



# How Dynamic is the Structure of Employment & Well-being:

A Comparison of IDPs from Abkhazia in the 1990s and South Ossetia in 2008  
Beth Mitchneck & Julia Carboni, Tbilisi, March 2011, funded by the NSF

# What constitutes economic well-being and how is it experienced?

- + Well-being as:
  - + Access to employment or income generation
  - + Access to resources for one's household's livelihood
- + Experience for IDPs of management of economic well-being different over time and space
  - + IDPs from Abkhazia: 88% organize family budgets collectively as opposed to 74% of local population (statistically significant difference)
  - + IDPs from South Ossetia: R1 CC – 86% collective organization as opposed to 53% already in new settlements
- + Argument: self-organization choices: over time IDPs from Abkhazia developed livelihood strategy of the everyday collective economy while the IDPs' from Ossetia livelihood strategy is more the economy of the individual

## Role of Time & Space in Collective Living: IDPs from South Ossetia Sharing Household Budgetary Decisionmaking, % Fully Sharing or Partial Sharing

	R1 Fully/Partial	R2 Fully/Partial	R3 Fully/Partial
CC/Verkhvebi	86/90	68/89	54/98
Other new settlements	53/70	43/76	53/66
Pearson Chi2	0.02 significance	Not significant	0.002 significance

# IDP Well-being: Role of Time and Space

- + Experience of IDPs from Abkhazia
  - + Everyday collective economy and networks of survival
- + Experience of IDPs from South Ossetia
  - + Rippling economy of the individual/family and networks of instability
- + Long-term versus the short-term
  - + Static and stable versus dynamic
- + Less relevant geography versus determining role of geography
  - + More common experience versus the centrality of place

# Survey Analysis of IDPs

- + Social network analysis, demographic and economic information as well as trust, perceptions, and narrative questions
- + IDPs from Abkhazia (120) and local population (60) surveyed in 2007
  - + Tbilisi, Kutaisi/Tskaltubo, Zugdidi
- + IDPs from South Ossetia in 3 rounds and 4 sites (60 to 58)
  - + Round 1: May 23 – June 26, 2009
  - + Round 2: December 17 – 30, 2009
  - + Round 3: June 21 – July 28, 2010
  - + Gori collective center and Verkhvebi (30 IDPs)
  - + Tserovani (10)
  - + Mtekhi (10)
  - + Tsimindatskali (10)

## Economic Well-Being of IDPs from Abkhazia and Local Population, Percentage of Respondents

	Local Population	IDPs in CC	IDPs in PA	IDPs in Tbilisi	IDPs in Zugdidi	IDPs in Kutaisi
Not enough money for food	19.4	57.1	50.9	36.8	70.0	55.0
Enough for food not clothes	22.6	6.3	9.1	13.2	2.5	7.5
Enough for clothes & food not durables	29.0	22.2	27.3	26.3	22.5	25.0
Enough for durables not expensive things	29.0	14.3	12.7	23.7	5.0	12.5
N=	62	63	55	38	40	40

## IDPs from Abkhazia & Local Population: Collective Access to Livelihood Resources, 2007 by %

Item	IDP CC	IDP PA	Local Population
<b>Computer</b>			
No Regular Access	33.3	34.6	41.9
Collective Access	66.7	65.5	58.1
<b>Cell Phone</b>			
No Regular Access	6.4	1.8	6.5
Collective Access	93.7	98.2	93.6
<b>Commercial Space</b>			
No Regular Access	42.9	40.0	50.0
Collective Access	57.1	60.0	50.0
<b>Possessions for Income</b>			
No Regular Access	38.1	40.0	51.6
Collective Access	61.9	60.0	48.4
<b>Plot of Land</b>			
No Regular Access	25.4	29.1	17.7
Collective Access	74.6	70.9	82.3

# IDPs from Abkhazia Talk about their Social Networks: Networks of Survival

- + Respondent 51: Whatever I am is thanks to people from my closest circle. It is thanks to my close friend that I have furniture, clothes and everything.
- + Respondent 15: Many people help me in my circle, I have many paternal cousins, relatives, uncle's wife, uncle, everybody helps....
- + Respondent 71: If I cannot get any work I shall borrow money from my relatives, then from my close friends, but I have to return money on time, don't I?



