

Migration and empowerment

Data from a follow-up survey among a sample of households in Western Honduras

Francisco Ceballos, Jessica Heckert, Manuel A. Hernandez, and Florencia Paz¹

¹ Francisco Ceballos is a Research Fellow in the Markets, Trade, and Institutions (MTI) unit at the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), Jessica Heckert is a Research Fellow in the Poverty, Gen-der, and Inclusion (PGI) unit at IFPRI, Manuel Hernandez is a Senior Research Fellow in the MTI unit at IFPRI, and Florencia Paz is a Senior Research Analyst in the PGI unit at IFPRI. We thank Raíces Colectivo for outstanding data collection efforts over the two survey rounds. The study was funded by the Honduras Mission of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and One CGIAR's Fragility, Conflict, and Migration Initiative. The funding sources had no role in data collection, data analysis, or report writing, the conclusions of the study are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), One CGIAR, USAID, or the United States Government. Corresponding author: f.cebillos@cgiar.org

This note describes the accompanying dataset on migration and empowerment indicators collected over two survey rounds from a sample of households in Western Honduras, as part of a broader validation study around the Migration Propensity Index (MPI).²

The baseline and follow-up surveys were conducted in, respectively, May-June 2023 and 2024 across six Honduran departments: Comayagua, Copán, Cortés, Intibucá, Francisco Morazán, La Paz, Lempira, Ocotepeque, and Santa Bárbara.

The baseline survey reached 1,209 households and was designed to collect the questions underlying Migration Propensity Index³ in addition to a broad range of data related to potential migration factors. The baseline survey sample was selected through a multi-stage cluster sampling strategy. In a first step, 23 municipalities were selected with selection probability proportional to migration prevalence (using the 2022 rate of returnees to total population) and size (total population as per the 2013 Census). The oversampling of municipalities with a higher prevalence of cross-border migration was done with the objective of maximizing the chances of observing future migration events among interviewed households. In the second step, five aldeas were randomly drawn within each of the municipalities selected in the first step, with selection probability proportional to their total population during the 2013 Census. In the third step, two caseríos or barrios were selected within each aldea.⁴ Finally, in order to obtain a random sample of households within each community (caserío or barrio) — and in the absence of listing data—, we designed a procedure inspired by the EPI method (originally proposed by the World Health Organization’s Expanded Program on Immunization).⁵ Using GPS coordinates for each community (available from the Instituto Nacional de Estadística), six random locations were selected within a 5-kilometer radius of the community’s coordinates.⁶ Enumerators were instructed to travel to each of these random locations and identify the nearest structure where a household could be living in an attempt to interview that household, proceeding to neighboring structures until a household willing to participate was found.⁷

The follow-up survey was conducted 12 months after the baseline survey and re-interviewed 1,094 of the original households, inquiring about actual (external and internal) migration instances of any of the household members during the previous 12 months. In addition, a tracking protocol was implemented for households that were not available to be interviewed, which attempted to find out through other family members outside of the household, neighbors, and/or community leaders whether anyone in the household had migrated either domestically or internationally. Such an exercise provides us with migration information on 82 additional households, for a total of 1,176 households (or 97% of the baseline sample) with data on migration, our main outcome of interest.

² See “External and Internal Migration Propensity Index (MPI) for Honduras: Out-of-sample Validation. Ceballos, F., Hernandez, M., Espinoza Hernandez, A. (2024).”

³ See “Migration Propensity Index: Calibration for Honduras. IFPRI Technical Note (internal report). Almanzar, M., Ceballos, F., Constenla, S., and Hernandez, M.A. (2022)” and “Internal Migration Propensity Index (i-MPI) for Guatemala and Honduras: A tool to estimate the household-level likelihood of domestic migration. Ceballos, F., Hernandez, M.A., and Espinoza Hernandez, A. (2023).”

⁴ Since sampling was conducted with replacement, the number of aldeas and caseríos (barrios) selected within each municipality (aldea) is not exactly 5 (2) in practice, but rather fluctuates around these numbers.

