave 1]

1. Yes	[Go to Q-15b]
2. No	[Skip to Q-16]
98. Refused (vol.)	[Skip to Q-16]
99. Don't know (vol.)	[Skip to Q-16]

Q-15b [Ask if code 1, 'yes' at Q-15a] *Which levels of education did you receive while abroad?*
[Read out options; multiple response, Select all that apply]

[Similar to Q-15b in Wave 1 with revised wording]

1. Elementary school
2. Lower Secondary school
3. Upper Secondary/High school
4. University/Bachelor's degree
5. Master's or Professional degree
6. Vocational training
7. Islamic Madrasa or other religious education
96. Other (vol. – specify): _____
97. Not Asked
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

Q-16. [Ask All] *Have you learned any new skills or learned a profession while abroad?*

[Same as Wave 1]

1. Yes	[Go to Q-17]
2. No	[Skip to Q-19]
98. Refused (vol.)	[Skip to Q-19]
99. Don't know (vol.)	[Skip to Q-19]

<p>Q-17. [Ask if 1 in Q-16] What were the two most valuable skills you learned while abroad? (Record up to two mentions)</p> <p>[Same as Wave 1]</p>	<p>Q-18. [Ask if offered response in Q-17] How useful do you feel this skill was for finding a new job when you returned back to Afghanistan?</p> <p>[Same as Wave 1]</p>
<p>a) First mention: _____ [Go to Q18a]</p> <p>_____</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Very useful 2. Somewhat useful 3. Only a little useful 4. Not useful at all</p> <p>_____</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)</p>
<p>b) Second Mention: _____ [Go to Q18b]</p> <p>_____</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Very useful 2. Somewhat useful 3. Only a little useful 4. Not useful at all</p> <p>_____</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)</p>

SECTION 4: SERVICES

<p>Q-19. [Ask All] Thinking about when you last returned to Afghanistan, have you received the following types of support from any entity or organization:</p> <p>[Same as Wave 1]</p>		<p>Q-20. [Ask if code 1 in Q-19] Who provided support to your family? (DO NOT READ OUT)</p> <p>[Same as Wave 1]</p>	<p>Q-21. [Ask if codes 4 or 5 in Q-20] Please , specify which agency, NGO, or government office provided support.</p> <p>[Same as Wave 1]</p>	<p>Q-24. [if 1 in Q-19] What were you and your family able to do with the support they received?</p> <p>[Same as Wave 1]</p>
<p>a) Your housing</p>	<p>1. Yes 2. No _____ 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Friends 2. Neighbors 3. Family 4. NGO and UN 5. Government 6. Tribal or religious communities 7. Nobody 96. Other: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Ref.(vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)</p>	<p>a) First mention: _____</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)</p> <p>b) Second mention: _____</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)</p>	

<p>b) Food</p>	<p>1. Yes 2. No _____ 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Friends 2. Neighbors 3. Family 4. NGO and UN 5. Government 6. Tribal or religious communities 7. Nobody 96. Other: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Ref.(vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)</p>	<p>a) First mention: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)</p> <p>b) Second mention: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)</p>	
<p>c) Employment/ Jobs</p>	<p>1. Yes 2. No _____ 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Friends 2. Neighbors 3. Family 4. NGO and UN 5. Government 6. Tribal or religious communities 7. Nobody 96. Other: - _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Ref.(vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)</p>	<p>a) First mention: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)</p> <p>b) Second mention: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)</p>	
<p>d) Health care</p>	<p>1. Yes 2. No _____ 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Friends 2. Neighbors 3. Family 4. NGO and UN 5. Government 6. Tribal or religious communities 7. Nobody 96. Other: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Ref.(vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)</p>	<p>a) First mention: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)</p> <p>b) Second mention: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)</p>	
<p>e) Cash and/or loans</p>	<p>1. Yes 2. No _____ 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Friends 2. Neighbors 3. Family 4. NGO and UN 5. Government 6. Tribal or religious communities 7. Nobody 96. Other: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Ref.(vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)</p>	<p>a) First mention: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)</p> <p>b) Second mention: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)</p>	<p>a) First mention: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)</p> <p>b) Second mention: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)</p>

f) Training	1. Yes 2. No _____ 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)	1. Friends 2. Neighbors 3. Family 4. NGO and UN 5. Government 6. Tribal or religious communities 7. Nobody 96. Other: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)	a) First mention: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.) b) Second mention: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)	a) First mention: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.) b) Second mention: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)
g) Other help such as clothes, kitchen materials, etc.	1. Yes 2. No _____ 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)	1. Friends 2. Neighbors 3. Family 4. NGO and UN 5. Government 6. Tribal or religious communities 7. Nobody 96. Other: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)	a) First mention: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.) b) Second mention: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)	a) First mention: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.) b) Second mention: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)

Q-25. [Ask All] Have you approached anyone in the government to ask for help with anything?

[Same as Wave 1]

1. Yes	[Go to Q-26]
2. No	[Skip to Q-31]
98. Refused	[Skip to Q-31]
99. Don't know	[Skip to Q-31]

Q-26. [Ask if code 1 in Q-25] Which government offices/ departments/ministries did you approach? [Same as Wave 1]	Q-27. [Ask if code 1 in Q-25] What were the issues you raised? [Same as Wave 1]	Q-28. [Ask if code 1 in Q-25] Did you have to give money, a gift or perform a favor while in that office? [Same as Wave 1]	Q-29. [Ask if code 1 in Q-25] Overall, did you receive the support you sought? [Same as Wave 1]	Q-30. [Ask if code 1 in Q-29] If you received the support you sought, was it timely? [Same as Wave 1]
a) First mention: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)	a) First mention: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)	1. Yes 2. No _____ 3. Was asked but did not provide (vol.) 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)	1. Yes [Go to Q-30a] 2. No _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)	1. Yes 2. No _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)

b) Second mention: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)	b) Second mention: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't Know (vol.)	1. Yes 2. No _____ 3. Was asked but did not provide (vol.) 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)	1. Yes [Go to Q-30b] 2. No _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)	1. Yes 2. No _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)
--	--	---	---	--

Q-31. [Ask All] Have you approached anyone in your neighborhood to ask for help on any issue?

