

Description of the Acayucan Standards of Living Survey*

Marco Gonzalez-Navarro
UC Berkeley [†]

Climent Quintana-Domeque
Universitat d'Alacant [‡]

First version: October, 2006. This version: July, 2010.

Abstract

This paper describes the “Encuesta de Condiciones de Vida y Opciones Económicas en Acayucan” (Acayucan Standards of Living Survey, ASLS). This is a two-round household panel survey implemented in 2006 and 2009. Its purpose was to provide household information to evaluate the effects of the experimental provision of street pavement in the city of Acayucan, Veracruz (Mexico).

*We would like to thank Anne Case, Angus Deaton, Alan Krueger, David Lee, Adriana Lleras-Muney, Cecilia Rouse, and Jesse Rothstein for their comments and advice in this research project. The collaboration of the Acayucan 2005-2007 and 2008-2010 Municipal administrations is gratefully acknowledged. We also recognize the effort of José Luis Palma, Luz Uribe and Monica González at INSAD who were in charge of the survey, and José Luis Reyes whose company provided us with the house value assessments. Financial aid and support from Princeton University, Princeton Woodrow Wilson Scholars, Princeton Industrial Relations Section, Princeton Research Program in Development Studies, Robert Wood Johnson Scholars in Health Policy Research Program, Berkeley Economics, Universitat d'Alacant, the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy and the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation (ECO 2008-05721/ECON) is gratefully acknowledged. Any errors contained in the paper are our own. The data collected for this study underwent the approval process of Princeton Universitys Institutional Review Panel (Research Protocol 3104).

[†]50 University Hall, MC 7360 Berkeley, CA 94720. Email: marcog@berkeley.edu

[‡]Departament de Fonaments de l'Anàlisi Econòmica, Universitat d'Alacant, Sant Vicent del Raspeig, 03690 Alacant, Spain. Email: climent@ua.es

1 Institutional Context

Acayucan is a municipality in the southern part of the state of Veracruz, in eastern México. In Table 1 we present some descriptive statistics from the entire city, column (1), and from the set of streets that the municipality in Acayucan was interested in providing pavement, i.e. experimental streets, columns (2) and (3). According to the 2005 short Census (Conteo), the municipality has a population of 79,459, with the city accounting for about 50,000. The average altitude is 100 meters above sea level, with tropical climate. The sex ratio is 0.89 males for every female.¹ Of those aged 15 and more, 9% are illiterate. School enrollment is 94% among adolescents aged 12-14.

Regarding household level variables, electricity is enjoyed by almost everyone with 98% of homes having electricity in their property. Tap water is less common: 16% of private inhabited dwellings report not having access to piped water in their lot or home. In terms of assets, 81% of homes have a refrigerator, 55% have a washing machine, and 14% have computers.

Interestingly, the descriptive statistics from the Acayucan Standards of Living Surveys in 2006 are close to those of the 2005 short Census, with the exception of the fraction of households having access to piped water in their lot or home and the number of rooms in the house, which are less for inhabitants from our survey. Although census tracts with streets that are part of the experiment have worse indicators than census tracts in the downtown area of the city, there are many areas that were not part of the experiment with even worse socioeconomic indicators. This highlights the fact that although the experiment took place in parts of the city that are relatively poor, they did not contain the poorest households, which tend to live in scarcely populated areas with many vacant lots, where the municipal government was not yet interested in providing urban road infrastructure.

¹Grech, Vassallo-Agius, and Savona-Ventura (2003) have documented a falling male to female ratio in all of Mexico, but well above one. The only explanation we have encountered in the literature for low male to female sex ratios such as the one in Acayucan is the existence of male migrant labor (Bean, King, and Passel, 1980).

Municipal governments in Mexico have as their main responsibilities garbage collection, paying for public street illumination, providing local public safety, regulating businesses, tending to public gardens, and providing and maintaining public infrastructure including sewerage, road pavement, and sidewalks. Each three-year administration has freedom to choose what it will focus its budget on.