⁵ The EPI method has many variants, but it can be loosely described as follows. In a selected community, (i) select a location near the centre of the community, (ii) choose a random direction (often defined in the field by spinning a bottle or pen), and (iii) identify a random household along the chosen direction pointing outwards from the centre of the community to its boundary. In subsequent steps, the procedure above is repeated, identifying a new household in each iteration until the required number of households is surveyed.

⁶ These locations were manually checked against satellite imagery to ensure they fell near a structure. In the cases where they did not, a new random replacement location was drawn.

⁷ Overall, this procedure worked quite well in practice, with little to no complications reported from enumerators, with only a few exceptions.

Migrants in each household were identified based on a survey question on whether someone in the household migrated in the previous 12 months and a follow-up question on where they migrated. External migration captures any migration outside of Honduras, while internal migration captures instances where at least an individual within a household migrated to a different department within Honduras (thus excluding individuals who left the household but moved to the same community or to another community in the same department). While we have information on individual migrants and on the number of migrants within each household, since the MPI is defined only at the household level, we construct the migration indicators using the household as the unit of analysis. Note that a household may thus exhibit both external and internal migration, since different household members could have migrated to different locations.

In addition, the survey collected data on a theoretically-informed subset of indicators from the Women's Empowerment Metric for National Statistical Systems (WEMNS), identified as those most likely to be associated with migration based on a review of the literature.⁸ The data to construct these indicators were collected during the follow-up survey from a single respondent in each household. The protocol was to administer this module to a woman between 18 and 49 years old, in the absence of which the module could be administered to a man in this same age range. The indicators are divided into four domains, intrinsic agency, instrumental agency, collective agency, and agency-enabling resources. In addition, we construct an index that aggregates all the individual indicators into a single empowerment measure. Table 1 shows the indicators that we collected in addition to their conceptual definition and their weights, which are derived from the WEMNS weights.

⁸ WEMNS was developed by IFPRI, Emory University, and the Living Standards and Measurement Study Team at the World Bank. See "Measuring women's empowerment in national surveys: Development of the Women's Empowerment Metric for National Statistical Systems (WEMNS). IFPRI Discussion Paper 02254. Seymour, G., Heckert, J., Quisumbing, A. R., Meinzen-Dick, R. S., Malapit, H. J., Paz, F., Faas, S., Myers, E., Doss, C., Sinharoy, S. S., Cheong, Y. F., Yount, K. M., Hassan, M. Z., Hassan, M. I., Sharma, S., Pokhrel, P., Dardón Sagastume, M. D., Kanyanda, S. S. E., Vundru, W., & Moylan, H. G. (2024)."

Table 1. Selected empowerment indicators from WEMNS index

Indicator	Conceptual definition	Weights for female respondents	Weights for male respondents
Intrinsic agency:			
Endorsement of women's freedom in livelihood choices (female respondents only)	Believes that every woman has the right to attend school, pursue her preferred livelihood strategies, and use her money as she wishes as demonstrated by fully agreeing with each of a series of five statements regarding women's rights in this domain	0.1364	-
Instrumental agency:			
Influence over time allocation	Has had a lot of influence on whether to spend their time on all activities in which they participated in the last 7 days (from among households duties, caring for household members, going to the market to purchase essential items, non-agricultural work activities, agricultural production for sale, agricultural production for household consumption)	0.1364	0.1579
Influence in spending decisions	Has a lot of influence on control over any source of income and over large household purchases	0.1364	0.1579
Influence in own health decisions	Has a lot of influence on own healthcare decisions	0.1364	0.1579
Collective agency:			
Participation in organizations	Participated in at least one type of community organization in the last 12 months (from among government councils or agencies, groups that provide local services, formal or informal savings or credit groups, groups related to livelihood activities, and other groups)	0.1364	0.1579
Leadership in organizations	Acted as a leader in at least one type of community organization in the last 12 months (same groups as above)	0.1364	0.1579
Agency-enabling resources:			
Use of financial services	Has used at least one financial service in last 12 months	0.0682	0.0789
Access to credit	Believes would be able to take a loan from at least one formal or semi-formal lending source	0.0682	0.0789
Secure property rights	Name listed on ownership document for at least one land parcel or dwelling	0.0455	0.0526