[Same as Wave 1]

1. Yes	[Go to Q-32]
2. No	[Skip to Q-34]
98. Refused	[Skip to Q-34]
99. Don't know	[Skip to Q-34]

Q-32. [Ask if code 1 at Q-31] What did you ask for from your neighbor? (DO NOT READ OUT) [Same as Wave 1]		Q-33 [Ask if code 1 at Q-31] Did you receive the help you asked for? [Same as Wave 1]				
		Yes	No	Not Asked	Ref (vol.)	DK (vol.)
A	a) First mention: _____ 1. Money/cash 2. Loan 3. Food 4. Help with home repairs 5. Childcare 6. Help with resolving a dispute 7. Help finding employment 8. Directions 9. Advice (in general) 10. Transport/use of car or vehicle _____ 96. Other (specify): _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)	1	2	97	98	99

B	b) Second mention: _____ 1. Money/cash 2. Loan 3. Food 4. Help with home repairs 5. Childcare 6. Help with resolving a dispute 7. Help finding employment 8. Directions 9. Advice (in general) 10. Transport/use of car or vehicle _____ 96. Other (specify): _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)	1	2	97	98	99
---	--	---	---	----	----	----

SECTION 5: CONFLICT AND INTEGRATION

Q-34. [Ask All] I am going to list a number of statements about your neighborhood. Please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with each of them

[Same as Wave 1]

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Refused (vol.)	Don't know (vol.)
a) My neighborhood has been friendly and welcoming	1	2	3	4	98	99
b) I can comfortably go to any of my neighbors for help	1	2	3	4	98	99
c) My neighbors respect me and my family	1	2	3	4	98	99
d) My neighbors invite me to their ceremonies such as wedding and khatm	1	2	3	4	98	99
e) I feel safe in my neighborhood	1	2	3	4	98	99
f) I have felt discrimination from others in my neighborhood, because of my language or the way I speak	1	2	3	4	98	99

Q34g. *To what extent is your neighborhood diverse and multiethnic?*

[Same as Wave 1]

1. A great extent
2. Somewhat
3. A little
4. Not at all
98. refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

Q-35. [Ask All] *Since returning to Afghanistan, has [INSERT ITEM] gotten better, worse, or stayed the same for women of your household?*

	Better	Worse	The same	Refused (vol.)	Don't know (vol.)
a) ability to walk outside the home	1	2	3	98	99
b) employment opportunities	1	2	3	98	99
c) their financial situation	1	2	3	98	99
d) social acceptance within the community	1	2	3	98	99
e) educational opportunities	1	2	3	98	99
f) household decision making	1	2	3	98	99
g) cultural conditions	1	2	3	98	99

Q-36. *What, if anything, is the biggest problem facing women in your household today? What is the next biggest problem? [Interviewer: record first two mentions]*

[Same as Wave 1]

Q-36a. First mention: _____
Q-36b. Second mention: _____
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

Q-37. *Since coming back to Afghanistan, where would you say you have had the most challenging experiences for your family? [Interviewer: record first two mentions, do not read out pre-codes]*

[Same as Wave 1, added response code from previous wave]

Q-37a. First mention: _____
Q-37b. Second mention: _____
██████ add pre codes if necessary]
1. Returnees camp/shelter
2. Neighborhood
3. School
4. University
5. Bazaar/Marketplace
6. Mosque
7. Workplace
8. Hospital/clinic
9. Government offices
10. At home
12. Nothing/nowhere
96. Other (vol.): _____
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

Q-39. *Since returning to Afghanistan, have you or family members personally experienced a dispute or conflict with a community member(s)?*

[Same as Wave 1]

1. Yes	[Go to Q-40]
2. No	[Skip to Q-45]
98. Refused	[Skip to Q-45]
99. Don't know	[Skip to Q-45]

Q-40. *[Ask if code 1 in Q-39] What type of dispute or conflict was it? (DO NOT READ OUT)*

[Same as Wave 1]

Write Response: _____

██████ add pre codes if necessary]
1. Verbal argument or confrontation
2. Physical fight or attack

3. Property dispute
96. Other (specify): _____
97. Not Asked
98. Refused
99. Don't know

Q-41. [Ask if code 1 in Q-39] What was the cause of the dispute or conflict? (DO NOT READ OUT)

[Same as Wave 1]

1. Intimidation
2. Discrimination
3. Vandalism
4. Immorality
5. Criminal activity
6. Name/honor
7. Harassment
96. Other: _____
97. Not Asked
98. Refused
99. Don't know

Q-42. [Ask if code 1 in Q-39] Where did the issue occur?

[Same as Wave 1]

1. Home
2. School
3. Government office
4. Workplace
5. Market
6. Restaurant
7. Street
96. Other: _____
97. Not Asked
98. Refused

99. Don't know

Q-43. [Ask if code 1 in Q-39] Was the conflict resolved?

[Same as Wave 1]

1. Yes	[Go to Q-44]
2. No	[Skip to Q-45]
97. Not Asked	
98. Refused	[Skip to Q-45]
99. Don't know	[Skip to Q-45]

Q-44. [Ask if code 1 in Q-43] Did any of the following help with dispute resolution? (Multiple response, code all that apply)

[Same as Wave 1]

1. State court
2. Huquq Department
3. Shura or jirga
4. The parties themselves
96. Other (vol.): _____
97. Not Askedt
98. Refused
99. Don't know

Q-45. [Ask All] Since you moved back to Afghanistan, have the following services gotten better, gotten worse, or is there no difference for your household?

[Same as Wave 1]

	Better	Worse	No difference	Refused (vol.)	Don't know (vol.)
a) Household financial situation	1	2	3	98	99
b) Access to drinking water	1	2	3	98	99
c) Quality of drinking water	1	2	3	98	99
d) Access to health care	1	2	3	98	99
e) Quality of health services	1	2	3	98	99

f) Access to education for children	1	2	3	98	99
g) Quality of education for children	1	2	3	98	99
h) Access to electricity	1	2	3	98	99
i) Quality of electricity supply	1	2	3	98	99
j) Access to transportation	1	2	3	98	99
k) Quality of transportation	1	2	3	98	99
l) Jobs and work opportunities	1	2	3	98	99
m) Safety and security for your family	1	2	3	98	99
n) Access to housing/land	1	2	3	98	99
o) Your overall happiness	1	2	3	98	99

Q-46a. [Ask All] *Compared to your neighbors who are not returnees, would you say the following services are better, worse, or no different for your household?*

[NEW in Wave 2]

	Better	Worse	No difference	Refused (vol.)	Don't know (vol.)
a) Household financial situation	1	2	3	98	99
b) Access to drinking water	1	2	3	98	99
c) Quality of drinking water	1	2	3	98	99
d) Access to health care	1	2	3	98	99
e) Quality of health services	1	2	3	98	99
f) Access to education for children	1	2	3	98	99
g) Quality of education for children	1	2	3	98	99
h) Access to electricity	1	2	3	98	99
i) Quality of electricity supply	1	2	3	98	99
j) Access to transportation	1	2	3	98	99
k) Quality of transportation	1	2	3	98	99
l) Jobs and work opportunities	1	2	3	98	99

m) Safety and security for your family	1	2	3	98	99
n) Access to housing/land	1	2	3	98	99
o) Your overall happiness	1	2	3	98	99

