



# The Development Potential of Remittances: A Gender Perspective

## Qualitative Research Methodology



February 2006



## CONTENTS

1. Introduction
2. Project Objectives
3. Case Study Objectives
4. Theoretical Framework
5. Methodological Design
  - 5.1 Sample and selection criteria as outlined in the methodology
  - 5.2 Data collection techniques
  - 5.3 Instruments
6. Guidelines to follow
7. Basis for methodological decisions
  - Annex (instruments)
    - I Guide for Interviewing Key Informants
    - II Guide for Interviewing Returned Migrants
    - III Guide for Interviewing Remittance-sending Migrants
    - IV Guide for Interviewing Remittance-receiving Households
    - V Guide for Interviewing the Leaders of Migration-related Organizations in the communities of origin
    - VI Guide for Interviewing Leaders of Organizations

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to define a qualitative research methodology for development potential of remittances from a gender perspective. The methodology will be used for the first time in a case study conducted in the Dominican Republic and will focus specifically on the migration of Dominicans to Spain. Nevertheless, the methodology is designed for use in different geographical regions with distinct migration patterns in order to ensure the development of a comparative framework that maps the largest possible number of variables in addressing the issue of remittances from a gender perspective. The methodology thus contains basic steps and techniques that should be subsequently adapted to each specific case.

## 2. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

### “The Development Potential of Remittances: A Gender Perspective”

#### 2.1 Main objective

To contribute to efforts aimed at harnessing the potential of remittances in developing countries by mainstreaming the gender perspective into the study of remittance flows and their use and socio-economic impact among remittance-receiving households and communities.

#### 2.2 Specific objectives

1. To better understand the gender patterns present in remittance flows and their impact on gender roles within remittance-receiving households and communities.
2. To provide key stakeholders –migrant associations, NGOs, academia, international assistance agencies, United Nations agencies and financial institutions- with the tools to enhance the gender perspective in programmes that draw connections between remittances and development.

## 3. OBJECTIVES/AREAS TO BE EXAMINED IN THE CASE STUDY

In order to achieve the objectives described, a case study must be conducted that seeks to identify:

- Gender factors present in homes where one family member has migrated: Selection by sex of the migrant, gender dynamics existing in the household when the decision to use migration as a strategy was made, and efforts to redefine gender roles in the household following migration.
- Gender differences in remittance sending: Amount of money, channels, frequency, reasons, percentage of total income (changes in sending percentages and interrelation with the migration process), preferred channels for outgoing remittances and the trends seen in remittances throughout the migration process).

- Gender patterns in receipt and utilization of remittances: Who receives the funds; who decides what they are used for; who uses them effectively; what are they used for; how do all household members benefit from them?
- Gender differences in investment and savings practices: How income-generating activities financed by remittances help improve the economic status of women.
- How the receipt, use and management of remittances –both monetary and social- impact or change gender roles in remittance-receiving households.
- Impact of remittances on the development of the community where these households are located: Are their activities and needs met as a result of incoming remittances; are measures adopted by the recipient communities to foster the development of human skills to harness the economic potential of remittances; how do men and women benefit from these learning tools?
- Mapping of trans-national relationships and networks established between remittance-receiving households and the migrant community abroad, involvement of men and women in these networks and the decision-making processes, effects on gender relations.
- Gender perspective in programmes and projects aimed at maximizing the potential of remittances as tools for local development: Gender relations in recipient households and communities; impact of gender relationships on projects; mainstreaming gender in projects; how the projects are taking into account the needs, priorities and power relationships of the various trans-national stakeholders.

## 4. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The underlying theoretical framework of the study is set out in the INSTRAW working paper “Crossing Borders: Gender, remittances and development,”<sup>1</sup> which outlines the basic assumptions on which the study is based. As such, this methodology does not elaborate on the framework, but does list several of the variables that the working paper establishes as key in the study of remittances from a gender perspective, which determine the type of methodology that should be employed. These variables include:

- The main unit of analysis used in the study of migration and remittance-sending is the household. The household is subject to power and gender relations that determine which household member will migrate, as well as how remittances will be utilized and who will benefit from them. In general, migration does not mean that there has been a break in family or emotional ties - the household continues to function as a transnational unit even though household members reside in different geographical locations.
- A household’s decision to have one member migrate as an economic survival strategy, and the subsequent receipt of remittances, alters the power and authority system, family and social dynamics, hierarchies, boundaries and the roles of men and women within the household.

1. [http://www.un-instraw.org/en/images/stories/remmitances/documents/crossing\\_borders.pdf](http://www.un-instraw.org/en/images/stories/remmitances/documents/crossing_borders.pdf)

- The consistent increase in the number of women who migrate as economic providers is leading to change in women's position, which affects not only the household but the community.
- Remittances go beyond the monetary dimension. Social remittances have an impact on gender relations within the household and community, challenging traditional views of gender roles and images of women.
- In the case of remittance-receiving households and communities in the Dominican Republic's southwestern region, migration from that area and the subsequent inflow of remittances help alleviate poverty. Remittances improve the nutrition levels of recipient households, their access to healthcare, quality of housing, channels of economic activity and ability to invest in productive activities.
- In recipient communities, remittances sent by migrants have an impact on productive capacity and systems and also promote local development.