Mexico's government obtains its funds mainly from a national VAT, a national income tax, and oil proceeds from the state-run oil company. These funds are shared by the three orders of government: Federal, State and Local. Hence, funding of the municipal government comes mainly from transfers from the Federal and State Government. A significant portion of these transfers is conditional on being spent on things like infrastructure. Local sources of revenue (mainly the urban property tax) account for less than 10% of the total municipality budget.

2 The Acayucan Standards of Living Survey

The survey contains two rounds: a baseline (2006) and a follow-up (2009) conducted during the second half of February and the beginning of March. Both rounds were conducted during the same months with the intention of minimizing seasonality effects. Table 5 in the Appendix shows the structure of the questionnaire in the ASLS. We also obtained information on business units through a very short business census in 2006 and 2009 and home value assessments made by a real estate agent. The target population of the ASLS consisted of all private households and businesses located on the street projects that were part of the experiment.

The survey firm created a sampling frame from all inhabited residential dwellings found in experiment streets in early 2006. As recognized by Deaton (1997), the use of out-dated or otherwise inaccurate sampling frames is an important source of error in survey estimates. The sampling procedure was clustered sampling: From the list of dwellings in each cluster

we randomly chose a pre-specified fraction to be interviewed.

Given the uncertainty about the total number of projects the municipality would be able to conclude by the time of the follow-up survey, and since we did not have any prior about having different sample variances of the outcome means in the treatment and control groups, we decided to sample with a higher intensity in the intent-to-treat (ITT) group (70% of dwellings) than in the control group (50% of dwellings).²

Notice that some dwellings would contain more than one household (defined as a group of one or more people who live in the same house and share food expenditures). The procedure in case of multiple households per dwelling was to interview all of them. It is worth noting that neither quota sampling nor substitution of non-responding households or individuals (whether refusals or non-contacts) were permitted at any stage.

The household questionnaire collects detailed information for each individual in the household (e.g. age, sex, etc.) and characteristics at the household level (e.g. wall material, electricity availability, etc.). Both household and individual questions were answered by a reference person who was targeted to be either the household head or the spouse/partner of the head. In over 95% of cases the respondent was the household head or the spouse as intended, see Table 2. If the household head or the spouse were not going to be available in a second visit, but a knowledgeable adult was willing to participate, the interview took place.

Survey weights (or expansions factors) represent the inverse of the probability that a dwelling or household is included in the sample. They are constructed taking into account the proportion of households that we attempted to interview in each cluster and cluster specific non-response. In the construction of the weights non-response is assumed to be random: it simply inflates the weight given to households in a project that were successfully interviewed. The response rate in the baseline survey was 94%.

In order to compare nominal variables between the follow-up (2009) and the baseline

²Duflo, Glennerster and Kremer (2007), and List, Sadoff and Wagner (2010) offer a detailed discussion on optimal size arrangements.

(2006) survey, the cumulative inflation between 2006-2009, 14.68%, is taken into account.

2.1 Business Census

A very short business census was applied to all business units with their main entrance on the street project in 2006 and 2009. Mobile business units were excluded from analysis (for example, a seller on a motorcycle, or a water distributor going around on a truck). The supervisors of each survey team were in charge of locating all business units on their street project and administering the questionnaire. The questions included the type of business, years of operation, employees, total sales, expenditures, changes in profits, and whether the business unit is located in a house, a special purpose commercial locale, or on the street.

2.2 Housing Value Assessments

Finally, the other source of data was the housing value assessments produced by a real estate agent. The real estate agent was asked to visit one out of every two successfully interviewed homes and to assess the market value of the house in 2006 and 2009. In each year, the assessments were performed once the household survey fieldwork was completed.

3 Baseline Descriptive Statistics

3.1 Baseline Household Characteristics

This section offers a detailed picture of the experimental streets in 2006. Table 3 provides descriptive statistics. The survey obtained information from 1,231 households, with an average and median of 4 members, suggesting a nuclear family rather than an extensive household with multiple generations. Only 3% of individuals speak an indigenous language. Individuals aged 15 and over have a median of 8 years of schooling (mean of 7.5 years) and 88% of them have ever attended school. Lack of schooling is mostly concentrated among the

elderly. 88% of individuals aged 5 and over declare to be literate - defined as being able to read and write a note in Spanish.