Q-47a. [Ask All] *In general, in the future, if you continue to stay in your present location, do you feel your living conditions for your family would improve, deteriorate, or remain the same?*

[Was Q-46a in Wave 1]

1. Improve
2. Deteriorate
3. Remain the same
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

Q-46b. [Ask All] *Why do you say that?*

[Was Q-46b in Wave 1, pre-codes from previous wave have been added]

Q-47b_1. First mention: _____
Q-47b_2. Second mention: _____
1. Security is better now
2. Reconstruction has taken place
3. There is insecurity
5. There is unemployment
8. The Education has been improved
9. The Economy has been improved
10. The living condition of people has improved.
11. Government is weak
12. Lack of Shelter
18. Lack of electricity
20. Lack of school
22. Everything is too expensive
30. Worse economy
31. Employment opportunities are better

33. Because there is patriotism
47. Lack of Health care
98. Refused (vol.)

**Q-48. [Ask All] When you returned to Afghanistan, did you register with any organization?
[Was Q-47 in Wave 1]**

1. Yes	[Go to Q49]
2. No	[Skip to D1]
98. Refused (vol.)	[Skip to D1]
99. Don't know (vol.)	[Skip to D1]

**Q-49. [Ask if code 1 in Q-48] Which organization did you register with? (MULTIPLE RESPONSE, select all that apply, do not read out)
[Was Q-48 in Wave 1]**

1. Government
2. IOM
3. World Bank
4. UNHCR
96. Other (vol. - specify):_____
97. Not Asked
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

DEMOGRAPHIC SECTION

Interviewer Read: That completes the main part of the survey. These last questions are just for statistical purposes.

D-1. Gender (Do not ask; Code by observation)

[Same as Wave 1]

1. Male
2. Female

D-2. How old are you? (Record actual age; if respondent doesn't know or refuses, please estimate)

[Same as Wave 1]

Response: _____

D-3. What is your marital status? Are you married or single?

[Same as Wave 1]

1. Single
2. Married
3. Widower/Widow
4. Divorced/Separated
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

D-4. Do you have a tazkira?

[Same as Wave 1]

1. Yes
2. No
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

D-5. What is the highest level (grade) of school you have completed, not including schooling in Islamic madrasa? (Calculate the highest level into years. If none, write down zero)

Response: _____ (write down number of years)
97. Informal schooling at home or at a literacy class
98. Refused
99. Don't know

D-6. What type of dwelling best describes your current dwelling?

[Same as Wave 1]

1. Single family house
2. Part of a shared house/Compound
3. Separate apartment unit (just your family)

4. Shared apartment unit (shared with another family; clarify difference with house or separate apartment)
5. Tent
96. Other: _____
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

D-7. What is the arrangement on the basis of which your household occupies this dwelling?

[Same as Wave 1]

Write Response: _____

1. Tenant (renting)	[Go to D-8a]
2. Lease (Gerawee)	[Go to D-8a]
3. Inherited	[Skip to D-9]
4. Ancestral home	[Skip to D-9]
5. Purchased dwelling	[Skip to D-9]
6. Constructed dwelling	[Skip to D-9]
7. Relative or friend of owner (does not pay rent)	[Skip to D-9]
8. Own – given free through charity	[Skip to D-9]
9. Caretaker (do no own and does not pay rent)	[Skip to D-9]
[Redacted] add pre codes if necessary]	
96. Other: _____	[Skip to D-9]
98. Refused (vol.)	[Skip to D-9]
99. Don't know (vol.)	[Skip to D-9]

D-8a. [Ask if code 1 or 2 in D-7] Do you pay rent or lease monthly or annually?

[Same as Wave 1]

1. Monthly
2. Annually
96. Other (vol.): _____
97. Not Asked
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

D-8b. [Ask if code 1 or 2 in D-7] How much is the rent (monthly)/lease (annual) and in which currency?

[Same as Wave 1]

D-8ba. Amount rent (monthly)/lease (annual): _____

97. Not Asked
98. Refused
99. Don't know

D-8bb. Currency: _____

1. Afs
2. U.S. Dollars
3. Euros
4. Pakistani Rupees
5. Iranian Tomans
96. Other (specify): _____
97. Not Asked
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

D-9. [Ask All] Do the following types of people live in your neighborhood? (select all that apply)

[Same as Wave 1]

	Yes	No	Refused (vol.)	Don't know (vol.)
a) Your immediate family	1	2	98	99
b) Your extended family	1	2	98	99
c) Other returnees from your ethnic group	1	2	98	99
d) Returnees from other ethnic groups				
e) Neighbors from your ethnic group	1	2	98	99
f) Neighbors from other ethnic groups	1	2	98	99
g) Neighbors from other parts of the country	1	2	98	99
h) Wealthy neighbors	1	2	98	99
i) Impoverished neighbors	1	2	98	99

D-10. How many of the following items does your household currently own?

[Similar to D-10 in Wave 1, item j is NEW]

	Number of Items (if not sure, estimate)	Refused (vol)	Don't Know (vol)
a) Bicycle		98	99
b) Motorcycle		98	99
c) Car		98	99
d) TV		98	99
h) Jeribs of Land		98	99
i) Livestock (not poultry)		98	99
j. Mobile phone		98	99

<p>D-11. How many children in your household were old enough to attend school while abroad? How many are boys and how many girls? (write number)</p> <p>[NEW in Wave 2]</p>	<p>D-12. (Ask if greater than 0 in D-11) How many of them attended primary school while abroad?</p> <p>[NEW in Wave 2]</p>	<p>D-13. (Ask if greater than 0 in D-11) How many of them attended secondary school while abroad?</p> <p>[NEW in Wave 2]</p>	<p>D-14. (Ask if greater than 0 in D-11) How many of them attended high school while abroad?</p> <p>[NEW in Wave 2]</p>	<p>D-15. (Ask if codes 1 or 2 in any of D-12, D-13, or D-14) Why didn't they go to school?</p> <p>[Similar to D-13 in Wave 1 with revised filtering, wording and response options]</p>
--	--	--	---	--

