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Objectives of the Study

- Increase the developmental and poverty reduction role of migration
- Address where migration becomes obstacles to development and poverty reduction
Methodology

- **Quantitative** and **qualitative**
- **2 rounds** of data collection
- **Community and HH questionnaires** and **aide memoire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HH roster</th>
<th>Migration aspirations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>HH assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour and employment</td>
<td>HH living conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return migrants</td>
<td>HH income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current migrants</td>
<td>Food security and poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration information</td>
<td>Financial services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration finance</td>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sampling – quantitative

- **Random sampling** with support of the Department of Population
- Findings are **representative** of rural HHs in case of Mandalay and Ayeyarwady, not in Rakhine and Shan
- Same HHs are **surveyed twice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/region</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>1st approved</th>
<th>1st actual</th>
<th>2nd approved</th>
<th>2nd actual</th>
<th>HHs covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>HH</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>HH</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>HH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandalay</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayeyarwardy</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shan</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>617*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakhine</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>172</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,440</strong></td>
<td><strong>141</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,820</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,836</strong>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Included HHs in towns. Total rural HHs is 2,819.
Sampling - qualitative

- Migrant sending households and their migrating family members identified through quantitative survey
- HHs/migrants were interviewed once

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/region</th>
<th>1st round</th>
<th>2nd round</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandalay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayeyarwady</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakhine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yangon (Destination)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandalay (Destination)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tachileik (Destination)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Snapshot of migration

**Mandalay**
- HHs with migrants: 36%
- Internal-international ratio: 79:21
  - M-F ratio (internal): 57:43
  - M-F ratio (international): 81:19

**Rakhine**
- HHs with migrants: 26%
- Internal-international ratio: 51:49
  - M-F ratio (internal): 52:48
  - M-F ratio (international): 83:17

**Limited areas S&E Shan**
- HHs with migrants: 21%
- Internal-international ratio: 86:14
  - M-F ratio (internal): 43:57
  - M-F ratio (international): 35:65

**Ayeyarwady**
- HHs with migrants: 19%
- Internal-international ratio: 89:11
  - M-F ratio (internal): 47:53
  - M-F ratio (international): 73:27
### Percentage of economically active migrants who send remittances in the last 12 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Region/State of Origin</th>
<th>Ayeyarwady</th>
<th>Mandalay</th>
<th>Rakhine</th>
<th>Limited areas S&amp;E Shan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ayeyarwady</td>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandalay</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakhine</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shan</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yangon</td>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kachin</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### International destinations of migrants by region/state of origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region/Site of Origin</th>
<th>Ayeyarwady</th>
<th>Mandalay</th>
<th>Rakhine</th>
<th>Limited areas S&amp;E Shan</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>108</strong></td>
<td><strong>147</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>297</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employment types of migrants at destination who used to be in irregular employment prior to migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ayeyarwady</th>
<th>Mandalay</th>
<th>Rakhine</th>
<th>Limited areas S&amp;E Shan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular employment</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular employment</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factors influencing the decisions on the migration destinations (multiple answers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>factor</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Internal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had friends in destination</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had families/relatives in destination</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brokers/RAs were able to arrange migration</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident to get work at destination</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work wa arranged prior to migration</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest income option</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination was close to home</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of migration was low</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage of economically active migrants who send remittances in the last 12 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mandalay</th>
<th>Rakhine</th>
<th>S&amp;E Shan Selected areas</th>
<th>Ayeyarwady</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>