Home ownership is relatively high: 84% of households declare to be owners of the property they live on. Only 71% of homeowners have a title of property. Indeed, some homeowners even declared to have acquired the property by invading it. The survey asked for an estimate of property value: the median house value estimate is 114,680 in 2009 Mexican pesos (13,500 PPP-adjusted 2009 US dollars). Houses in the sample are relatively simple, with a median of 2 rooms (mean of 2.3 rooms), 93% of the homes with cement floor (or hard-floor) and 92% with cement walls. Cement roof is not the norm, given that only 37% of homes have it. Asbestos or metal sheets were by far the most common form of roofing. 41% of homes have the bathroom located outside the house. 25% of households use wood or charcoal as cooking fuel. In households that cook with wood the kitchen is typically under a roof outside the main structure.

In terms of labor, 51% of the 4,099 individuals aged 8 and over worked the previous week. A person is defined as working if he or she engaged in any income generating activity or worked without pay in the family business or farm. Among those who worked, the median number of days worked was 6 and the average was 5.5 days. Work is usually 8 hours per day. Multiplying *days worked* by the number of *hours worked per day* provides a measure of weekly hours worked. With a median of 48 and an average of 46.5 hours worked last week, part-time employment does not seem to play an important role. Average monthly labor income is 3,374 pesos, with a median of 2,408 pesos (around 280 PPP adjusted 2009 US dollars). Our estimated rate of unemployment (excluding students, housewives, the elderly and anyone not looking for work) is around 6%, which compares to the 3.5% unemployment rate for Mexico as a whole in the first quarter of 2006. This suggests that the inhabitants of the city's outer neighborhoods do not seem to experience the degree of high joblessness encountered in other urban contexts (Magruder, 2009).

In the consumption panel of Table 3 we can see that household expenditure is on average

3,748 pesos, with a median of 3,211 pesos. Dividing monthly household expenditure by the number of family members provides a measure of per capita expenditure, which is on average 1,067 pesos with a median of 860 pesos (around 100 PPP-adjusted 2009 US dollars per month). The median per capita expenditure is slightly higher than the 2 dollar a day³ poverty line (Banerjee and Duflo, 2007). In terms of durable goods, 12% of households have an automobile, and 8% have a pick up truck. The median household does not have either. In terms of other durable goods, 79% of households have a refrigerator, 51% have a washing machine, 38% have a video player, 20% have a microwave oven, 10% have a personal computer, and 6% have air conditioning. Television and radio ownership were not asked because other surveys have showed that they have been almost universally adopted in Mexican households. Participation in government welfare programs, such as Progresas-Oportunidades, DIF food aid, is positive in 7% of households.

The panel on public services shows that the distance to the nearest paved street is on average 1.4 blocks. Street blocks in Acayucan vary in size but are roughly 200 meters long. 78% of households have tap water in their lot. During the course of the fieldwork, we learned that some households do have a tap water line to their property but do not use it because they have not opened an account with the water company. These families either fetch their water from a neighbor, or use a water well. 87% of homes have a sewerage line connected to the city sewerage system. Electricity was available in practically all homes (98%). Regarding garbage collection, although the service is free and supposedly universal, only 58% of homes declared to have refuse collection services. Those without collection service either burn their refuse or take it to a street where the garbage is actually collected. 22% of homes experienced a flooding of their home in the past year. In terms of public safety, 11% of homes experienced a burglary in the past 12 months, and 62% declare to feel safe walking in their street at night.

The credit panel shows that 17% of households had a bank account, and 10% had a credit card. Use of collateral-based credit, such as mortgages and private bank loans was positive

³The 2 dollar a day poverty line was for 1985, which is 2.92 dollars in 2005.

for 3% of individuals aged 18 and over, whereas uncollateral-based credit was positive for 0.4% of individuals (Electronic and furniture store credit, credit card, automobile loans, etc.) Credit from informal sources, such as friends and family, was relatively uncommon, as only 0.4 and 0.1% of individuals reported using credit from these sources in the past year.