a) Girls	<p>Write number: _____</p> <p>— 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>1. All of them 2. Some of them 3. None of them</p> <p>—</p> <p>96. Children were not of appropriate age at the time (vol.) 97. Not Asked 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>1. All of them 2. Some of them 3. None of them</p> <p>—</p> <p>96. Children were not of appropriate age at the time (vol.) 97. Not Asked 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>1. All of them 2. Some of them 3. None of them</p> <p>—</p> <p>96. Children were not of appropriate age at the time (vol.) 97. Not Asked 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>a) Response: _____</p> <p>1. Cannot afford tuition and/or school supplies 2. They need to work 3. Quality of education is bad 4. Don't see the point in education 5. Transportation difficulties 6. School teaches immoral things 7. Cannot afford school supplies 8. They were married/got married</p> <p>—</p> <p>96. Other (specify): _____</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>
b) Boys	<p>Write number: _____</p> <p>— 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>1. All of them 2. Some of them 3. None of them</p> <p>—</p> <p>96. Children were not of appropriate age at the time (vol.) 97. Not Asked 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>1. All of them 2. Some of them 3. None of them</p> <p>—</p> <p>96. Children were not of appropriate age at the time (vol.) 97. Not Asked 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>1. All of them 2. Some of them 3. None of them</p> <p>—</p> <p>96. Children were not of appropriate age at the time (vol.) 97. Not Asked 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>b) Response: _____</p> <p>1. Cannot afford tuition and/or school supplies 2. They need to work 3. Quality of education is bad 4. Don't see the point in education 5. Transportation difficulties 6. School teaches immoral things 7. Cannot afford school supplies 8. They were married/got married</p> <p>—</p> <p>96. Other (specify): _____</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>

<p>D-16. As of right now, how many children in your household are old enough to attend school? How many are boys and how many girls? (write number)</p> <p>[NEW in Wave 2]</p>		<p>D-17. (Ask if greater than 0 in D-16) How many of them attend or have completed primary school?</p> <p>[NEW in Wave 2]</p>	<p>D-18. (Ask if greater than 0 in D-16) How many of them attend or have completed secondary school?</p> <p>[NEW in Wave 2]</p>	<p>D-19. (Ask if greater than 0 in D-16) How many of them attend high school?</p> <p>[NEW in Wave 2]</p>	<p>D-20. (Ask if codes 1 or 2 in any of D-12, D-13, or D-14) Why didn't they go to school?</p> <p>[Similar to D-13 in Wave 1 with revised filtering, wording and response options]</p>
<p>a) Girls</p>	<p>Write number: _____</p> <p>98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>1. All of them 2. Some of them 3. None of them</p> <p>—</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>1. All of them 2. Some of them 3. None of them</p> <p>—</p> <p>96. Children not yet of appropriate age (vol.) 97. Not Asked 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>1. All of them 2. Some of them 3. None of them</p> <p>—</p> <p>96. Children not yet of appropriate age (vol.) 97. Not Asked 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>a) Response: _____</p> <p>1. Cannot afford tuition and/or school supplies 2. They need to work 3. Quality of education is bad 4. Don't see the point in education 5. Transportation difficulties 6. School teaches immoral things 7. Cannot afford school supplies 8. They were married/got married</p> <p>—</p> <p>96. Other (specify): _____</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>

b) Boys	Write number: _____ 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)	1. All of them 2. Some of them 3. None of them _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)	1. All of them 2. Some of them 3. None of them _____ 96. Children not yet of appropriate age (vol.) 97. Not Asked 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)	1. All of them 2. Some of them 3. None of them _____ 96. Children not yet of appropriate age (vol.) 97. Not Asked 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)	b) Response: _____ 1. Cannot afford tuition and/or school supplies 2. They need to work 3. Quality of education is bad 4. Don't see the point in education 5. Transportation difficulties 6. School teaches immoral things 7. Cannot afford school supplies 8. They were married/got married _____ 96. Other (specify): _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)
---------	--	--	--	--	--

D-21. Which languages do you speak? (Multiple Response, code all mentioned)

[Was D-14 in Wave 1]

D-22. Which ethnic group do you belong to? (Record first mention)

[Was D-15 in Wave 1]



APPENDIX 3: HOST COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRE

SCREENING QUESTIONS

S-1. Please use the Kish below for all eligible household members

HH Members		Pre-Selected Number									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2
4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1
6	4	3	2	1	6	5	4	3	2	1	6
7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4
8	5	4	3	2	1	8	7	6	5	4	3
9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2
10	6	5	4	3	2	1	10	9	8	7	6

S-2. Ask person selected in Kish Grid in S-1) Are you a returnee that has come back to Afghanistan in the past 5 years?

1. Yes	[End interview and go to next household]
2. No	[Go to S-3]
98. Refused (vol.)	[End interview and go to next household]
99. Don't Know (vol.)	[End interview and go to next household]

S-3. Do you know or have you known personally anyone who has returned to Afghanistan from another country in the past 5 years to resettle or work in this neighborhood?

1. Yes	[Go to Q-1]
2. No	[End interview and go to next household]
98. Refused (vol.)	[End interview and go to next household]
99. Don't Know (vol.)	[End interview and go to next household]

Proceed with questionnaire with selected respondent:

SECTION 1: PERCEPTIONS ABOUT RETURNEES

Thinking about the returnees you personally know, we want to ask some questions about them. You can tell us about up to three of them.

<p>READ PROMPT BELOW, THEN GO THROUGH Q1-Q6 ABOUT EACH RETURNEE</p>	<p>Q-1. Is the returnee your relative? [Same as Wave 1]</p>	<p>Q-2. Which country did they return from? [Same as Wave 1]</p>	<p>Q-3. How many months ago did they return? If you aren't sure, please estimate. [Same as Wave 1]</p>	<p>Q-4. Overall, how comfortable would you say you are interacting with them? [Same as Wave 1]</p>	<p>Q-5. (Ask if codes 3 or 4 in Q-4) Why are you uncomfortable interacting with them? [Same as Wave 1]</p>	<p>Q-6. Have they ever approached your household for any help? If yes, what were they asking for? [Same as Wave 1]</p>
<p>Thinking of the first returnee who comes to mind...</p>	<p>1. Yes 2. No: _____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>	<p>Q-2a. Response: _____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>	<p>Q-3a. Response: _____</p> <p>(in months, if response provided in years, multiple by 12)</p> <p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>	<p>1. Very comfortable 2. Somewhat comfortable 3. Somewhat uncomfortable 4. Very uncomfortable _____ 98. Refused 99. Don't know</p>	<p>Q-5a. Response: _____</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>	<p>Q-6a. Response: _____</p> <p>97. have not approached 98. Refused 99. Don't Know</p>
<p>Thinking of the second returnee who comes to mind...</p>	<p>1. Yes 2. No: _____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>	<p>Q-2b. Response: _____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>	<p>Q-3b. Response: _____</p> <p>(in months, if response provided in years, multiple by 12)</p> <p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>	<p>1. Very comfortable 2. Somewhat comfortable 3. Somewhat uncomfortable 4. Very uncomfortable _____ 98. Refused 99. Don't know</p>	<p>Q-5b. Response: _____</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>	<p>Q-6b. Response: _____</p> <p>97. have not approached 98. Refused 99. Don't Know</p>

Thinking of the third returnee who comes to mind...	1. Yes 2. No: _____ 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)	Q-2c. Response: _____ 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)	Q-3c. Response: _____ (in months, if response provided in years, multiple by 12) 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)	1. Very comfortable 2. Somewhat comfortable 3. Somewhat uncomfortable 4. Very uncomfortable _____ 98. Refused 99. Don't know	Q-5c. Response: _____ 97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)	Q-6c. Response: _____ 97. have not approached 98. Refused 99. Don't Know
---	--	--	--	--	---	---

Q-7. [Ask All] Thinking about returnees settling in your area, what type of effect do you think they have on the following areas in your neighborhood?