## 5. METHODOLOGICAL DESIGN FOR THE CASE STUDY

In order to meet the objectives of this study, interviews and group discussions should be conducted with the following stakeholders:

- **households with a member who has migrated** and that receive remittances (interviews or group discussions are to be held with the individuals who directly receive the remittances)
- **migrants who send remittances** to those households.
- **representatives of the organizations** involved in migration-related issues and/or development, as well as with leaders in the community and other entities that belong to the transnational networks involved in remittance flows.
- **key informants** in the community who will provide details as to the impact of the remittances on the development of the community: local leaders, teachers, association representatives, groups or NGOs, etc.
- **returned migrants** who have engaged in productive activities upon their return.

### 5.1 Sample and selection criteria

The results of a qualitative methodology are not based on statistical representation but rather on what is called structural representation. The sample is thus understood to include a sufficient number of individuals who are representative of the social structure in the community and of the issue under study. These are variables that the researcher defines beforehand based on his or her theoretical framework - because they believe that, in speaking with the subjects, those specific variables will shed light on differences. In migration-specific cases, several key variables include the sex of the migrant, his or her legal status in the country of residence, level of education, type of work performed in the country of origin and in the country of residence, etc.<sup>2</sup>

2. The variables that we deem relevant when selecting the sample for the study on the development potential of remittances are included in the working document "Crossing borders."

For this reason, the exact number of interviews that need to be conducted cannot be determined beforehand, but rather the final sample size will depend on the number of variables at play, among other factors.

## How many interviews and discussion groups must be held?

Given the fact that the selection criteria for the sample are structural, conducting a very large number of interviews will not on its own ensure that the sample is representative. To be sure, a large sample offers more guarantees than a smaller sample, but far more important is the *composition* of the sample. The number of interviews can be determined by the *saturation of data* - which occurs when, having interviewed representatives from all previously identified social situations (for e.g. single-parent households/households with a couple; households with a member who migrated some time ago/households with a member who recently migrated, etc.), the information being collected becomes repetitive.

Between fifteen and twenty interviews generally tend to suffice but, as explained, it is not possible to determine an exact number beforehand.

## Household sample selection criteria

In accordance with the theoretical framework used as the basis of this study, the variables that may determine differences in how remittances are sent and utilized include:

- **sex** of the migrant: the sample must include households where the migrant is female and households where the migrant is male.<sup>3</sup>
- **structure of the household** in the country of origin:
  - ☐ Single-parent households (women who migrate as heads of household);
  - ☐ Households with a female or male migrant in which the significant other is left in charge of the household;
  - ☐ Households where the migrant is a son or daughter.
- **legal status of the migrant** in the destination country (documented or undocumented);
- **type of employment held by the migrant** in the destination country;
- **number of years the migrant has spent in the destination country** (over ten years, between five and ten years, less than 5 years).

**3.** The methodology we are proposing is designed for use in locations with varying migration dynamics. In the Dominican Republic case specifically, a location in the countryside characterized by a large number of female migrants has been selected. Women lead migration and men, if they have migrated, have done so primarily to reunite with their families. As such, in this particular case, it is difficult to meet this criterion when selecting the sample. This will also occur anywhere where the methodology is used that has experienced a primarily male-led migration.

## 5.2 Data collection techniques

The following techniques should be used:

- **Participant observation:** normally used in anthropological studies. Relevant data is collected by observing the behaviour and the system of social interaction within the community under study at the time and under the circumstances in which they occur, interfering to the least possible extent. This technique is used to explore the impact of migration on the community where the case study is conducted and, above all, to collect all household data regarding the quality of housing, type of housing, distribution of space, etc.
- **In-depth open interviews:** despite the fact that the annexes include an interview guide for households and migrants, we must point out that the role of the interviewer is to present a topic in an open-ended manner and let the interviewee decide how to respond. It is the duty of the interviewer to refocus and steer the interview toward addressing certain issues, always allowing the interviewee to formulate questions and refraining at all times from increasing the pace of the interview in order to cover as many issues as possible. It bears mentioning that after one hour has passed, interviews are no longer productive since the interviewee will tire. In the event the interview is particularly engaging and the estimated time of one hour has passed, a separate interview can be scheduled to continue elaborating on specific topics.

A general introduction that can be presented to the households is as follows:

*We are interested in learning how your community has changed over the past few years. We know that in this area, many people have left to work elsewhere, such as in your case for example, and we would like to know how you decided that that individual would leave, how things have changed since they left, if your circumstances have changed as a result of that individual sending money, etc."*

With this universal introduction, we can then go on to cover, based on what the interviewee reveals, the different areas that we want to learn about and that are specified in the "guide to interviewing remittance-receiving households" (see annex).

For migrants, the introduction could be:

*We are conducting a study about individuals who have left their countries and who are sending money to the family members who remain there.*

The complete household sample will be obtained using the snowball effect, that is, once several households have been contacted, they will lead us to the remainder of the households.

- **Group discussion** (also known as "group meetings" or "sessions"): Seven to eight people meet to discuss a specific topic, with the aim of addressing ideas, views, opinions, attitudes, motivations, etc. To do so, researchers should gather a somewhat homogeneous group of individuals in terms of social characteristics (age, level of education, type of work) but balanced by a certain level of heterogeneity, which allows for confrontation and an exchange of opinions.