In terms of schooling, 87% of children aged 5-17 were reported to be able to read and write a note in Spanish. 91% of children aged 5-17 were enrolled in school, and 21% reported missing at least 1 school day in the past month.

The Table also inquires about expectations. 45% of individuals in the sample had plans to out migrate for work reasons. Regarding the satisfaction of living in Acayucan, the average and the median on a 4 point increasing scale was 3: satisfied. When asked about 13 different kinds of home improvements performed in the past 6 months, the average number of improvements was 0.45 and the median was 0. Only 5% of households declared to have opened a business in the past year. 64% of those new businesses were located at home.

3.2 Baseline Business Characteristics

In the baseline round, 250 business units were located and successfully interviewed in the experimental streets. We present summary statistics from the business census for employment (firm size), sales, expenditures, and estimated profits. We trim the sample by 5% from above and below in terms of profit rank to eliminate the influence of extreme outliers. The median firm in the study areas has 1 worker (who is usually the owner) and an average of 1.66 workers. The largest firm had 10 workers. Median sales were 2,300 pesos, median expenditures were 1,200 pesos and median profits were 917 pesos per month (around 108 PPP-adjusted 2009 US dollars). The averages are larger but a similar picture emerges. All measures are suggestive of very small businesses. The most common business is a small shop (*tiendita*) selling goods like milk, tortillas, beer, sodas, potato chips, canned goods, candy and snacks (50% of units). In 84% of cases, the business is located in the house of the owner. The business census revealed that less than 15% of adults work in business units located in

the neighborhoods under study. These neighborhoods are thus primarily for housing people whose work is located either in the downtown areas of the city or in ranches/farms located around the city. The little commerce that exists is mainly providing basic foods to neighbors of these areas.

4 Stayers, Movers and Newcomers

Households interviewed in 2006 can be partitioned into two groups: those who stayed in the experimental areas and those that moved out between 2006 and 2009. Due to budgetary reasons, the survey only followed up on non-mover households. Although mover households were not contacted, we do have information about them from the 2006 ASLS that allow us to understand along which dimensions they were different from those who stayed.

Field workers had maps with locations of dwellings interviewed in 2006. They approached the dwelling in 2009 with questionnaires that had a pre-filled section with identifying information about the household that was interviewed in 2006. If the head of the household was the same as in 2006, the households were matched.⁴ If there were additional households in the dwelling (new households or subdivisions), they were all interviewed, but were coded as new households (with no household counterpart in 2006). Matched households allow an analysis of changes within households over time.

In the second round of the ASLS we were able to measure how the infrastructure provision changed the composition of the neighbors that inhabit the road pavement projects. The characteristics of new neighbors were assessed in two ways. First, by interviewing new households living in dwellings vacated by mover households: if a dwelling that was surveyed in 2006 had a different household in 2009, the new household was interviewed (but had no household counterpart in 2006). The purpose of these surveys is to measure if neighbors attracted by the infrastructure have different characteristics than those who were already

⁴The exception to this rule occurs if family members are the same, but now another member is declared to be the household head.

living there. However, not all new households come to live in pre-existing houses, some families build new houses upon arrival. To include them in our measurement, households living in all residential constructions built between 2006 and 2009 were also interviewed.

The matched data set thus contains three types of households: 1- Those interviewed in 2006 and 2009, 2- those interviewed in 2006 only that could not be followed because they out migrated, and 3- new households with information from the 2009 round only (which can be further subdivided into: new households replacing those that out migrated, households inhabiting new constructions, subdivisions of households from 2006, and new households that neither substituted mover households nor were part of the household in 2006).

Table 4 presents a summary of the interview results for the 2006 and 2009 matched data set. The baseline sampling frame was all inhabited residential structures with main entrance facing the proposed road pavement projects found in early 2006. Out of 1,275 inhabited residential structures selected for interview, completed interviews were obtained from 1,193 dwellings. The response rate was thus a very high 94%. In those 1,193 dwellings, 1,231 household interviews were obtained, because in a few cases, there were 2 (and even 3) households living in the same property.