	Positive effect	Negative effect	Depends on who is returning or where they are returning from (vol.)	No effect (vol)	Ref (vol)	DK (vol)
a) Safety	1	2	3	4	98	99
b) Crime	1	2	3	4	98	99
c) Culture	1	2	3	4	98	99
d) Availability of job opportunities	1	2	3	4	98	99
e) Cleanness and maintenance of public areas	1	2	3	4	98	99

Q-8. [Ask All] How much would you favor or oppose each of the following? Would you say that you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose each of them?

[Same as Wave 1]

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	Ref (vol)	DK (vol)
a. A returnee moving next door to you	1	2	3 [Ask Q9a]	4 [Ask Q9a]	98	99
b. Your children/sibling playing with returnees' children	1	2	3 [Ask Q9b]	4 [Ask Q9b]	98	99
c. Your children/sibling receiving education from a returnee teacher in school/university	1	2	3 [Ask Q9c]	4 [Ask Q9c]	98	99
d. Work with a returnee in the same workplace	1	2	3 [Ask Q9d]	4 [Ask Q9d]	98	99

Q9a. [Ask if codes 3 or 4 at Q8a] Why would you oppose a returnee moving next door to you?

[Same as Wave 1, added pre-codes from previous wave]

Write Response: _____

1. Creating security problem
2. They are addicted to drugs
3. He/she is rude
4. He/she has indirect connection with AGE
5. I don't know him/her
6. Because of language problems
97. Not Asked
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

Q9b. [Ask if codes 3 or 4 at Q8b] Why would you oppose your children/sibling playing with returnees' children?

[Same as Wave 1, added pre-codes from previous wave]

Write Response: _____

1. Because their living condition is different
2. I don't trust him/her
3. He/she is rude
4. He/she is bringing foreign culture
5. He/she is addicted to drugs
6. Because of language problems
97. Not Asked
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

Q9c. [Ask if codes 3 or 4 at Q8c] Why would you oppose your children/sibling receiving education from a returnee teacher in school/university?

[Same as Wave 1, added pre-codes from previous wave]

Write Response: _____

1. I don't trust him/her
2. He/she is implementing foreign culture
3. He/she is illiterate
4. He/she is corrupt

5. He/she is rude
6. Because of language problems
97. Not Asked
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

Q9d. [Ask if codes 3 or 4 at Q8d] Why would you oppose working with a returnee in the same workplace?

[Same as Wave 1, added pre-codes from previous wave]

Write Response: _____

1. I don't trust him/her
2. Creating security problem
3. He/she is impolite
4. He/she is bringing foreign culture
5. Because of linguistic problems
6. He/she is addicted to drugs
7. He/she does not know how to work
97. Not Asked
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

Q-10. [Ask All] I am going to list a number of statements about your neighborhood. Please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with each of them

[Same as Wave 1]

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Refused (vol.)	Don't know (vol.)
a) My neighbors are friendly and welcoming	1	2	3	4	98	99
b) I can comfortably go to any of my neighbors for help	1	2	3	4	98	99
c) My neighbors respect me and my family	1	2	3	4	98	99
d) My neighbors invite me to their ceremonies such as wedding and khatm	1	2	3	4	98	99
e) I feel safe in my neighborhood	1	2	3	4	98	99

Q10f. *To what extent is your neighborhood diverse and multiethnic?*

[Same as Wave 1]

1. A great extent
2. Somewhat
3. A little
4. Not at all
98. Refused
99. Don't know

Q-11. [Ask All] *To what extent would you trust a returnee to [INSERT ITEM]. Would you trust a returnee to do this to a great extent, a moderate extent, a small extent, or not at all?*

[Same as Wave 1]

	A great extent	A moderate extent	A small extent	Not at all	Ref (vol.)	DK (vol.)
Q-11a. Be a member of your community development council	1	2	3 [Ask Q-12a]	4 [Ask Q-12a]	98	99
Q-11b. Serve in the ANDSF	1	2	3 [Ask Q-12b]	4 [Ask Q-12b]	98	99
Q-11c. Represent you in government	1	2	3 [Ask Q-12c]	4 [Ask Q-12c]	98	99
Q-11d. Deliver religious sermons	1	2	3 [Ask Q-12d]	4 [Ask Q-12d]	98	99
Q-11e. Rent your house or apartment	1	2	3 [Ask Q-12e]	4 [Ask Q-12e]	98	99

Q12a. [Ask if codes 3 or 4 at Q11a] *Why would you not trust a returnee to be a member of your community development council?*

[Same as Wave 1, added pre-codes from previous wave]

Write Response: _____

1. I don't know him/her
2. They cause insecurity
3. They are not from our village
4. They are criminals
5. They are corrupt
6. They have indirect connections with AGE
7. They work for other countries
97. Not Asked
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

Q12b. [Ask if codes 3 or 4 at Q11b] Why would you not trust a returnee to serve in the ANDSF

[Same as Wave 1, added pre-codes from previous wave]

Write Response: _____

1. They are not a real Afghans
2. They are working for foreigners
3. They are corrupt
4. Creating problems
5. I don't trust them
6. They are not being recruited in ANDSF
7. They work for AGE
8. They are addicted to drugs.
97. Not Asked
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

Q12c. [Ask if codes 3 or 4 at Q11c] Why would you not trust a returnee to represent you in government?

[Same as Wave 1, added pre-codes from previous wave]

Write Response: _____

1. They are not Afghans
2. They are addicted to drugs
3. They cause destruction in the country
4. I don't know him/her
5. He/she makes his/her own law
6. They are spies
7. I don't trust them
8. They are rude
9. They are illiterate
10. They are not one of our village elders
11. Because of language problems
97. Not Asked
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

Q12d. [Ask if codes 3 or 4 at Q11d] Why would you not trust a returnee to deliver religious sermons?