4. The presence of the researcher constitutes interference in and of itself. However, all tools or techniques used in research interfere with reality. Furthermore, a social reality is never an isolated object in a laboratory.

Although it is not possible to determine beforehand how many discussion groups should be held, it is advisable to hold at least the following:

- A discussion group with household members who receive remittances
- A discussion group with local leaders, representatives from development-focused organizations and key informants
- A discussion group with migrants who send remittances
- A discussion group with the young children of migrants
- A discussion group with young children whose parents are not migrants

Just as in the case of in-depth interviews, a general introduction to the topic should be presented to allow the group to move forward and to steer the discussion, while the moderator's duty is only to keep the discussion on track, rekindle discussion in moments of silence, elaborate on certain points, etc.

## 5.3 Instruments (see annex)

The instruments designed for data collection include the following:

- Guide for Interviewing Local Leaders and Authorities.
- Guide for Interviewing Institutions that Work with Development and/or Migration Issues in the Area.
- Guide for Interviewing Remittance-receiving Households
- Guide for Interviewing Remittance-sending Migrants
- Guide for Interviewing Returned Migrants

## 6. GUIDELINES TO FOLLOW

- Conduct bibliographic and documentary research on the dynamics of migration, remittances, and development in the country of origin in order to understand the issue at hand: past studies, specific interventions by international agencies and NGOs, etc.
- In the countries of origin, identify the communities that generate migration and where remittance levels are significant by referencing past field studies and contacting institutions working at the grassroots level on migration and development issues.
- Compile information on the dynamics of migration in the selected region - including demographic, economic, and other indicators.
- Establish formal and informal contact with influential individuals and institutions in the area. Hold meetings to identify remittance-receiving households in the communities.
- Map key trans-national stakeholders for migration and remittances in the selected area.
- Select a sample of remittance-receiving households according to the criterion of structural representation and the additional criteria outlined under item 5.1.
- Conduct in-depth open interviews with recipient households.
- Identify programmes and projects that link remittances and development. Conduct interviews with influential state agencies and civil society organizations in the area to learn about any programmes and projects that have been implemented or that are underway.



- Contact migrants who send remittances to the households interviewed.
- Conduct in-depth open interviews in the destination country with the individuals contacted.<sup>5</sup>
- Hold discussion groups.

The order in which the interviews and group discussions are held does not have to be sequential, that is, in-depth interviews do not have to be completed before beginning group discussions. Both processes can be underway concurrently and the order will depend on how the fieldwork progresses.

## 7. Basis for methodological decisions

Each subject has an appropriate method of study, which includes a number of techniques that satisfy the needs of the study to a greater or lesser extent. In broad terms, we can say that the main choice is between a qualitative or quantitative approach, or a combination of both; a choice that must be made according to the subject under study.<sup>6</sup>

All researchers carry out their work based on a framework through which sense is made of the social events under study. Based on the approach we chose –explained in greater detail below- we believe that research techniques are essentially incomplete and fragmentary, as they break the world into sections, and the process into moments. This dissociation causes researchers to commit both serious and frequent methodological errors, and thus it is necessary to move away from a perspective based solely on a linear selection of techniques that are seemingly neutral and separate from a more sophisticated methodological framework.

The temptation that always arises to turn the precepts of the methodology into scientific cooking recipes or laboratory processes can only be fought by maintaining a constant epistemological eye that, by scrutinizing the use of techniques and concepts on the basis of the circumstances and limitations of its validity, will put an end to the convenience of automatically applying proven procedures and show that all operations, no matter how mundane or repetitive, must be rethought and take into consideration the specific case (...) we must be cautious of the belief that the subject of scientific creation is an *automaton spirituale* that conforms to the mechanisms in place in a methodological process created once forevermore and as such, confines the researcher to the limits of blind submission of a process that undermines any reflection on the process itself. (Bourdieu et al, 1994).

Each approach is based on several theoretical assumptions and is able to produce one series of items, and not others. Quantitative methods make sense when we are looking at external social events, that is, events that can be described in relatively objective terms and that are capable of being quantified (amount and frequency of remittances, percentage of the recipient country's gross domestic product attributable to remittances, etc.) The questionnaire, the ultimate quantitative technique, obscures the fact that the power of the question is determining reality (as defined by the asking party - what questions are asked and which are not structures the field in an ideologically determined manner).

The most airtight questionnaire does not necessarily guarantee the un-ambiguity of responses because of the simple fact that all subjects are asked formally identical questions. Supposing that the same question has the same meaning for subjects from different social groups is being ignorant

5. Furthermore, if while conducting fieldwork, supplemental data appears to be needed, interviews could be held with migrants whose households were not previously interviewed and later interview their households in the country of origin.

6. There is no sense in comparing qualitative and quantitative approaches as if they were mutually exclusive. Each can provide accurate and relevant data and each has their own scopes and limitations. As Luis Enrique Alonso explains: "Both approaches have their limitations and also their complementarity (...) Complementarity, in turn, which is nothing other than the result of understanding what with Miguel Beltrán we began to refer to as *cognitive pluralism* (...) which must be offset by a *methodological pluralism* that will diversify the ways to model a social reality" (Alonso, 1998:43)

to the fact that languages differ not only in the breadth of their lexicon or level of abstraction but also in terms of subject matter or issues dealt with (...) And while intellectual, researchers belong to a group that deems as natural the interests, thought patterns, and problems, in short, every system of assumption, that is linked to the intellectual class, as a privileged point of reference. Researchers thus reinterpret on the basis of a logic that always depends heavily on the position held in the social structure and this is something that must be expressed if there is no desire to incur in an ethnocentric error (Bourdieu et al, 1994: 64).

