Subjective Well-being among Internally Displaced Persons in Ukraine: family support, social mobility, and adaptation

Brienna Perelli-Harris, *University Of Southampton*

Jane Zavisca, *University of Arizona*

Nataliia Levchuk, *Ptoukha Institute for Demography and Social Sciences*

Theodore Gerber, *University of Wisconsin*

In 2014, war erupted in Eastern Ukraine, resulting in the largest internally displaced population in Europe. Over the next few years, around 1.5 million people left their homes and resettled throughout Ukraine. Despite being ethnically and culturally similar to the local population, IDPs encountered severe economic, housing, and societal challenges during resettlement, not to mention residual trauma from the violence. Given that the conflict is ongoing, many of the IDPs continue to face a situation of protracted displacement and uncertainty about whether they can return home. Using a unique survey conducted in 2018 and OLS regression methods, we investigate IDP's subjective well-being (SWB), which provides a way of gauging resilience and adaptation to their new situation. First, we compare IDPs to the local population and focus on factors attenuating any differences: family structure and separation, local support, economic situation, and housing. Second, we conduct an analysis solely on IDPs to better understand how SWB is related to the severity of the displacement (e.g. reasons for moving, relatives left behind), declines in social mobility (the experience of unemployment, lower occupational status, lower housing status), and barriers to integration (slow adaptation, only friends who are IDPs, intentions to return). Preliminary analyses indicate IDPs still have significantly worse life satisfaction than locals after controlling for a range of variables. Next steps will investigate how covariates differ between IDPs and locals, and which factors matter most for SWB. Taken together, these analyses will provide insights into variation and adaptation among this vulnerable population.

Remarkably few studies have been able to directly assess the impact of war and forced displacement on happiness (Frey 2011). Those that do have found that armed conflict and resettlement have a long-term impact on subjective well-being and mental health (Shemyakina and Plegnol 2013, Kijewski 2019). Studies from the refugee literature indicate that negative experiences impact mental health in both the short and long-term (Bogic et al 2015). Less is known, however, about the situation of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs), who are forced to migrate during conflict, but remain in their original country. On the one hand, IDPs do not cross international borders and often share a common nationality, language, and culture with the host population, potentially making it easier to adapt. On the other hand, IDPs face similar challenges to refugees, including residual trauma, lack of housing and support networks, and difficulties with integration (Mitchnek 2016). And even though there are more IDPs in the world than refugees, IDPs remain less visible, supported, and studied than refugees (Mitchneck et al 2016, Mitchnek 2016). Thus, investigating the subjective well-being of IDPs, especially the factors that explain variation and assimilation, is important for understanding how this vulnerable group copes and adapts to their new situation.

Here we examine the case of IDPs in Ukraine, who make up Europe's largest group of IDPs (Mitchneck et al 2016). Armed conflict broke out in Ukraine in the spring of 2014, starting with the annexation of Crimea and intensifying in the Donbass, the easternmost regions of the country. In 2015, Ukraine was the fourth largest producer of new IDPs in the world, with an estimated 1.7 million displaced to Ukraine-held territory and another 0.8 million displaced within separatist regions. Subsequently, some IDPs returned home, and in 2019, the Ukrainian government estimated that around 1.4 million IDPs live in the government controlled areas of Ukraine (Ministry of Social Policy). Thus, many IDPs are nearing a situation of protracted displacement (defined by UNHCR as five years), raising questions about integration into and strain on local communities. In addition, because the conflict is on-going, the situation for many is still uncertain, with many traveling back and forth between government and non-government controlled areas and not knowing what their future holds.

The situation of IDPs in Ukraine differs from many other areas facing internal conflict in that the Ukrainian government made a concerted decision not to build new collective housing settlements or camps to resettle the displaced, in hopes that settlement into existing housing stock would facilitate IDP social integration (Zavisca et al 2019). While international organizations such as UNICEF and IMO, as well as local volunteer charities, provided immediate assistance with housing and employment search, and the Ukrainian government allocated funds to assist IDPs with emergency rehousing and other basic needs, overall, the IDPs were required to fend for themselves. Unless they had relatives or other connections in the western Ukrainian-speaking regions, most IDPs remained in Russian-speaking areas bordering on the line of contact.

