YANGON UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS
MASTER OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES PROGRAM

A STUDY ON THE EFFECT OF MIGRATION ON
SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF MIGRANTS' HOUSEHOLDS
(A Case Study: Selected Villages in Myebon Township at Rakhine State)

SU HTET WAI
MDevS – 17 (14th BATCH)

MAY, 2019

YANGON UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS

MASTER OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES PROGRAMME

A STUDY ON THE EFFECT OF LABOUR MIGRATION ON SOCIO-ECONOMICS STATUS OF MIGRANTS' HOUSEHOLDS

(Case Study: Selected Villages in Myebon Township at Rakhine State)

A thesis submitted as a partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Development Studies (MDevS)

Supervised by

Submitted by

Daw Mie Mie Soe

Su Htet Wai

Lecture

Roll No. 17

Department of Economics

MDevS – 14th Batch

Yangon University of Economics

(2017- 2019)

August, 2019

ABSTRACT

Myanmar has grown to be the largest migration source country it is an important of rural people and poverty and illegal migration but also migration effect on migrants' households economically and socially. This study aimed to examine the condition of the migrants' households and to analyze the effect of labour migration on socio-economic status of migrant sending households after migration. The study used was descriptive method based on primary data and using conducted interview. It is found that the main reason of the household decided to migrate because of the poverty in these villages and receiving high income in abroad, but the land provide very low return and the rest of others are landless and odd job wages. That are the major factors contributed to the migration and the villagers went to change better job opportunities in abroad. It provide for meeting basic needs for the poor and then access to invest on small scale economic activities but there is many adverse effect of migration on families as well as community due to migration.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Professor Dr. Tin Win, Rector of Yangon University of Economics and Professor Dr. Ni Lar Myint Htoo, Pro-Rector of Yangon University of Economics for their permission to attend Master of Development Studies Programme.

I am also grateful to Professor Dr. Cho Cho Thein, Programme Director and Head of Department of Development Studies, Yangon University of Economics and all the teachers of Master of Development Studies Programme for their guidance and encouragement.

In addition, I express my warm thanks to my supervisor Daw Mie Mie Soe, Lecturer, Department of Economics, Yangon University of Economics for her continuous support for my study, for her guidance and constructive suggestions and encouragement.

I have to thank broad examiners taking their time out to talk to me and gave their guidance about my thesis. And I deeply thank to all the professors, lecturers and all other teachers who   have provided their greatest effort in teaching subjects during the study time.

Especially, my warmest thanks to U Than Shwe (GS), Myebon, U Thet Soe Aung (staff office, MOP), Myebon and also village authority from selected villages, and villagers who provide reliable assistance for smoothness to field trip while it met in abnormal situation in Rakhine for the time being, and then village resource persons, U Than Hlaing, U Kyaw Kyaw Win, U Myo Thein, U Mg Than, who are community funded teachers from respective villages, for their valuable assistance on the field trip and also, my best friends, Mg Khant Win, and Ma Khin Thuzar Aye, who are excellent facilitators for their clever facilitation for conducting effective interviews, focus group discussion with migrants households, and I grateful to the migrants' households, with whom I stayed for field days, for their hospitality and their interest for in depth discussion as well as patiently cooperated in filling up the questionnaires and answering the queries.

Sample output to test PDF Combine only

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADB	Asia Development Bank
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asia
CSO	Civil Society Organization
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GCC	Gulf Cooperation Council
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GMS	Greater Mekong Subregion
GS	Greenlives Society
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ILO	International Labour Organization
IOM	International Organization for Migration
LIFT	Livelihoods and Food Security Fund
MOLIP	Ministry of Labour, Immigration and Population
MOP	Ministry of Planning
MOP	Ministry of Population
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NPA	National Plan of Action
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
UNDESA	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
UNDP	United Nations Development Councils

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

1.1   Rationale of the Study

Migration is a natural process and practice of humankind. It is an important factor in the advancement of progressive livelihood and overall development of the society. People migrate from one area to other for their self-need and to protect their existence since the ancients period. It is such a process, in which leaving permanent area people shift another place for long time.

Migration has occurred for better opportunity and for better job. The rate of migration is increasing gradually all over the world. In developing countries, people migrate from one place to another areas due to facilities of employment and to fulfill the subsistence need. Rural poor consider migration as a process to be free from the vicious cycle of poverty. Various push and pull factors are responsible for migration. 'Push' factors are associated with a range of limitations and difficulties by which people migrate for their better livelihood. In aspect of 'push' factors, poverty, unemployment, law level of livelihood, discrimination by politics and religion individual development of particular party and lack of employment etc. are important. In addition, employment facilities in new area, possibilities of economic structure, standard livelihood and standard geographical condition of migrated areas are considered as important 'pull' factors.