When what we seek are discourses - symbolic statements from a specific social position, meanings and sensible attributions - it is advisable to use a qualitative approach, given that we are not interested in the figure (how many, where) but rather in the "how." Two qualitative techniques are particularly appropriate for the subject of our study: i) open interviews (as there is no method the interview is structured in accordance with the circumstances of the interaction), which are able to capture the dramatization of a subject in response to a phenomenon and provide his or her experiences; and ii) discussion groups, which are able to stimulate subject-oriented discussions and an exchange of social views about a specific topic or issue (such as remittances, gendered positions, and development).

As researchers, we place considerable importance on the power-sign-subject relationship (an ideological and therefore power relationship). The researching power tends to view subjects as objects within a certain context, and thus the questionnaire as a technique is codified with specific meanings that seek to gather certain information. It is a cage that forces responses to pass through previously determined categories, reduces the breadth of the response to one possible response, and progresses from top to bottom. On the other hand, the interview and the group discussion as techniques go from bottom to top, allowing individuals to speak on their own and build their own context, thereby granting them the right to speak. These are techniques that view the subjects as human beings and not as the objects of a study with a right to explain themselves in their own language.

INSTRAW's research activities seek to bridge the knowledge gained from both research and intervention (applied social research) and the formulation of public policy. One of the specific objectives of the project "The Development Potential of Remittances: A Gender Perspective" is to provide key stakeholders - migrants' associations, NGOs, academia, international organizations and cooperation agencies, and financial institutions - with the tools to enhance the gender perspective of programmes that link remittances and development.

Thus, the most appropriate methodological option seems to be that which will allow us to hear the views of the stakeholders themselves regarding the importance of having a family member migrate, the remittances received as a result of the migration and the effects of both migration and remittances on gender relations in the households and communities involved. Just as the models should not simply mirror previous models, nor should they be created in a vacuum (although this is a common practice), without notifying those who must later be involved in them if the aim is to link remittances to co-development projects. All too often the failures of certain projects or actions, both in terms of international cooperation and social organizations at the local level, are a result of the failure to take into account the desires and opinions of the subjects affected in the implementation of the project. It is not about "to every problem (developing countries), there is a solution (migration and remittances)," but rather learning about the impact on households of a decision to have a member of the family migrate, what are the motivations for doing so, what is sought with remittances, what are they used

for and with what purpose, how are changes in gender relations perceived as a result of remittances, etc.

While quantitative indicators can give us a distribution of vulnerabilities (insufficient income, precarious employment, poor housing conditions) and an objective interpretation of the position of the individual in terms of social status and the social and power relations that govern the society in which he or she lives, qualitative indicators enable us to explore the views and meanings given by the individuals themselves regarding the vulnerabilities they face, as well as the opportunities and resources available to them. It is therefore essential to understand the subjective experience (how subjects understand their own experiences), the sense of belonging that they establish, the ability to act as they wish, both as individuals and as a group, and above all, the hopes, plans and expectations regarding their situation.<sup>7</sup>

Knowledge of all these aspects and how they relate to one another allows us to find a better starting point in order to articulate efforts aimed at promoting development from a gender perspective.

In concluding this explanation of the methodological choices made, we believe that the study of gender, remittances and development should serve as a pillar for the subsequent promotion of participatory action research. From this perspective, it is assumed, as with qualitative approaches, that the researcher is a conduit for social change. All research causes change on its own and in the case of action research; the researcher her or himself prompts this change, assuming that the subjects, objectified by the researcher, are able to become subjects. Moreover, the community (the collective subject) is able to define its own problems and participate in solving them. The researcher now hands the lead role over to the subjects and recognizes their ability to take control of the intervention that follows, thus breaking the researcher-subject dualism and putting an end to the logic of division between she or he who knows (and all knowledge is power) and those who don't know.<sup>8</sup>

In the event that it is possible to further elaborate on the research, opening a process of this nature would be the most appropriate, having the individuals with a migrant family member and the migrant themselves participate and in the formulation of efforts that, in the end, are targeting them.

**7.** The cooperation professionals and technicians that work in the area of social intervention often form a bridge between the policies formulated and the individuals subject to them. In this regard, exchanges with the former could help us understand the logic behind implementing certain programmes or policies in which the country, the technical professionals in charge of applying them and the individuals subject to them are involved. The moral aspects of many of the policies targeting the population of developing countries merit further study. In the case of remittances, this tends to manifest itself in concern that the remittances are being spent on consumer items instead of productive investments.