[Same as Wave 1, added pre-codes from previous wave]

Write Response: _____

1. I don't trust them
2. They make useless decisions
3. They bring/practice inappropriate culture
4. They are not good people
5. He/she is not a good scholar
6. They have indirect connection with AGE
7. They work for other countries
8. They are illiterate
97. Not Asked
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

Q12e. [Ask if codes 3 or 4 at Q11e] Why would you not trust a returnee to rent your house or apartment?

[Same as Wave 1, added pre-codes from previous wave]

Write Response: _____

1. I don't know them
2. I don't trust them
3. They are not Afghans
4. Does not have enough money
5. They annoy people
6. They are rude
7. They are corrupted
8. They are criminals
9. They have religious problem
10. Fear of suicide attacks
11. He/she is illiterate
12. They cause security problems
97. Not Asked
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

Q-13. [Ask All] Thinking now about the overall situation of your household in comparison with returnees in this community, would you say that the following things are better for your household than they are for returnees, worse for your household than they are for returnees, or about the same relative to returnees?

[NEW in Wave 2]

	Better	Worse	About the same	Refused (vol.)	Don't know (vol.)
a) Household financial situation	1	2	3	98	99
b) Access to drinking water	1	2	3	98	99
c) Quality of drinking water	1	2	3	98	99
d) Access to health care	1	2	3	98	99
e) Quality of health services	1	2	3	98	99
f) Access to education for children	1	2	3	98	99
g) Quality of education for children	1	2	3	98	99
h) Access to electricity	1	2	3	98	99
i) Quality of electricity supply	1	2	3	98	99
j) Access to transportation	1	2	3	98	99
k) Quality of transportation	1	2	3	98	99
l) Jobs and work opportunities	1	2	3	98	99
m) Safety and security for your family	1	2	3	98	99
n) Access to housing/land	1	2	3	98	99
o) Your overall happiness	1	2	3	98	99

SECTION 2: SKILLS, EMPLOYMENT, AND ECONOMIC IMPACT

Q-14. [Ask All] Now I will read out some problems. Please tell me if each of these is a major problem, a minor problem, or not a problem for the returnees in this neighborhood.

[Was Q-13 in Wave 1]

	Major problem	Minor problem	Not a problem	Refused (vol.)	Don't Know (vol.)
a) Access to land and housing	1	2	3	98	99
b) Unemployment/ Joblessness	1	2	3	98	99
c) Not enough food	1	2	3	98	99
d) Not enough electricity	1	2	3	98	99
e) Not enough health care/services	1	2	3	98	99
f) Not enough education	1	2	3	98	99

Q-15. [Ask All] Do you think returnees should receive the following benefits from the government to help them resettle in Afghanistan?

[Was Q-14 in Wave 1]

	Yes	No	Refused (vol)	Don't know (vol)
a) Food support	1	2	98	99
b) Housing support	1	2	98	99
c) Free land	1	2	98	99
d) Livestock	1	2	98	99
e) Money	1	2	98	99
f) Skills or job training	1	2	98	99

Q-16. Currently, which of the following groups help returnees in your community? [Was Q-15 in Wave 1]		Q-17. [Ask if code 1 in Q-16] what kind of help do they give? [Was Q-16 in Wave 1]
Q-16a. Elders in your community	1. Yes [Go to Q-17a] 2. No _____ 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)	Q-17a. Response: _____ - 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)
Q-16b. Community members	1. Yes [Go to Q-17b] 2. No _____ 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)	Q-17b. Response: _____ - 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)
Q-16c. The government	1. Yes [Go to Q-17c] 2. No _____ 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)	Q-17c. Response: _____ - 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)
Q-16d. The United Nations / IOM	1. Yes [Go to Q-17d] 2. No _____ 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)	Q-17d. Response: _____ - 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)
Q-16e. Afghan NGOs	1. Yes [Go to Q-17e] 2. No _____ 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)	Q-17e. Response: _____ - 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)
Q-16f. Foreign NGOs	1. Yes [Go to Q-17f] 2. No _____ 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)	Q-17f. Response: _____ - 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)

Q-16g. Other (specify): _____	1. Yes [Go to Q-17g] 2. No _____ 98. Ref (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)	Q-17g. Response: _____ - 97. Not Asked 98. Refused (vol.) 99. Don't know (vol.)
--------------------------------------	--	--

Q-18. *Thinking about the amount of help returnees in your community receive, would you say that they need more help, less help, or about the same amount of help that they have been receiving?*

[Was Q-14 in Wave 1]

1. More help	[Go to Q-19]
2. Less help	[Skip to Q-21]
3. About the same amount of help	[Skip to Q-21]

98. Refused	[Skip to Q-21]
99. Don't know	[Skip to Q-21]

Q-19. *[Ask if code 1 at Q-18] What types of help do you think it is most important that they provide more of?*

[Was Q-18 in Wave 1]

Q-19a. Write first response: _____
Q-19b. Write second response: _____

97. Not Asked
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

Q-20. *[Ask if code 1 at Q-18] Which groups or organizations do you think should be responsible for providing this help?*

[Was Q-19 in Wave 1]

Q-20a. Write first response: _____
Q-20b. Write second response: _____

97. Not Asked
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

Q-21. [Ask All] Now I need to ask some questions about the members of your household who currently work or used to work. Please tell us how they are related to you and their age, as well as their profession or job and whether they contribute to your household income at present. **(Record information for up to 10 household members. If respondent is unwilling to provide information about opposite-sex household members, record information about HH members of the same sex as the respondent)**

[NEW in Wave 2]

	Q-21a. Relationship to respondent	Q-21b. Current Age (If not known, please estimate)	Q-21c. Gender	Q-21d. Professions that generate money	Q-21e. [if offered response in Q-21d] Current monthly income (in Afs)	Q-21f. [if offered response in Q-21d] How difficult was to get this job?
1	01 SELF	_____ 98. Ref (vol.)	1. Male 2. Female 98. Ref (vol.)	a. _____ 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol) b. _____ 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)	_____ 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)	1. Very difficult 2. Somewhat difficult 3. Not very difficult 4. Easy 97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)
2		_____ 98. Ref (vol.)	1. Male 2. Female 98. Ref (vol.)	a. _____ 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol) b. _____ 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)	98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)	1. Very difficult 2. Somewhat difficult 3. Not very difficult 4. Easy 97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)
3		_____ 98. Ref (vol.)	1. Male 2. Female 98. Ref (vol.)	a. _____ 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol) b. _____ 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)	98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)	1. Very difficult 2. Somewhat difficult 3. Not very difficult 4. Easy 97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)