Myanmar is the second largest country in Southeast Asia and rich in natural resources including arable land, forests, minerals, natural gas, and fresh water and marine resources. However, longstanding conflicts and decades of martial law and rule has set back the development of this once prosperous Southeast Asian country. Majority of the rural population in Myanmar is dependent on farm incomes which are low and seasonal in nature. Thus, Myanmar has very mobility of people within the country boundaries for labour purpose. Furthermore, Myanmar is one of the migrants sending countries in Southeast Asia, and the estimated numbers of Myanmar workers working outside of the country in 2018 was 2,021,919 as of Ministry of Population (MOP). As several thousands of Myanmar workers are working outside of the

country, welfare and protection of workers and families should not be overlooked. International labour migration more than 2 million Myanmar citizens migrated abroad. 70.2 percent of all migrants were in Thailand, and a smaller number was working in Malaysia, China and Singapore. Other countries of destination include Republic of Korea, Japan, and the GCC countries (ILO 2019).

The bulk of the Rakhine economy is made up of farmers, fishermen and wages in the agricultural sector are low. Landleness is more common in Rakhine that other part of the country especially in the northern part of the state where 60 percent of household are landless. The poor farmer could not stand to survive their farm because of low return from their farm and also most of the farm labour are in subsistence level and low wages from farming cannot cover for the whole families. But, 85 percent of agricultural land under cultivation used for rice puddy cultivation. It is estimated that a farmer in Rakhine can earn up to MMK 200,000 annually from one acre of puddy. This return is insufficient for a family to survive. In Rakhine State, 43.2 percent are skilled agricultural forestry and fishery workers and 15.7 percent are elementary occupations (National Census, 2014). Seasonal and temporary labour migration to other villages or towns within the State (mostly rural-rural) is also a common phenomenon in Rakhine State. While some people migrate abroad with a passport and valid visa, the majority of migrants from Rakhine State do so irregularly and are as such vulnerable to human trafficking and exploitation. The driver of irregular migration from Rakhine State, where significant numbers from all communities have left, are not unique. Approximately, 115,502 Rakhine household members were living abroad of the which 94,000 were men. Of the total of Rakhine migrants, over 74,000 of them were in Thailand and over 28,000 in Malaysia (National Census, 2014).

Migration including rural-urban migration is more and more seen as a very important factor of poverty reduction of rural areas in developing countries. The earnings can be used for investment in farm and non-farm activities (for education and health) and even increased consumption may also create employment opportunities.

Therefore, it is important to study the effect of migration on left-behind families of Myanmar migrant workers from rural areas specifically in Myebon Township in Rakhine State of Myanmar. By knowing the effect of migration on socio-economic status in rural areas, it is ready to make policy to reduce poverty and improvement of rural livelihood. By using the information before and after migration,

this study aim to examine the socio-economic status that households experience after migration. The majority of the households in the village are migrant sending households and the main source of income for the families is remittance from the migrants in abroad.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

The main objectives of the study are to examine the condition of migrant's household in Myebon Townships in Rakhine State and to identify the effect of labour migration on socio-economic status of migrants' households in Myebon Township, Rakhine State.

1.3 Method of Study

This study is mainly based on descriptive method by using primary data and some secondary data. All of field survey in four selected villages of Myebon Township, Rakhine State. The primary data are gained from field survey with semi-structured questionnaires towards migrant. The major sources of some secondary data are from department of planning, department of immigration, previous research paper and internet website.

1.4 Scope and Limitation of the Study

This thesis is focus on the effect of migration on socio-economics status of migrants' households in Myebon Township. The Survey is completed with questionnaires for 200 respondents of migrants' households from selected villages were selected with sampling using face to face interview. The survey period is from April to May in 2019.

1.5 Organization of the Study

It consists five chapters. The first chapter is an introduction, begins with rationale of the study, methods of the study, objective of the study, method of study, scope and limitation of the study and organization of the study. The second chapter is literature review. The chapter three mentions labour migration in Myanmar context. The fourth chapter is formed by a case study on analysis on survey data. The final chapter consists of findings and suggestions.

CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1   Historical Perspective on Migration

Migration has become an internal part of the current global economy. Both internal and international migration can have major development and poverty implications for individuals and their families, for origin and destination areas, as well as for national economies.

International migration occurs when people cross state boundaries and stay in the host state for some minimum length of time. Migration occurs for many reasons. Many people leave their home countries in order to look for economic opportunities in another country. Others migrate to be with family members who have migrated or because of political conditions in their countries. Education is another reason for international migration, as students purse their studies abroad. While there are several different potential systems for categorizing international migrants, one system organizes them into nine groups: temporary labour migrants; irregular, illegal, or undocumented migrants; highly skilled and business migrants; refugees; asylum seekers; forced migration; family members; return migrants; and long-term, low-skilled migrants. These migrants can also be divided into two large groups, permanent and temporary. Permanent migrants intend to establish their permanent residence in a new country and possibly obtain that country's citizenship. Temporary migrants intend only to stay for a limited periods of time; perhaps until the end of a particular program of the study or for the duration of a their work contract or a certain work reason. Both types of migrants have a significant effect on the economies and societies of the chosen destination country and the country of the origin.

Similarly, the countries which receive these migrants are often grouped into four categories: traditional settlement countries, European countries which encouraged labour migration after World War II, European countries which receive a significant portion of their immigrant populations from their former colonies, and countries which formerly were points of emigration but have recently emerged as immigrant destinations.