**8.** Of the vast bibliography on this topic, see, for example, *Documentación Social*, nº 2, July-September 1993 or Salazar, C. (Ed): *La Investigación Acción Participativa*, Ed. Popular, Madrid, 1992. Participatory action research comes from the case of several subjects in the south who did not allow themselves to become objects. For example, individuals who do not allow themselves to be photographed by tourists who want to make an object, by way of their photographic objects, of the poverty of the south or social movements that question the researcher in the north on what will be done with that research, what is the reason for it and who is it for. By questioning and refusing to give in to the power of those who treat them as objects reinforces the fact that they are subjects and reinforces their dignity and creates problems in terms of social asymmetry. They dare to question the purpose of academic science. For what and whom does it serve? (Rodríguez Villasante, 1998)



## Annex I

### Guide for Interviewing Key Informants (authorities, community leaders, others)

#### 1. General information

Name of Interviewer:

Date:

Municipality:

Place:

Start time:

Name of Interviewee:

Job title or relationship to the issue of migration:

Organization / institution:

Sex:

Age:

Level of Education:

Address:

Telephone:

E-mail:


Place of Birth:

If you were not born in the community, when did you begin to reside there?

#### 2. Matters of Inquiry

##### A. About the community and the changes it has undergone

1. Could you please provide an overall description of this community?
2. What's the main source of income for the residents in the community?
3. Has the source of income of the residents changed in the past 15 years? In what way?
4. Have there been any changes in the community's productive activities?
5. Have any changes been made to ensure the needs of remittance recipients are met?



(Exchange houses, pay phone centers, telephone booths, Internet, travel agencies, various kinds of stores, bars, restaurants, casinos, etc.)

6. What do you think about migration to a foreign country and especially to ...?
7. Has the migration to a foreign country of a large number of people from this community changed the standards of living in it? How?
8. Are there differences between households that receive money from abroad and those that do not? What kinds?
9. Has the number of poor families in the community decreased?
10. What impact has migration and remittances had in the following areas?
  - Housing
  - Job creation
  - Access to education
  - Procurement of goods
  - Access to healthcare services
11. In terms of the community, have needs been met by the inflow of remittances?
12. Do you think that remittances have had an impact on the community's level of development (economic, social, human)?
13. Besides the families of the migrants, who in the community has benefited the most from the emigration and/or funds sent from abroad by migrants?

#### **B. Impact on gender relations and the structure of the household**

14. Do you think that migration and particularly remittances have benefited men or women more? How do men and women benefit?
15. Do you think that there are differences in how decisions are made in households as a result of one/ some of the household members migrating and sending money?
16. Have migration and/or remittances in some way affected relations between couples or the roles of men and women in the community?
17. Are there any changes in the behaviour of men and women in the community that could be attributed to migration and/or remittances?

#### **C. Remittances and investment**

18. How common is it in the community for the money from remittances to be used in productive investments such as businesses, taxis, livestock, farms, etc? What differences in this regard are there between men and women?
19. When those who have migrated from the community return on vacation, how do they spend the money they bring with them? What do they spend it on? Do men and women differ in this aspect?
20. What do the individuals who return from abroad and begin living in the community again do with the savings that they managed to save while abroad? Does there tend to be a difference in how the money is used depending on whether the individual is male or female?
21. From your standpoint, what investments or businesses are initiated in with the resources of migrants (or returned migrants) that have been the most successful? Are there differences by gender in this aspect?



**D. Institutions and organizations**

22. Please explain the levels of organization (community boards, sports, recreational, cultural, political committees, etc.) in your community? What type and how many organizations are there? What is the community's level of participation in them, comparing men and women?
23. How does the level of leadership in the community exercised by a man or woman differ? What role is played by each within the various organizations in terms of managing or operating them?
24. In general, does the community trust its organizations and institutions (public administration, committees, NGOs, churches, etc.) and the leaders that oversee them? Does the level of trust have something to do with the gender of the leaders?
25. Have the institutions and organizations in the community taken any type of action to address the consequences of migration or to harness their advantages? Which institutions or organizations and what type of action?
26. Has the institution or organization that you belong to specifically done anything in this regard? If not, why not?
27. In general, has the action taken in the community in response to the migrations taken into account the different needs and priorities of men and women?
28. Do you know of any organizations of Dominicans abroad? If there are community-based organizations abroad, whom do they communicate with in the community?
29. Are you familiar with the experiences of programmes and/or projects that link people from here and others abroad? What was that experience like? Who do they use to send resources? Who decides how the resources will be spent? Who made the decisions?

**HIGHLY IMPORTANT:** THE QUESTIONS ARE ONLY TO BE USED AS A REFERENCE GUIDE BY THE INTERVIEWER SO THAT CERTAIN ELEMENTS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED ARE BORNE IN MIND. THEY SHOULD **NEVER** BE USED AS A BATTERY OF QUESTIONS TO ASK. AN OPEN INTERVIEW ALWAYS AVOIDS INITIATING A QUESTION-ANSWER DYNAMIC.



## **Annex II**

### **Guide for Interviewing Returned Migrants**

#### **1. General information**

Name of Interviewer:

Date:

Municipality:

Place:

Start time:

Name of Interviewee:

Job title or relationship to the issue of migration:

Organization / institution:

Sex:

Age:

Level of Education:

Address:

Telephone:

E-mail:

Place of Birth:

If you were not born in the community, when did you begin to reside there?