The 2009 survey was intended to follow up on the 1,231 households successfully interviewed in 2006. 900 follow-up households were successfully located and interviewed. In 56 cases the family was located but refused to participate in the survey, and in 271 cases the household had moved. The household was categorized as having moved if neighbors or new dwelling inhabitants had information that the previous family had moved out. This means the 2009 ASLS survey had a recontact rate of 73% of households interviewed in 2006. The main reason for the low recontact rate was household out-migration.

In 2009, 183 new households were interviewed. 120 of the newly interviewed households were families living in the dwellings left by mover households (labeled “Substitution” in the Table). 27 families were interviewed in new inhabited residential constructions. 22 cases were family subdivisions; typically one of the sons got married, had a child, and created a

new household in the same plot because food expenditure was not shared with the parents anymore. 14 cases were simply defined as new households and occurred whenever the 2006 household was contacted, but now there was an additional family in the household. For example, if a room in the property was now rented out to another family. The 2009 ASLS round obtained a total of 1,083 completed surveys.

References

- BANERJEE, A. V., AND E. DUFLO (2007): “The Economic Lives of the Poor,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 21(1), 141–167.
- BEAN, F. D., A. G. KING, AND J. S. PASSEL (1983): “The Number of Illegal Migrants of Mexican Origin in the United States: Sex Ratio-based Estimates for 1980,” *Demography*, 20(1), 99–109.
- DEATON, A. (1997): *The Analysis of Household Surveys. A Microeconometric Approach to Development Policy*. John Hopkins University Press.
- DUFLO, E., R. GLENNERSTER, AND M. KREMER (2007): “Using Randomization in Development Economics Research: A Toolkit,” vol. 4 of *Handbook of Development Economics in T. Paul Schultz, and John Strauss (eds.)*. Elsevier Science Ltd.: North Holland.
- GRECH, V., P. VASSALLO-AGIUS, AND C. SAVONA-VENTURA (2003): “Secular Trends in Sex Ratios at Birth in North America and Europe over the Second Half of the 20th Century,” *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 57, 612–615.
- LIST, J. A., S. SADOFF, AND M. WAGNER (2010): “So you want to run an experiment, now what? Some Simple Rules of Thumb for Optimal Experimental Design,” Working Paper 15701, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- MAGRUDER, J. (2009): “High Unemployment Yet Few Small Firms: The Role of Centralized Bargaining in South Africa,” *UC-Berkeley ARE Mimeo*.

Figure 1: Acayucan Street Projects



Tables

Table 1: Comparison to City

Individual Level Variables	Acayucan (2005 Census)	Experimental Streets (ASLS 2006)	Experimental Streets (ASLS 2006, Weighted)
Population	49,945	4,943	9,088
Males/Females	89%	89%	89%
Share Aged 0-5	11%	11%	11%
Share Aged 65+	6%	5%	5%
15+ Illiterate	9%	11%	11%
6-14 Not Enrolled in School	4%	4%	4%
12-14 Not Enrolled in School	6%	7%	7%
15-24 Enrolled in School	48%	48%	48%
Household Level Variables			
Families	12,874	1,231	2,264
Dwellings	12,693	1,193	2,197
1 Room Dwelling	22%	27%	27%
2 Room Dwelling	17%	36%	36%
3+ Room Dwelling	60%	37%	37%
No Tap Water in Lot	16%	22%	21%
Electricity	98%	98%	98%
Fridge	81%	80%	80%
Washing Machine	55%	51%	52%
Computer	14%	10%	11%

First column data from locality census Iter 2005 (INEGI). Second and third column data from baseline Acayucan Standards of Living Survey 2006. Weights are the street-project inverse of sampling probability.