On the face of it, integration could have been considered relatively easy for IDPs in Ukraine, because they did not differ ethnically, nationally, or socioeconomically from the local population prior to displacement. However, previous studies have shown a stark difference between Ukrainian IDPs and the local population with respect to housing, living conditions, and a sense of being "at home" (Zavisca et al 2019). These disadvantages, along with the experience of trauma, separation from family members, loss of property, and decline in social status most likely resulted in lower life satisfaction than the local population.

To study the factors associated with life satisfaction among IDPs, we use a unique survey well-suited to comparing IDPs with the local population. Conducted in January- March 2018, the Comparative Housing Experiences and Societal Stability (CHESS) survey includes 3200 urban Ukrainians aged 18-49, including 1600 IDPs and 1600 locals. The survey focuses on issues related to

housing, but also asks about life satisfaction, family structure, and economic conditions. In a separate section, the survey asks IDPs a range of questions on motivations for leaving, social support, adaptation, and how different dimensions of life compare to five years previously. Using OLS methods, we apply two strategies to better understand variation in life satisfaction and adaptation to new conditions. First, we compare the IDP and local population to better understand which factors reduce differences between the two populations. Second, we investigate how the experience of displacement and subsequent social support influences life satisfaction. In both approaches, we control for factors known to be associated with subjective well-being, such as education, age, and gender. Each strategy provides insights into which IDPs are more likely to adapt to their new surroundings, and the coping mechanisms needed to adapt.

Data

As mentioned above, we use the Comparative Housing Experiences and Societal Stability (CHESS) survey which interviewed 1600 IDPs and 1600 locals aged 18-49, the prime working and reproductive ages. The 2018 CHESS survey sample is drawn from 12 urban settlements, which were selected purposively and are not nationally representative. Most settlements were selected within the four oblasts in which the vast majority of IDPs reside: Dnipopetrovsk, Kharkiv and Zaporizha oblasts, as well as the government-controlled area (GCA) of Donetsk oblast. In addition, we selected the cities of Kyiv and Lviv, the two largest cities in Ukraine that host sizeable IDP populations and are distant from the conflict zone. Within the four focal oblasts near the conflict zone, we selected settlements to ensure variation in type of place (oblast capital versus other city), distance from the line of contact between GCA and NGCA regions, and density of IDP populations as a proportion of local host population. We further restricted sampled sites to those where the survey institute was able to safely carry out fieldwork.

Given the difficulty of finding the hidden population of IDPs within the general population, our sampling framework could not be employed completely at random. Although the government maintains a register of IDPs, this register is not available for survey sampling. In addition, the International Monitoring Organization has found that a sizeable proportion of IDPs do not register and must be found through other methods. Thus, our IDP sample is not a probability sample, but a combination of IDPs encountered during the random walk used to recruit the local sample, referrals from the local sample (who were asked to provide contact information for IDPs who they knew who might be willing to participate in the survey), and purposive recruitment via organizations serving IDPs. The response rate for the random walk stage was 24.4%, and the response rate for the IDP sample is 38.2%. In addition, our IDP sample is comparable to the International Monitoring Survey with respect to gender (see Zavisca et al 2019 for a comparison between the two surveys). Because of our complex survey design, we cannot apply sampling weights to make our sample representative of the national population; nonetheless, our OLS regressions include control variables that would typically be included in sampling weights, with the aim of reducing the bias of our estimates.

Methods

In this paper, we use OLS regression techniques, with a measure of life satisfaction as the dependent variable. The question asked, "To what degree are you satisfied with your life on the whole?" with the following answers: Completely satisfied, Mostly satisfied, Yes and No, Mostly unsatisfied, Absolutely unsatisfied. Although the outcome variable is ordinal, we use OLS to facilitate interpretation; however, we will also test models with ordered logits to see if the results differ.

Part 1: **A comparison between IDPs and Locals**

In the first part of the paper, we will focus on the comparison of life satisfaction between IDPs and the general population. We will systematically evaluate different sets of factors that could be protective against low subjective well-being. Table 2 provides an overview of the variables that we will analyse.