#### **2. Matters of Inquiry**

##### **A. Basic history of migration of the individual and their family**

1. How many times have you lived abroad, in what areas and for how long?

2. How many individuals, including yourself, form your household?

3. How are you related to the head of household?

- You are the head of household
- Head of household's spouse or partner
- Son (daughter) of the head of household
- Father (mother) of the head of household
- Father-in-law (mother-in-law) of the head of household
- Brother (sister) of the head of household
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

4. Please tell me about the members of the household, including yourself, that live or have lived abroad (excluding tourist travels)

Relation to the head of household*	Age	Lives (X)	Lived (X)	Country/Countries	Year departed	Year returned

\*The head of household himself or herself, spouse or partner, son, father or mother, brother, father in law, grandchild, nephew, other

5. Did you take other household members with you to live abroad? Did these individuals also return?
6. How did you stay in contact with the household members who remained in the Dominican Republic and how do you think these relationships were affected by distance?
7. If you left your spouse/partner when you traveled abroad, what became of your relationship while you were away? And when you returned?

#### **B. Remittances**

8. When you left, who helped support the household financially and how? Did all those who had income contribute to the household? Were there differences in the contributions by gender?
9. Did an adult family member stop working as a result of you migrating? Why?
10. What changes in the employment or activities of those who stayed behind were there after you migrated?
11. Who decided how much money should be sent from abroad? How was it decided?
12. In addition to money, were any other types of shipments made? (clothing, electrical appliances, food, etc.). What method was used?
13. How much (percentage or fraction) of the household income was from remittances?
14. Did you always send the same amount? What factors influenced the amount sent?
15. Who received the remittances? Why?
16. What was the money spent on?
17. Who decided what to spend it on? Why that individual?
18. How did each family member benefit from the money that you sent?
19. What things were done following your travel that were not possible prior to migrating?
20. Was more invested in education and health?
21. Were improvements made or a new home purchased?
22. Was some part of the money received saved?
23. While you were abroad, was an investment made in: a business, purchase of property, purchase of animals, etc.? Who did so? Who helped them do so? Did you have problems how your investment was managed?





**C. The return**

24. What year did you last return to the Dominican Republic and why did you do so?
25. Do you feel that you met the expectations that you had when you left the country?
26. What positive aspects would you highlight from your time abroad? What did you achieve? Did you bring back savings? What did you invest them in?
27. Does your time abroad allow you to now live better than you did before you left?
28. What were the negative aspects? What did you lose?
29. If you weighed the positive against the negative aspects of your time abroad, what would the outcome be?
30. Would you like to live abroad again? Where? Why or why not?

## Annex III

### Guide for Interviewing Remittance-sending Migrants

#### 1. General Information

Name of Interviewer:

Date:

City:

Place:

Start time:

Interviewee:

Sex:

Age:

Level of Education:

Municipality of Origin:

Urban\_\_\_ Rural\_\_\_

Occupation in the Dominican Republic:

Current occupation:

Marital Status (has a spouse/partner or not, and where):

Number of children, if any. Where do they live (country of origin or country of destination):

Address:

Telephone:

E-mail:

Who is the head of your household in the Dominican Republic (kinship between the interviewee and head of household, or is he/she the head of household himself/herself?):

Individuals who comprise the household (including those who live in the Dominican Republic):

Relation to the head of household*	Age (X)	Gender	Level of education	Business	Lives	
					HOME	AWAY

\*The head of household himself or herself, spouse or partner, son/daughter, father or mother, brother/sister, father/mother-in-law, grandchild, nephew/niece, other



**1. Matters of Inquiry**

**A. History of migration**


1. Narration of the migration process. When and how the decision was made, what method was used to reach their destination, what was it like at first, how did they find work, what types of jobs were taken on, etc.

**B. Remittances and use**

2. At what stage of the migration process did you begin to send remittances?
3. Through which channels did you send money? Changes in channels and reasons for such
4. What percentage of your earnings were sent? Changes in the percentage and reasons for such
5. To whom did you send the money? Why to that individual and not to a different member of the household?
6. Who decides how the money will be used?
7. What does your household typically use the remittance money for?
8. How does each family member benefit from the money received?
9. Have you made any type of productive investment?
10. What things are done now that were not possible prior to migrating?
11. Is more invested in education and health?
12. Have improvements been made or a new home purchased?
13. Do they have a bank account?
14. Is some of the money received saved?
15. Since you migrated, have you made any investments in the Dominican Republic? (Businesses, purchase of property, purchase of animals, etc.)
16. Have any such investments been made with your return in mind?
17. Do they own land?
18. Is part of the remittance money used for agricultural/livestock activities?
19. Have any problems come up regarding the use of the money that you send?

**C. Family and gender relations**

20. Did your departure lead to a change in the head of household?
21. If you were in a relationship when you left the Dominican Republic, what happened to that relationship?
22. Did the separation end up affecting the stability or quality of the relationship? Why and how?
23. If the relationship is ongoing, what have you done to overcome the difficulties posed by distance?
24. What things do you do now that you did not do previously?
25. And what does (or do you suppose they do) your spouse/partner that they did not do before?
26. When you left, did you leave behind minor children?