4		<p>_____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Male 2. Female</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.)</p>	<p>a. _____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p> <p>b. _____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>	<p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>	<p>1. Very difficult 2. Somewhat difficult 3. Not very difficult 4. Easy</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>
5		<p>_____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Male 2. Female</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.)</p>	<p>a. _____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p> <p>b. _____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>	<p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>	<p>1. Very difficult 2. Somewhat difficult 3. Not very difficult 4. Easy</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>
6		<p>_____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Male 2. Female</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.)</p>	<p>a. _____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p> <p>b. _____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>	<p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>	<p>1. Very difficult 2. Somewhat difficult 3. Not very difficult 4. Easy</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>
7		<p>_____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Male 2. Female</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.)</p>	<p>a. _____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p> <p>b. _____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>	<p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>	<p>1. Very difficult 2. Somewhat difficult 3. Not very difficult 4. Easy</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>
8		<p>_____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Male 2. Female</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.)</p>	<p>a. _____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p> <p>b. _____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>	<p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>	<p>1. Very difficult 2. Somewhat difficult 3. Not very difficult 4. Easy</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>

9		<p>_____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Male 2. Female</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.)</p>	<p>a. _____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p> <p>b. _____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>	<p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>	<p>1. Very difficult 2. Somewhat difficult 3. Not very difficult 4. Easy</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>
10		<p>_____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.)</p>	<p>1. Male 2. Female</p> <p>98. Ref (vol.)</p>	<p>a. _____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p> <p>b. _____</p> <p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>	<p>98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>	<p>1. Very difficult 2. Somewhat difficult 3. Not very difficult 4. Easy</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref (vol) 99. DK (vol)</p>

CODE LIST FOR HOUSEHOLD ROSTER IN Q11

[NEW in Wave 2]

Q21a. Relationship to Respondent	01 = Unemployed / Without Income
01 = SELF	02 = Retired
02 = Spouse (wife or husband)	03 = Student
03 = Child (son or daughter)	04 = Housewife
04 = Son-in-law or Daughter-in-law	05 = Farmer on own land
05 = Parent	06 = Farmer or agricultural worker on someone else's land
06 = Father-in-law or Mother-in-law	07 = Animal Breeding or shepherd
07 = Brother or Sister	08 = Fisherman
08 = Adopted/foster/step child	09 = Peddler/Street vendor/selling of food, vegetables, or small items on the street
98 = Refused (vol.)	10 = Working in your own kiosk or shop
98 = Don't Know (vol.)	11 = Working in someone else's kiosk or shop
	12 = Bicycle/Motorbike repair person
	13 = Car repair/mechanic
	14 = Professional driver (taxi or rideshare)
	15 = Tailor
	16 = Miner
	17 = Factory worker
	18 = Weaver

	19 = Handicrafts
	20 = Mason/brickmaker/bricklayer
	21 = Carpenter/joiner
	23 = Painter
	24 = Blacksmith, Steelworker, Welder
	25 = Salon/Barbershop employee
	26 = Baker/Butcher/Food Preparation & Sales
	27 = Electrician
	28 = Plumber
	29 = Heating/AC/Boiler repair/maintenance
	30 = Cobbler/ Shoe repair
	31 = Cook/chef
	32 = Doctor
	33 = Veterinarian
	34 = Nurse
	35 = Midwife
	36 = School teacher
	37 = Public employee
	38 = Religious teacher/scholar/ mullah
	39 = Social or NGO worker
	40 = Soldier, Policeman, Policewoman, or Guard
	41 = Bodyguard
	42 = Employee in a company or firm
	43 = government official / political/ administrative position
	44 = Trader/ Small Business
	45 = Money Lender (Hawala)
	96 = Other (specify): _____
	97 = Not Asked
	98 = Refused (vol.)
	99 = Don't know (vol.)

SECTION 3: CONFLICT AND INTEGRATION

Q-22. [Ask All] How well do you think returnee families integrate into your community, would you say that in general, they do the following things often, sometimes, rarely, or never:

[Was Q-20 in Wave 1]

	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Refused (vol.)	Don't know (vol.)
a) Attend mosque	1	2	3	4	98	99
b) Attend weddings	1	2	3	4	98	99
c) Interact with people from the community on the street/market	1	2	3	4	98	99
d) Engage in community activities and events, ie. Jirgas	1	2	3	4	98	99
e) Visit neighbors during Eid holidays	1	2	3	4	98	99

Q-23A. [Ask All] Do you think there is any reason why a returnee would not integrate into your community?

[Was Q-21A in Wave 1]

1. Yes	[Go to Q-23B]
2. No	[Skip to Q-24]
—	
98. Refused (vol.)	[Skip to Q-24]
99. Don't know (vol.)	[Skip to Q-24]

Q-23B. (Ask if code 1 'yes' in Q-23A) In your opinion, what are the reasons that a returnee would not integrate into your community?

[Was Q-21B in Wave 1]

Q-23B_1 Write first mention:_____
Q-23B_2 Write second mention:_____

97. Not Asked
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

Q-24. [Ask All] Are there currently any returnees that may have a difficult time integrating into your community?

[Was Q-22 in Wave 1]

1. Yes	[Go to Q-25]
2. No	[Skip to Q-26]
—	
98. Refused	[Skip to Q-26]
99. Don't know	[Skip to Q-26]

Q-25. [Ask if 1 in Q-24] Why do you think they might have a more difficult time?

[Was Q-23 in Wave 1]

Q-25a. First mention: _____
Q-25b. Second mention: _____
1. Differences in language
2. Differences in customs/culture
3. Poverty/class differences
4. Religious sect (Mazhab)
5. Difference in accent
██████ add pre codes if necessary]

96. Other (specify): _____
97. Not Asked
98. Refused
99. Don't know

Q-26. [Ask All] Have you or family members personally experienced a dispute or conflict with a returnee(s)?

[Was Q-24 in Wave 1]

1. Yes	[Go to Q-27]
2. No	[Skip to D-1]
—	
98. Refused	[Skip to D-1]
99. Don't know	[Skip to D-1]

Q-27. [Ask if code 1 in Q-26] What type of dispute or conflict was it? (Open-ended with pre-codes, do not read out)

[Was Q-25 in Wave 1]

Write Response: _____
██████ add pre codes if necessary]
1. Verbal argument or confrontation
2. Physical fight or attack
3. Property dispute

96. Other (specify): _____
97. Not Asked
98. Refused
99. Don't know

Q-28. [Ask if code 1 in Q-26] What was the dispute or conflict about? (Open-ended with pre-codes, do not read out)

[Was Q-26 in Wave 1]

1. Intimidation
2. Discrimination
3. Vandalism
4. Immorality
5. Criminal activity
6. Name/honor
7. Harassment

96. Other: _____
97. Not Asked
98. Refused
99. Don't know

Q-29. [Ask if code 1 in Q-26] Where did the issue occur? (Open-ended with pre-codes, do not read out)

[Was Q-27 in Wave 1]

1. Home
2. School
3. Government office

4. Workplace
5. Market
6. Restaurant
7. Street

96. Other: _____
97. Not Asked
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

Q-30. [Ask if code 1 in Q-26] Was the conflict resolved?