Family structure and support. Prior studies show that *partnered* individuals have higher subjective well-being than unmarried or divorced individuals (e.g. Perelli-Harris et al 2019). During times of crisis, spouses may provide emotional and psychological support, as well as additional financial resources. *Children* may also contribute to a greater happiness, although some studies indicate that subjective well-being declines after having children, and during times of crisis, children could be an additional source of anxiety if parents worry about their safety and healthy development. The conflict also led to many *split households*, with IDPs leaving many close relatives behind in the Non-Government Controlled Area, and potentially placing an additional strain on individuals' well-being. Finally, not only household members but non-resident family and friends could be a source of *social support* during a period of upheaval. We examine if respondents know anyone in their current place of settlement, beyond those with whom they live, who would provide support in a number of situations, from asking advice to providing a place to stay. Perceived social support is a subset of social capital referring to tangible and information resources derived from individuals' interpersonal networks (Thoits 2011), which could differentially influence subjective well-being among IDPs and locals.

Economic status. Those who had to leave the Non-Government Controlled Area often experienced the loss of employment and a worsening of economic conditions. We examine a number of economic variables that could produce differences in SWB between IDPs and the locals. First, we examine whether *unemployment* contributes to the variance between IDPs and locals. According to the IOM monitoring survey conducted in 2018, 8% IDPs are unemployed, and controlling for this indicator may explain some of IDPs' unhappiness (IOM 2019). We then investigate *occupational status* and broad *income* categories, which may reflect social stratification, but also whether resources are available to help adapt to a new life. However, because prior studies have shown income measures to be unreliable in studies in the former Soviet Union, and due to high level of missing data in our own survey on income questions, we also examine an *indirect measure of living standards* to better approximate resources. Finally, we include a battery of questions on housing, including *home ownership, housing quality deprivation, and density/overcrowding*, all of which have been shown to be important to subjective wellbeing, particularly in this part of the world and among Ukrainian IDPs (Zavisca et al 2019; Clapham and Christian 2018).

Controls: We include basic controls previously found to be associated with life satisfaction, including age, gender, region, language, and education.

Part 2: In-depth analysis among IDPs

Our second analysis examines who among IDPs is more likely to have higher levels of subjective well-being, and what leads to the greatest resilience for those forced to start a new life. This analysis provides a general picture of the factors associated most closely with low levels of life satisfaction, and while we cannot directly compare the situation of IDPs before and after the conflict, simply examining associations within four years of the start of the conflict sheds light on the lingering effects of trauma and the role of resilience. Table 3 shows the variables to be included in the analyses.

Experience of Displacement. The survey asks questions that provide clues about how the displacement influenced current life satisfaction. One of the most important questions is the *motivation for moving*, which includes categories for fear of war, home was destroyed, poor opportunities for employment and education, and reunification with family. Related to this is the *date of move*. On the one hand, those who moved earlier would have had more time to adjust and adapt to a new situation. On the other hand, academics and NGOs agree that those who moved earlier, for example in 2014-15, were more likely to have fled violence and war, while those who moved more recently did so for economic reasons. Thus, the earlier group may have experienced traumatic events that continues to influence their satisfaction with life.

Support and Social Integration. As in the previous analysis, we hypothesize that those who *left close relatives behind* and are without *local support* are more likely to have lower subjective well-being. Additionally, we examine to what extent the IDPs have socially integrated, both by directly asking how easy it was for them to *adapt to their new situation*, and by asking about whether they have *friends who are not IDPs*. We expect that those with local friends are more likely to have assimilated and be happier. Finally, we ask about the IDPs' *intentions to return home* and whether they still have *property in the NGCA*. Both of these measures would suggest a lack of integration, which could be reflected in their levels of subjective well-being.

Experience of Downward mobility. Finally, we expect that not only unemployment and low income are associated with lower subjective well-being, but also declines in socio-economic status. We expect that people who once had stable employment, a decent standard of living, and a higher occupational status, but then experience a decline in social status would have lower life satisfaction. We use indicators of *occupational status* (ISCO codes) before (in 2013) and after the displacement (2018) to construct indicators of *downward social mobility.* We can also evaluate whether people who *lost possessions* – e.g. durable goods such as cars and electronics – have worse life satisfaction.

Perception of change. Finally, we have direct measures of whether IDP respondents perceived a decline in different dimensions of well-being, such as health, housing, etc. Although to some degree these measures are endogenous with SWB, they still provide a useful starting point for better understanding which aspects of well-being have suffered the most.