- 
27. Who took care of them here and what arrangements or agreements were made for such care?
  28. What is or what was the relationship like between these children and their caretaker?
  29. Did these children display or have these children displayed any behavioural problems that you may have attributed to the separation? (Try to differentiate by gender)
  30. If the minors study or studied, do you think that the separation had any effect on their academic performance?
  31. How did you maintain or have you maintained a relationship between you and your children in the Dominican Republic? What do you do to make up for your separation from them?
  32. What economic demands are made by your children in the Dominican Republic?
  33. Has the separation ended up affecting your relationship with your children? Why and how?
  34. What other family relations have been affected as a result of your emigration?
  35. What changes has the migration meant for your children? (advantages and disadvantages)
  36. Who tends to the household chores here and in the Dominican Republic?
  37. How have the living conditions of your household improved as a result of your migration?
  38. What negative effects do you think your migration has had on the living conditions of your household?
  39. If you had not migrated, how do you think the overall situation of your household would be different from what it is today?
  40. If they stopped receiving remittances, how would the family's lifestyle change?
  41. What changes has the migration brought for women?
  42. And for the men?

**D. Return and future**

43. Have you considered returning?
44. How do you see the future of your place of origin?
45. If employment opportunities existed in your country of origin, would that constitute an incentive to return?
46. If you returned, how do you think your life in the Dominican Republic would be different compared to how you lived prior to migrating?

## Annex IV

### Guide for Interviewing Remittance-receiving Households

#### 1. General Information

Name of Interviewer:

Date:

Municipality:

Place:

Start time:

Address:

Telephone:

Name of the head of household:

Individuals who comprise the household (including those who live in abroad):

Relation to the head of household*	Age (X)	Gender	Level of education	Business	Interview

\*The head of household himself or herself, spouse or partner, son, father or mother, brother/sister, father/mother-in-law, grandchild, nephew/niece, other


#### 1. Matters of Inquiry

##### A. History of migration

1. Of the household members that live abroad, where do they live and for how long? And who have lived abroad but no longer do?
2. How was the decision to migrate made in each case? (Narration of the process)
3. What was the occupation of those who migrated prior to leaving?
4. How are they earning a living now abroad?


##### B. Economic aspects and remittance sending

5. Who helps support the household financially and how? Do all those who have income contribute to the household? Are there differences in the contributions by gender?
6. Has an adult family member stopped working as a result of you migrating? Why?

- 
7. What changes in the employment or activity of those who stayed behind have there been since you migrated?
  8. Who decides how much money to send from abroad? How is it decided?
  9. In addition to money, are any other types of shipments made? (clothing, electrical appliances, food, etc.). What method is used?
  10. How much (percentage or fraction) of the household income is from remittances?
  11. Have you always sent the same amount? What factors influence the amount sent?
  12. Who receives the remittances? Why?
  13. What is the money spent on?
  14. Who decides what to spend it on?
  15. How does each family member benefit from the money received?
  16. What things are done now that were not possible prior to migrating?
  17. Is more invested in education and health?
  18. Have improvements been made or a new home purchased?
  19. Do they have a bank account?
  20. Is some of the money received saved?
  21. Since your family member has been abroad, has an investment been made in: a business, purchase of property, purchase of animals, etc.?
  22. Do you own land?
  23. Is part of the remittance money used for agricultural/livestock activities?

**C. Family and gender relations and impact**

24. Has the emigration of a member of this household meant changes in who heads the household?
25. If those who migrated were in a relationship when they left the Dominican Republic, what happened to that relationship?
26. When they left, did they leave behind minor children?
27. Who took care of them here and what arrangements or agreements were made for this?
28. What is or what was the relationship like between these children and their caretaker?
29. Did these children display or have these children displayed any behavioural problems that you may have attributed to the separation? (Try to differentiate by gender)
30. If the minors study or studied, do you think that the separation had any effect on their academic performance?
31. How was or has the relationship between the migrant and his/her children in the Dominican Republic been maintained? What does he/she try to do to make up for their separation from them?
32. What economic demands are made by his/her children in the Dominican Republic?
33. Has the separation ended up affecting their relationship with their children? Why and how?
34. What other family relations have been affected as a result of the migration of a member of this household abroad?
35. What changes has the migration meant for the children? (advantages and disadvantages)
36. Who tends to the household chores here?
37. How have the living conditions of this household improved as a result of the migration of a member of the household?

- 
38. What negative effects do you think the emigration abroad has had on the living conditions of this household?
  39. If they had not migrated, how do you think the overall situation of this household would be different from what it is today?
  40. If they stopped receiving remittances, how would the family's lifestyle change?
  41. What changes has the migration meant for women?
  42. And for the men?
  43. What changes has the migration meant for both women and the men?

**HIGHLY IMPORTANT:** THE QUESTIONS ARE ONLY TO BE USED AS A REFERENCE GUIDE BY THE INTERVIEWER SO THAT CERTAIN ELEMENTS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED ARE BORNE IN MIND. THEY SHOULD **NEVER** BE USED AS A BATTERY OF QUESTIONS TO ASK. AN OPEN INTERVIEW ALWAYS AVOIDS INITIATING A QUESTION-ANSWER DYNAMIC.



## Annex V

### Guide for Interviewing the Leaders of Migration-related Organizations in the communities of origin

#### 1. General information

Name of Interviewer:

Date:

Municipality:

Place:

Start time:

Name of Interviewee:

Job title or relationship to the issue of migration:

Organization / institution:

Sex:

Age:

Level of Education:

Address:

Telephone:

E-mail:


Place of Birth:

If you were not born in the community, when did you begin to reside there?