# Economic Well-Being of IDPs from South Ossetia, Percentage of Respondents

Respondent Well Being	Before 2008		Round 1		Round 2		Round 3	
	Verkhvebi	Other Sites	Verkhvebi	Other Sites	Verkhvebi	Other Sites	Verkhvebi	Other Sites
Not enough money for food	0%	3%	86%	63%	54%	76%	57%	77%
Enough for food but not clothes	0%	10%	14%	27%	39%	14%	21%	10%
Enough for food and clothes but not for durable purchases	29%	33%	0%	7%	7%	10%	21%	10%
Enough for durable purchases but not for expensive things	50%	47%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	3%
We can afford quite expensive purchases	21%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Total N</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Pearson chi2(4) = 6.1606 Pr = 0.187    Pearson chi2(3) = 4.8515 Pr = 0.183    Pearson chi2(2) = 4.7749 Pr = 0.092    Pearson chi2(3) = 4.1924 Pr = 0.241



# IDPs from South Ossetia: Collective Access to Livelihood Resources, Over Time by %

Item/Place & Round	Round 1				Round 2				Round 3			
	V	M	Tser	Tsm	V	M	Tsero	Tsm	V	M	Tser	Tsm
<b>Computer</b>												
No Regular Access	100%	100%	100%	90%	93%	100%	90%	70%	89%	100%	90%	90%
Collective Access	0%	0%	0%	10%	7%	0%	10%	30%	11%	0%	10%	10%
<b>Cell Phone</b>												
No Regular Access	11%	10%	10%	10%	0%	20%	0%	10%	11%	20%	10%	0%
Collective Access	89%	90%	90%	90%	100%	80%	100%	90%	89%	80%	90%	100%
<b>Commercial Space</b>												
No Regular Access	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	93%	100%	100%	100%
Collective Access	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Possessions for Income</b>												
No Regular Access	96%	100%	100%	100%	93%	100%	90%	90%	82%	100%	100%	90%
Collective Access	4%	0%	0%	0%	7%	0%	10%	10%	18%	0%	0%	10%
<b>Plot of Land</b>												
No Regular Access	100%	0%	40%	10%	96%	0%	100%	40%	86%	0%	70%	10%
Collective Access	0%	100%	60%	90%	4%	100%	0%	60%	14%	100%	30%	90%

# Networks of Economic Survival for IDPs from South Ossetia? Not really.

- + Financial assistance from relatives in Georgia
  - + Borrowing not prevalent
    - + Over time IDPs decreased their borrowing from friends & relatives in Georgia from 5 respondents to 2 in our survey
  - + Direct financial assistance from relatives more prevalent – 21%
  - + More women used social networks for financial assistance R1
- + Remittances from abroad minor role
  - + Round 1 = no one receiving
  - + Round 2 = 5 individuals receiving
  - + Round 3 = 2 individuals receiving
- + Borrowing from a financial institution
  - + More prevalent for those living in Gori (4 or 5) but not key

# Is there an association between levels of trust and economic well-being?

- + Overtime, trust has changed -
  - + R<sub>1</sub> – government institutions generally more trusted by those who are better off (all relative) than elected or non-government
  - + R<sub>3</sub> – by those who are better off – President more trusted and local government less trusted as are the leading political party and NGOs
- + This differs though for Verkhvebi – **more well off, trust less**
- + Overall, trust in national and local political entities have generally declined over time for IDPs from Ossetia
  - + But all IDPs trust in the MRA but especially Verkhvebi
  - + Trust in the NGO sector has increased over time for local and international organizations more so for Verkhvebi
  - + Trust in other IDPs declined over time for those living in other settlements – may explain why sharing seems to decline

# Implications for IDP Economic Well-Being

- + Protracted displacement very much associated with ECE
- + Dynamic processes associated with individual economy
- + Role of trust?
  - + Protracted – trust grown in those they live with
  - + Newly displaced and resettled – trust changing but those less trusting improve economic well-being
- + Role of place?
  - + Key but unclear if answer lies in the individuals who live in a particular place or if place shapes access to economic opportunity