Controls: As in the prior analyses, we include basic controls previously found to be associated with life satisfaction, including age, gender, region, language, and education.

Preliminary results

As shown in table 1 and 2 below, IDPs in Ukraine have significantly lower subjective well-being than the local population. This association is maintained even after controlling for a range of variables (Table 4). However, the inclusion of various indicators of socio-economic status attenuates the association between IDP status and life satisfaction, suggesting that subsequent conditions after displacement may facilitate social integration and adjustment. Table 5 shows that the factors associated with SWB differ between IDPs and locals, although we need to test interaction terms to see if these associations are significantly different from each other. For example, housing and housing quality seem to more negatively affect SWB for IDPs compared to locals, possibly reflecting the IDPs loss of homes during the conflict.

Subsequent analyses will explore these relationships in greater depth and include interaction terms. In addition, we will explore the factors which bolster subjective well-being among IDPs, which will lead us to a better understanding of adaptation among this vulnerable group.

REFERENCES

Bogic, M., A. Njoku, and S. Priebe. 2015. "Long-term mental health of war-refugees: a systematic literature review." *BMC international health and human rights* 15(1):29.

Clapham, D., C. Foye, and J. Christian. 2018. "The concept of subjective well-being in housing research." *Housing, Theory and Society* 35(3):261-280.

Frey, B.S. 2011. "Peace, war and happiness: Bruder Klaus as wellbeing facilitator." *International Journal of Wellbeing* 1(2).

IOM. 2019. "National monitoring system report on the situation of internally displaced persons." edited by U.S.D.o.S.B.o.P. International Organization for Migration, Refugees, and Migration, Ministry of Social Policy of Ukraine.

Kijewski, S. 2019. "Life Satisfaction Sixty Years after World War II: the Lasting Impact of War Across Generations." *Applied Research in Quality of Life*:1-32.

Mitchneck, B. 2016. " "Inside Out: How to Help Internally Displaced Refugees."." *Foreign Affairs* https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/middle-east/2016-01.

Mitchneck, B., Jane Zavisca, and Theodore Gerberand . 2016. "Europe's Forgotten Refugees: The Humanitarian Crisis in Ukraine." *Foreign Affairs* https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/ukraine/2016-08-24/europes-forgotten-refugees-0(August).

Perelli-Harris, B., S. Hoherz, T. Lappegård, and A. Evans. 2019. "Mind the "Happiness" Gap: The Relationship Between Cohabitation, Marriage, and Subjective Well-being in the United Kingdom, Australia, Germany, and Norway." *Demography* 56(4):1219-1246.

Policy, M.o.S. 2019. "Number of registered IDPs." Ukraine.

Shemyakina, O.N.and A.C. Plagnol. 2013. "Subjective well-being and armed conflict: Evidence from Bosnia-Herzegovina." *Social Indicators Research* 113(3):1129-1152.

Thoits, P.A. 2011. "Mechanisms linking social ties and support to physical and mental health." *Journal of health and social behavior* 52(2):145-161.

Zavisca, J.R., Gerber, Ted P., and Suh, Hyungjun. 2019. "Housing Status in Post-Soviet Contexts: A Multi-Dimensional Approach." in *Working paper*.

Table 1. Percent and number of IDPs, mean subjective well-being, and confidence intervals, men and women aged 18-49

	percent (n)	mean (CI95%)
IDP	50% (1600)	2.97 (2.92,3.02)
Local	50% (1600)	3.52 (3.47,3.58)

1 - completely dissatisfied, 5 – completely satisfied

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for men and women by IDP status