[Was Q-28 in Wave 1]

1. Yes	[Go to Q-31]
2. No	[Skip to D-1]
—	
97. Not Asked	
98. Refused	[Skip to D-1]
99. Don't know	[Skip to D-1]

Q-31. [Ask if code 1 in Q-30] Did any of the following help with dispute resolution? (Multiple response, code all that apply)

[Was Q-29 in Wave 1]

1. State court
2. Huquq Department
3. Shura or jirga
4. The parties themselves

96. Other (vol.): _____
97. Not Asked
98. Refused
99. Don't know

DEMOGRAPHIC SECTION

Interviewer Read: *That completes the main part of the survey. These last questions are just for statistical purposes.*

D-1. Gender (Do not ask; Code by observation)

[Same as Wave 1]

D-2. How old are you? (Record actual age; if respondent doesn't know or refuses, please estimate)

[Same as Wave 1]

Response: _____

D-3. What is your marital status? Are you married or single?

[Same as Wave 1]

1. Single
2. Married
3. Widower/Widow
4. Divorced/Separated

98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

D-4. Do you have a tazkira?

[Same as Wave 1]

1. Yes
2. No

98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

D-5. What is the highest level (grade) of school you have completed, not including schooling in Islamic madrasa? (Calculate the highest level into years. If none, write down zero)

[Same as Wave 1]

Response: _____ (write down number of years)

97. Informal schooling at home or at a literacy class
98. Refused
99. Don't know

D-6. What type of dwelling best describes your current dwelling?

[Same as Wave 1]

1. Single family house
2. Part of a shared house/Compound
3. Separate apartment unit
4. Shared apartment unit (clarify difference with house)
5. Tent

96. Other: _____
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

D-7. What is the arrangement on the basis of which your household occupies this dwelling?

[Same as Wave 1]

Response: _____

1. Tenant (renting)	[Go to D-8a]
2. Lease (Gerawee)	[Go to D-8a]
3. Inherited	[Skip to D-9]
4. Ancestral home	[Skip to D-9]
5. Purchased dwelling	[Skip to D-9]
6. Constructed dwelling	[Skip to D-9]
7. Relative or friend of owner (does not pay rent)	[Skip to D-9]
8. Own – given free through charity	[Skip to D-9]
9. Caretaker (do no own and does not pay rent)	[Skip to D-9]
██████ <i>add pre codes if necessary</i>	

96. Other (specify): _____	
98. Refused (vol.)	
99. Don't know (vol.)	

D-8a. [Ask if code 1 or 2 in D-7] Do you pay rent or lease monthly or annually?

[Same as Wave 1]

Response: _____

1. Monthly
2. Annually

96. Other (vol.): _____
97. Not Asked
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

D-8b. [Ask if code 1 or 2 in D-7] How much is the rent (monthly)/lease (annual) and in which currency?

[Same as Wave 1]

D-8ba. Amount rent (monthly)/lease (annual): _____

97. Not Asked
98. Refused
99. Don't know

D-8bb. Currency: _____

1. Afs
2. U.S. Dollars
3. Euros
4. Pakistani Rupees
5. Iranian Tomans
96. Other (specify): _____
97. Not Asked
98. Refused (vol.)
99. Don't know (vol.)

D-9. [Ask All] Do the following types of people live in your neighborhood? (select all that apply)

[Same as Wave 1]

	Yes	No	Refused (vol.)	Don't know (vol.)
a) Your immediate family	1	2	98	99
b) Your extended family	1	2	98	99
c) Returnees from your ethnic group	1	2	98	99
d) Returnees from other ethnic groups	1	2	98	99
e) Neighbors from your ethnic group	1	2	98	99

f) Neighbors from other ethnic groups	1	2	98	99
g) Neighbors from other parts of the country	1	2	98	99
h) Wealthy neighbors	1	2	98	99
i) Impoverished neighbors	1	2	98	99

D-10. How many of the following items does your household currently own?

[Similar to D-10 in Wave 1, item j is new]

	Number of Items (if not sure, estimate)	Refused (vol)	Don't Know (vol)
a) Bicycle		98	99
b) Motorcycle		98	99
c) Car		98	99
d) TV		98	99
h) Jeribs of Land		98	99
i) Livestock (not poultry)		98	99
j) Mobile phone		98	99

<p>D-11. How many children in your household are old enough to attend school? How many are boys and how many girls? (write number) [Same as Wave 1]</p>	<p>D-12. (Ask if greater than 0 in D-11) How many of them attend or have completed primary school? [NEW in Wave 2]</p>	<p>D-14. (Ask if greater than 0 in D-11) How many of them attend or have completed primary school? [NEW in Wave 2]</p>	<p>D-15. (Ask if greater than 0 in D-11) How many of them attend or have completed primary school? [NEW in Wave 2]</p>	<p>D-16. (Ask number in D-12 is less than number in D-11) Why don't they go to school? [Similar to D-13 in Wave 1 with revised filtering instructions and response options]</p>
--	--	--	--	---

a) Girls	<p><i>Write number:</i> _____</p> <p>98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>1. All of them 2. Some of them 3. None of them</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>1. All of them 2. Some of them 3. None of them</p> <p>96. Children not yet of appropriate age (vol.) 97. Not Asked 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>1. All of them 2. Some of them 3. None of them</p> <p>96. Children not yet of appropriate age (vol.) 97. Not Asked 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>a) Response: _____</p> <p>1. Cannot afford tuition and/or school supplies 2. They need to work 3. Quality of education is bad 4. Don't see the point in education 5. Transportation difficulties 6. School teaches immoral things 7. Cannot afford school supplies 8. They were married/got married</p> <p>96. Other (specify): _____</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>
b) Boys	<p><i>Write number:</i> _____</p> <p>98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>1. All of them 2. Some of them 3. None of them</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>1. All of them 2. Some of them 3. None of them</p> <p>96. Children not yet of appropriate age (vol.) 97. Not Asked 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>1. All of them 2. Some of them 3. None of them</p> <p>96. Children not yet of appropriate age (vol.) 97. Not Asked 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>	<p>b) Response: _____</p> <p>1. Cannot afford tuition and/or school supplies 2. They need to work 3. Quality of education is bad 4. Don't see the point in education 5. Transportation difficulties 6. School teaches immoral things 7. Cannot afford school supplies 8. They were married/got married</p> <p>96. Other (specify): _____</p> <p>97. Not Asked 98. Ref. (vol.) 99. DK (vol.)</p>