#### 2. Matters of Inquiry

1. Please describe the institution. What are its main spheres of action? To what extent do the institution's activities relate to issues of migration and development?
2. Within your scope of work, are the conditions and needs of men and women considered differently?
3. How many years have you been working in the area?
4. In which specific communities do you work? Please describe the scope of your work.
5. How does your organization (or you) describe the migration processes experienced in the area (or in the community in particular)?
  - a. Since when has your organization been involved in migration?
  - b. To where?
  - c. More importantly, what type of individual has migrated (age, gender, level of education, activity, socio-economic status, etc)?
  - d. How do they migrate? How long do they stay abroad? etc.



- 
6. What effects or impacts has migration had in the community? What changes in the community can be perceived?
  7. What effects or impacts has the inflow of remittances into the community had? What changes can be perceived in the community?
  8. In the households, what changes can be seen as a result of migration or receipt of remittances?
  9. What changes can be seen as a result of migration or receipt of remittances in gender relations?
  10. Does your organization have any suggestions as to how to use the contribution of remittances to promote the development of the community?
  11. Is it familiar with other suggestions in that regard or successful experiences in other communities that you consider feasible here?
  12. Are you familiar with experiences of group or social remittances in the community? If so, could you provide us with such details, indicating, if possible, the role played in such experiences by men and women?
  13. Have the institutions and organizations in the community taken any type of action to address the consequences of emigration or to harness their advantages? Which institutions or organizations and what type of action?
  14. In general, has the action taken in the community in response to the migration taken into account the different needs and priorities of men and women?
  15. Do you know of any organizations of Dominicans abroad? If there are community-based organizations abroad, whom do they communicate with in the community?
  16. Are you familiar with the experiences of programs and/or projects that link people from here and others abroad? What was that experience like? Who do they use to send resources? Who decides how the resources will be spent? Who has made the decisions?
  17. With whom do you recommend we speak about the issues discussed?

**HIGHLY IMPORTANT:** THE QUESTIONS ARE ONLY TO BE USED AS A REFERENCE GUIDE BY THE INTERVIEWER SO THAT CERTAIN ELEMENTS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED ARE BORNE IN MIND. THEY SHOULD **NEVER** BE USED AS A BATTERY OF QUESTIONS TO ASK. AN OPEN INTERVIEW ALWAYS AVOIDS INITIATING A QUESTION-ANSWER DYNAMIC.



## **Annex VI**

### **Guide for Interviewing Leaders of Organizations**

#### **1. General information**

Name of Interviewer:

Date:

Place:


Name of Interviewee:

Job title in the organization:

Organization / institution:

#### **2. Matters of Inquiry**

1. History of the association: when was it created, by whom
2. How many years has it been operating?
3. What are its main spheres of action?
4. Within your scope of work, are the conditions and needs of men and women considered differently?
5. How does your organization (or yourself) describe the migration process from the Dominican Republic to Spain?
  - a. Since when has your organization been involved? How has it progressed?
  - b. Do members come from any regions or areas of the Dominican Republic in particular?
  - c. What are the reasons for migrating from the Dominican Republic to Spain?
  - d. More importantly, what type of individual has migrated (age, gender, level of education, activity, socio-economic status, etc)?
  - e. How do they migrate? How long do they stay abroad? Do families migrate or do individuals migrate alone and leave their families behind? etc.
  - f. What are the primary problems faced by Dominicans in Spain?
  - g. Do you feel that these problems are different for men or women?
6. Association membership among immigrants:
  - h. How do you view the level of association joining among Dominicans?
  - i. Do they join in more or less than other groups?
  - j. What do you think would have to be done to encourage membership to associations among Dominicans in Spain?
  - k. Do you think that the Spanish government promotes involvement in immigrant associations? What do you think could be done to promote it?
7. Regarding remittances:
  - l. Does your organization have any suggestions as to how to harness the contribution of remittances to promote the development of Dominican communities?
  - m. Are you familiar with other suggestions in this regard or know of successful experiences of other groups of immigrants and that you deem feasible in the case of the Dominican Republic?

- 
- n. Are you familiar with experiences of group remittances among Dominicans in Spain?
  - o. If so, could you provide us with such details, indicating, if possible, the role played in such experiences by men and women?
  - p. Could you please describe the difficulties that have had to be faced in such experiences?
  8. Regarding co-development:
    - q. Do you have co-development projects?
    - r. If not, why not? Have you considered having them?
    - s. If so: describe the projects.
    - t. What types of problems have you run into when implementing these projects?
    - u. What types of representatives do you look for in the Dominican Republic to develop these projects? Associations or local leaders, local governments, regional governments?
    - v. Do these projects have a gender perspective?
  9. Regarding the tie between migration and development
    - w. Do you believe that migration can contribute to the development of the Dominican Republic?
    - x. Do you think that the governments of the Dominican Republic and Spain can help bridge the gap between migration and development? In what way?
  10. Would you like to add anything further?
  11. With whom do you recommend we speak about the issues discussed?

**HIGHLY IMPORTANT:** THE QUESTIONS ARE ONLY TO BE USED AS A REFERENCE GUIDE BY THE INTERVIEWER SO THAT CERTAIN ELEMENTS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED ARE BORNE IN MIND. THEY SHOULD **NEVER** BE USED AS A BATTERY OF QUESTIONS TO ASK. AN OPEN INTERVIEW ALWAYS AVOIDS INITIATING A QUESTION-ANSWER DYNAMIC.