	Men		Women	
	IDP	**Local**	**IDP**	**Local**
Subjective well-being (life satisfaction)	2.9	3.5	3.0	3.5
Mean/St. Dev.	2.87	3.3	3.01	3.4
Family structure and support				
Marital status, %				
married/cohabiting	57.5	55.5	56.9	64.4
separated/divorced/widowed	13.4	13.1	26.4	20.6
single	28.7	30.7	16.7	15.0
missing	0.4	0.8	0.1	0.0
Number of children, %				
no children	47.8	42.1	22.2	22.9
one	27.0	29.2	40.1	42.7
two or more	25.2	28.7	37.7	34.4
missing	0	0	0	0
Number of people could ask for help, %				
no person	31.7	14.4	26.8	12.5
one person	15.4	16.8	17.4	18.7
two or more	52.9	68.8	55.8	68.8
missing	0	0	0	0
Economic status				
Employment status, %				
employed	75.0	79.9	50.5	61.6
unemployed	8.1	9.0	10.2	5.9
other	16.1	10.7	38.1	32.2
missing	0.8	0.5	1.3	0.3
Standard of living, %				
cannot afford clothing	38.0	19.9	45.3	24.1
can afford food and clothing but not costly goods	49.8	44.7	44.3	46.6
can buy some costly goods but not a car or a new house	9.8	26.6	8.8	22.7
can buy a new car or a new house	1.4	6.3	0.5	3.5
missing	1.0	2.6	1.1	3.1
Income for previous month, hryvnia (*Only for employed, N=2042*)				
<3500	14.2	10.0	30.1	23.8
3500-6999	44.4	42.2	48.6	48.1
>7000	19.2	23.9	9.2	10.8
refusal or difficulty responding	22.3	23.9	11.6	17.4
Housing tenure, %				

own	9.3	91.0	8.2	89.8
private rental	58.9	5.9	61.3	6.6
other	27.8	2.3	26.3	2.6
missing	4.1	0.9	4.2	1.0
Housing deprivation Missing at least one of the three amenities: kitchen/toilet/bath or shower, %				
yes	34.8	3.5	30.0	2.7
no	64.8	96.2	69.8	97.0
missing	0.4	0.3	0.2	3.0
Having own room, %				
yes	68.7	90.4	68.4	85.7
no	30.5	8.7	31.0	13.6
missing	0.8	0.9	0.6	0.8
Total N	508	665	1092	935
%	31.8	41.6	68.2	58.4

Table 3. Descriptive statistics for IDPs

	Men	Women
Experience of Displacement		
Motivation for moving, %		
mostly fear of war and violence	54.7	69.1
mostly economic reasons	29.7	18.4
home destroyed	6.7	6.3
reunification with family	1.4	0.9
other	7.5	5.2
Date of move, %		
2014-2015	90.0	92.6
2016-2018	10.0	7.4
Close relatives in place of displacement, %		
having	53.2	55.1
not having	46.3	44.1
missing	0.5	0.8
Housing tenure in 2013, %		
yes	83.3	85.5
no	1.4	1.7
missing	15.3	12.8
Support and integration		
Adaptation since displacement, %		
quickly adapted	25.6	21.2
difficult at first, but then adapted	50.6	52.5
still difficult	21.7	24.9
missing	2.2	1.5
Circle of friends, %		
all or most are IDPs	19.7	24.5
all or most are locals	47.8	45.2
IDPs and locals in equal proportions	20.5	18.6
no friends	10.6	10.9
missing	1.4	0.8
Introduce self as IDP to locals, %		
introduce as IDP	13.8	10.5
do not emphasize it, but do not hide	68.1	72.6
try not to speak about it	16.1	13.2

missing	2.0	3.7

Intentions to return home, %		
willing to return home	36.6	39.1
unwilling to return home	36.0	35.5
difficult to say	25.4	24.5
missing	2.0	0.9

Experience of downward mobility: now (2018) vs. Dec. 2013		
Same or different job *(only for employed in 2013 and now, N=793)* **, %**		
same job	62.8	61.5
different job	34.2	34.4
missing	3.0	4.1
When work was better *(only for employed in 2013 and now, N=793)* **, %**		
better now	9.8	8.5
better before	63.7	65.4
no change	24.1	25.0
missing	2.4	1.1
Two variables combined *(only for employed in 2013 and now, N=793)*, %		
same job, better now	7.7	5.5
same job, better before	33.0	34.6
same job, no change	20.8	21.2
different job, better now	2.1	3.1
different job, better before	28.3	27.6
different job, no change	3.0	3.3
missing	5.1	4.8
When better: housing, health, circle of friends, %		
At least one domain is better now:		
yes	16.9	18.0
no	79.2	77.2
missing	3.9	4.8

Table 4. Determinants of subjective wellbeing (life satisfaction): IDPs and locals together, OLS regression