Table 2: Main Respondent

	2006 round			2009 round		
	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative
Head of the Household	541	43.9	43.9	501	46.3	46.3
Spouse or Partner	581	47.2	91.1	452	41.7	88.0
Son or Daughter	82	6.7	97.8	88	8.1	96.1
Father or Mother	9	0.7	98.5	12	1.1	97.2
Brother or Sister	6	0.5	99.0	11	1.0	98.2
Other	12	1.0	100.00	19	1.8	100.00
Total	1,231	100		1,083	100	

Other category in 2006 consists of: son/daughter in law (3), no family relationship (3), father/mother in law (2), brother/sister in law (1), nephew/niece (1), cousin (1), other family relationship (1).

Other category in 2009 consists of: son/daughter in law (6), nephew/niece (4), cousin (1), brother/sister in law (1), and missing (7).

Table 3: Baseline Descriptive Statistics (2006)

Variable	Obs.	Mean	Median	SD	Min	Max
Demographic Indicators						
Household members	1,231	4.01	4	1.80	1	16
Female (=1)	4,943	0.53	1	0.50	0	1
Age	4,939	28.0	24	19.6	0	96
Literate (=1)	4,401	0.88	1	0.33	0	1
Indigenous (=1)	4,401	0.03	0	0.15	0	1
Has ever attended school (age>15)	3,332	0.88	1	0.32	0	1
Years of schooling (age≥15)	3,289	7.52	8	4.7	0	20
Housing Quality						
Home owner (=1)	1,230	0.84	1	0.36	0	1
Property title (=1)	1,025	0.71	1	0.45	0	1
House value estimate	730	223,448	114,680	322,527	3,440	3,440,400
Cement floor (=1)	1,231	0.93	1	0.26	0	1
Cement roofing (=1)	1,231	0.37	0	0.48	0	1
Cement walls (=1)	1,229	0.92	1	0.27	0	1
Rooms (=1)	1,231	2.30	2	1.18	1	8
Bathroom inside house	1,231	0.59	1	0.49	0	1
Wood Fuel (=1)	1,221	0.25	0	0.44	0	1
Labor						
Worked last week	4,099	0.51	1	0.50	0	1
Days worked last week	2,018	5.54	6	1.55	1	7
Daily hours worked	2,031	8.10	8	3.18	0	16
Monthly labor income	1,735	3,374	2,408	3,592	0	62,500
Consumption						
Household expenditure	1,203	3,748	3,211	2,544	0	25,000
Per capita expenditure	1,203	1,067	860	846	0	9,174
Automobile	1,231	0.12	0	0.32	0	1
Pick-up truck	1,231	0.08	0	0.27	0	1
Motorcycle	1,231	0.02	0	0.15	0	1
Sum of durables	1,231	2.07	2	1.50	0	7
Refrigerator	1,231	0.79	1	0.40	0	1
Washing machine	1,231	0.51	1	0.50	0	1
Video player	1,231	0.38	0	0.48	0	1
Microwave oven	1,231	0.20	0	0.40	0	1
Computer	1,231	0.10	0	0.30	0	1
Air conditioning	1,231	0.06	0	0.24	0	1
Government program (=1)	1,231	0.07	0	0.25	0	1

Table 3: Baseline Descriptive Statistics (2006)

Variable	Obs.	Mean	Median	SD	Min	Max
Public services						
Distance to nearest paved street	1,231	1.40	1	1.31	0	9
Water in lot	1,229	0.78	1	0.42	0	1
Sewerage	1,227	0.87	1	0.34	0	1
Electricity	1,230	0.98	1	0.15	0	1
Garbage collection	1,230	0.58	1	0.49	0	1
Burn Garbage	1,230	0.15	0	0.37	0	1
Flooding (12 months)	1,211	0.22	0	0.42	0	1
Burglary (12 months)	1,224	0.11	0	0.30	0	1
Feel safe walking in your street at night	1,231	0.62	1	0.52	0	1
Credit						
Bank Account	1,221	0.17	0	0.37	0	1
Credit Card	1,223	0.10	0	0.30	0	1
Collateral based private credit	2,995	0.03	0	0.16	0	1
Uncollateralized private credit	2,995	0.04	0	0.20	0	1
Family or friends credit	2,995	0.01	0	0.08	0	1
Schooling (Ages 5-17)						
Literate	1,405	0.87	1	0.33	0	1
Enrolled in School	1,368	0.91	1	0.27	0	1
Absences Last Month (> 0)	1,243	0.21	0	0.40	0	1
Health						
Sick last month	4,851	0.46	0	0.50	0	1
Infection/parasite last year	4,851	0.15	0	0.35	0	1
Expectations, Investment						
Plans to out migrate for work	1,160	0.45	0	0.55	0	1
Home improvements (6 months)	1,231	0.45	0	1.08	0	10
New business (12 months)	1,231	0.05	0	0.21	0	1
New business at home	61	0.64	1	0.47	0	1
Satisfaction living in city	1,229	3.00	3	0.70	1	4
Business Units						
Number of employees	225	1.66	1	1.22	1	10
Sales	225	3,865	2,293	4,885	64	34,404
Expenditures	225	2,420	1,204	3,729	0	31,078
Profits	225	1,445	917	1,867	-1,950	8,715

Mean calculation takes survey weights into account, except in business units, which is a census.

Literate is being able to read and write a note in Spanish, asked for individuals 5 and older. *Indigenous* is speaking an indigenous language, asked for individuals 5 and older. *Has Ever Attended School* and *Years of Education* are for people aged 15 and older. *Property title* is not asked for renters. *House value estimate* in 2009 Mexican pesos. *Rooms* is the number of rooms in the house excluding kitchen, unless it is also used for sleeping. Labor questions are asked for people aged 8 and older. Labor statistics are calculated for the set of people who worked the previous week, except for *Worked last week*. *Hours Per Day* is coded as 0 when the person worked an average of less than 1 hour per day, and is top coded at 16 hours. *PCE* is per capita monthly expenditure in 2009 Mexican pesos at the household level. *Sum of durables* is a sum of indicators for: Refrigerator, washing machine, computer, video player, air conditioning, microwave oven, and motorcycle in the household. Government welfare programs include: Liconsa, Progres-Oportunidades, DIF, etc. *Distance to nearest paved street* in terms of city blocks, each of around 200 meters. *Burn garbage* means the household commonly disposes of garbage by burning it. *Credit Card* and *Bank Account* are coded as 1 if anyone in the household has them. Other credit questions are asked for all adults 18 and older. Informal private credit sources are: Money lenders, merchants, and local pawn shops. Collateral based credit sources are private bank loans and mortgages. Uncollateralized credit sources are credit cards, furniture and appliance stores, automobile loans, and casas de crédito popular. Home improvements is a sum of indicators of improvements in: flooring, walls, roofing, sewerage connection, plumbing, toilets, electrical, room construction, remodeling, air conditioning installation, security measures, and improvements to house front.

Table 4: Non Response and Recontact

	2006		2009
	Dwellings		Households
Eligible selected	1,275	Follow up	1,231
Completed	1,193	Completed at follow up	900
Response rate	94%	Household moved	271
		Non response	56
		Other	4
		Recontact rate	73%
		New households	183
		of which:	
		Subdivision	22
		Substitution	120
		New household	14
		New construction	27
		Completed in 2009	1,083

Eligible dwelling category excluded plots without a dwelling, unoccupied dwellings or temporary use dwellings.

2006 non response is in terms of dwellings selected from the frame, and the number of dwellings with completed household survey. 2009 recontact is in terms of households. There were 1,231 households in 1,193 dwellings in 2006, so that in some cases there is more than one household per dwelling.

Completed at follow up is defined as having recontacted at least one member of the household interviewed in 2006.

New households defined as not having been interviewed in 2006.

Subdivisions happen when one of the members in 2006 creates a new household living in the same plot, for example if the son gets married and lives in his parent's house but does not share food expenses.

Substitutions are new households found in 2009 that occupy the dwelling inhabited by an interviewed family in 2006, for example if the house is rented.

New household occurs when the interviewed family is still in the dwelling, but now there is an additional household, for example if a room in the house is now rented out.