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
IDP status	-0.554*** (0.037)	-0.525*** (0.037)	-0.499*** (0.037)	-0.250*** (0.063)
Control variables				
Gender			-	
male		-0.053 (0.038)	0.074 (0.039)	-0.112** (0.040)
Age		-0.019*** (0.002)	-0.017*** (0.002)	-0.016*** (0.002)
Education high=ref.				
low		-0.173** (0.063)	-0.142*(0.063)	0.012 (0.065)
medium		-0.156*** (0.038)	-0.132**(0.038)	-0.032 (0.039)
Language Ukrainian=ref.				
Russian		-0.105 (0.061)	-0.079 (0.061)	-0.032 (0.060)
mix or both languages		-0.087 (0.065)	-0.088 (0.065)	-0.105 (0.065)
Family structure and support				
Marital status married/cohabiting =ref.				
separated/divorced/widowed			-0.204***(0.048)	-0.087 (0.048)
single			-0.049 (0.060)	0.011 (0.059)

Number of children				
no children =ref.				
one			-0.083 (0.054)	-0.035 (0.053)
two or more			-0.013 (0.057)	0.019 (0.056)
Number of people could ask for help				
no person=ref.				
one person			0.079 (0.059)	0.021 (0.059)
two or more			0.185*** (0.047)	0.031 (0.048)
Economic status				
Employment status				
unemployed=ref.				
employed				0.137* (0.067)
other				0.126 (0.072)
Standard of living				
cannot afford clothing=ref.				
can afford food and clothing but not costly goods				0.335*** (0.043)
can buy some costly goods but not a car or a new house				0.651*** (0.059)
can buy a new car or a new house				1.010*** (0.115)
Housing tenure				
own housing=ref.				
private rental				-0.096 (0.065)
other				0.116 (0.079)
Housing quality				
having all three amenities (kitchen/toilet/bath or shower) =ref.				
missing at least one of the three amenities			-	-0.235***(0.059)
Having own room				0.226***(0.048)
Intercept	3.524*** (0.026)	4.376*** (0.096)	4.215*** (0.118)	3.494*** (0.146)
R squared	0.068	0.099	0.111	0.179
N	3179	3168	3160	2995

Significance levels:*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p <0.001. Unstandardized coefficients reported with standard errors in parentheses.

Table 5. Determinants of subjective wellbeing (life satisfaction): by IDP status, OLS regression.

	IDP	Local
Control variables:		
Gender		
male	-0.101 (0.057)	-0.111*(0.055)
Age	-0.012***(0.003)	-0.017***(0.004)
Education		
high=ref.		
low	0.029 (0.089)	0.012 (0.093)
medium	0.071 (0.054)	-0.117*(0.055)
Language		
Ukrainian=ref.		
Russian	-0.178 (0.103)	0.083 (0.075)
mix or both languages	-0.015 (0.109)	-0.225**(0.082)
Family structure and support:		
Marital status		
married/cohabiting =ref.		
separated/divorced/widowed	-0.014 (0.065)	-0.157*(0.072)
single	0.131 (0.079)	-0.085 (0.090)
Number of children		

no children =ref.		
one	0.027 (0.070)	-0.085 (0.082)
two or more	0.026 (0.073)	0.049 (0.087)
Number of people could ask for help		
no person=ref.		
one person	-0.075 (0.076)	0.149 (0.093)
two or more	-0.051 (0.059)	0.123 (0.081)
Economic status		
Employment status		
unemployed=ref.		
employed	0.168 (0.088)	0.101 (0.102)
other	0.130 (0.093)	0.116 (0.113)
Standard of living		
cannot afford clothing=ref.		
can afford food and clothing but not costly goods	0.286***(0.054)	0.389***(0.068)
can buy some costly goods but not a car or a new house	0.683*** (0.096)	0.655***(0.080)
can buy a new car or a new house	0.726* (0.281)	1.078***(0.135)
Housing tenure		
own housing=ref.		
private rental	-0.260** (0.091)	0.095 (0.107)
other	-0.055 (0.104)	0.185 (0.170)
Housing quality		
having all three amenities (kitchen/toilet/bath or shower) =ref.		
missing at least one of the three amenities	-0.323*** (0.064)	0.148 (0.150)
Having own room	0.182** (0.058)	0.317***(0.083)
Intercept	3.350*** (0.218)	3.387***(0.214)
R squared	0.139	0.144
N	1484	1511