New constructions are households interviewed in which the residential structure was not there in 2006 but is there in 2009.

Appendix

Table 5: ASLS Questionnaire Structure

I.	Individual Level Variables
----	----------------------------

A.	<u>Reference person reports information for every household member about:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Age (I.3)- Sex (I.4)- Residence condition of each household member (I.5)- Relationship of each household member with the household head (I.6)- Health care insurance (I.7)- Self-reported health status (I.8)- Chronic Disease and Type (I.9) (I.10)- Physical or Mental Disability / Type (I.11) (I.12)→ Demand for Health Services/ Where/ Which/ Transport Mode/ Time (I.13)-(I.17)- Health Problems (last month): cough, fever, flu, bronchitis, vomit, diarrhea, stomach ache. (I.18)-(I.24)- Health Problems (last year): fungus, intestinal parasites, skin disease. (I.25)-(I.27)- Other Health Problems (last month) / Type (I.28) (I.29)
B.	<u>Everyone aged 5+:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Indigenous Language (I.30)- Literate (I.31)- Went to school in the past (I.32)- Currently school enrolled (I.33)→ Transport /Time/Which School (I.34)-(I.36)→ Missed School Days / Reason (I.37)-(I.38)- Highest School Degree (I.39)

C. Everyone aged 8+:

- Worked last week (& verification) (I.40)-(I.42)
- Firm size (I.43)
- Activity (I.44)
- Job Position (I.45)
- Labor Supply last week (days / hours per day) (I.46) (I.47)
- Monthly labor income (I.48)
- Transport / Time / Where (I.49)-(I.51)

D. Everyone aged 18+:

- Other income flows / Specific Sources / Amount (I.52)-(I.54)
- Loan / Who / Purpose / Amount (I.55)-(I.58)

II. Household level variables

Reference person reports information about

- The number of years she (if the RP is the household head) or her family (if the RP is not the household head) has been living in the dwelling (II.2) (II.3)
- Someone in the household receives some kind of government aid (II.4)
- Expectations about someone in the household leaving Acayucan for work-
ing/schooling reasons during the next 5 years (II.5) (II.6)
- Characteristics of the dwelling
 - Tenure status (II.7)
 - Property Title (II.8)
 - Material of the floor (II.9)
 - Material of the roof (II.10)
 - Material of the walls (II.11)
 - Number of rooms (II.12)
 - Water (II.13)
 - Sewerage System (II.14)
 - Bathroom (II.15)
 - Electricity (II.16)

- Flooding (II.17)
- Squared meters of the plot of the dwelling (II.18)
- Self-assessed price of the dwelling (II.19)
- Credit Access and Wealth Indicators
 - Bank account (II.20)
 - Credit card (II.21)
 - Assets (motor vehicles, motorcycle, refrigerator, etc.) (II.22)
- Materials bought in the last 6 months to make home improvements (II.23)
- Home improvements made in the last 6 months (II.24)
- Expectations about improvements in the next 2 years (II.25)
- Cooking fuel (II.26)
- Gas truck distribution (II.27)
- Trash disposal (II.28)
- Mobile good sellers (II.29)
- Water source (II.30)
- Location where food is bought (II.31)
- Livestock / Which kind / How many (II.32) (II.33)
- Public Safety
 - Walking during night (II.34)
 - Home break in (II.35)
 - Vehicle theft (II.37)
- Public Services
 - Bus (II.38)
 - Transport to downtown (II.39)
 - Taxi / Price (II.40) (II.41)
- Satisfaction regarding living in Acayucan / Why (II.42) (II.43)
- Average hours of sleep (II.44)
- Satisfaction with local government (II.45)
- Satisfaction with state government (II.46)

- Satisfaction with federal government (II.47)
 - Public service ranking of preferences (II.48)
 - Responsible for paving streets (II.49)
 - Monthly Household expenditure by item (food, rent, telephone, etc.) (II.50)
 - Monthly Total Household expenditure (II.51)
 - Business start / Type / Where (II.52)-(II.54)
 - Business improvement / How / Type / Where (II.55) (II.56)
-
-