On a prior grounds one may distinguish four possible forms of migration among premodern population: radical displacement of one population by another as a result of systematic exercise of force; conquest of one population by another, leading to symbiosis of two previously diverse communities on the same ground; infiltration by outsiders with some degree of acquiescence form existing populations and without displacing existing rulers; importations of individuals or even of whole their initial place of residence by slave raiders and/or traders (Willian H McNell, 1984). The most spectacular exodus was that more than 700,000 Irish people had arrived on the British mainland by 1861, over 200,000 went to Canada, and 389,000 left for Australia. But the bulk of the migrants found their way to the United State – more than 3 million in all between 1848 and 1921(Prof: Sir Richard Evans FBA, 2017).

The nineteenth century witnessed a rapid expension in migration across Asia. In the century after 1840, around 20 million people from China and 30 million Indians moved to the growing cities and plantations of Southeast Asia (Sunil S Amrith, 2014). By the early nineteenth century Southeast Asia had emerged as a significant hub for the temporary migration of labour – both on an intra-regional and international scale (Chris Manning, Pradip Bhatnager, 2006).

Since the 1980s, Southeast Asia has re-emerged as a major player in global migration movements and the scale, diversity and significance of migration flows has grown exponentially. The people who now cross international borders move mainly for economic reasons, or are forced to move for a variety of reasons, including displacement by wars. In the main Southeast Asia destination countries such as Singapore, Malaysia and Thailand, foreign workers comprise between 15-30 percent of the labour force and their share is rising. Contemporary flows also comprise illegal movements and Southeast Asian states are striving to control their frontiers through evolving border strategies.

Demographic and economic factors including declining fertility rates, a growing shortage of workers to fill jobs requiring high and lows skills and a drive to remain competitive have led to selective immigration frameworks for different economic sectors. Migration goals of destination countries have also changed and coincide with national policies that underline the race, geographical origins, gender, skills and educational qualifications of migrants.

Importantly, the previous from settlement migration has been replaced by rotating, temporary contract labour systems. The new migration dynamics are

supported by a web of social networks and a migration industry comprising officially sanctioned recruitment agencies and entrepreneurs providing all sorts of services to migrant workers in exchange for fees.

A useful starting point for understanding economics change and labour migration associated with export production in Southeast Asia is to examine the region's demographic structure and to identify some of the most important production niches that led to labour immigration. Broadly, Southeast Asia had a markedly low population growth relative to the expanse of its cultivable area. Around 1870, population was estimated at about 55 million and rose to about 69 million in 1900. Moreover, it is estimated that the region had an average annual growth rate of approximately 1.3 percent between 1870 and 1930. With the exception of Java and Tonkin, populations were sparse, and labour, rather than land, was the principal source of value in Southeast Asian states. The population was also distributed very unevenly and population densities were relatively low. Form a comparative perspective, therefore, the broad division of the region into 'labour-scarce' and 'labour-surplus' countries had important implications for migrant labour flows. There were extremes to this polarity- Malaya and Java. In sparsely populated Malaya, landlessness and rural deprivation among the Malays was practically non-existent and they largely shunned wage work during the colonial period. In comparison, Java had a huge, poor population and non-farm employment was crucial for survival strategies. Javanese workers shifted or moved around during the colonial period to eke out a living. Thus, Java has been a labour exporter since colonial times and Malaya/ Malaysia a labour importer. Using this framework, the other Southeast Asian countries fit somewhere in a continuum between the two. After 1870 the great expansion in plantation production took place in the lightly settled areas of Malaya, Sumatra and Cochin-china. Concurrently, rice expansion occurred in the frontier areas of Myanmar, Thailand and Cochin-china.

By the 1920, the region was mainly exporting agricultural staples such as rice and rubber and there was mainly exporting agricultural staples such as mineral production. The region's demographic structure, therefore, had the destination of migrant workers. Importantly, the concentration of migrant workers in specific sectors and countries, and their racial origin, must thus also be viewed through this lens.

By about the 1970s, following the various problems of decolonization and post-war readjustment in Southeast Asia, there had emerged two broad groups of countries

6

in the region. There were those that under Communist or Socialist regimes withdrew from the international economy to a large extent. These included Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, whose trading relations were concentrated on Eastern-Bloc countries, and Myanmar, which remained politically neutral and became economically isolated. This group of countries experienced economics stagnation and continued to have per capita incomes among the lowest in the world. The other countries, Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, Philippines and Indonesia maintained open economies and achieved sustained levels of high economic growth based on export led development strategies. These newly-industrializing countries (NICs) also formed the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), with Brunei joining later, to promote common political interests. Although the subsequent Asian economic and financial crisis of 1997-98 resulted in an economic downturn from which the first three have since recovered, Indonesia has not yet established a firm platform for recovery, while the Philippines grapples with political and security problems. The other Southeast Asian states have also have also embraced trade liberalization and export -led growth strategies and joined ASEAN (Kaur, 2004).

2.2 Poverty and Migration

Migration is a complex phenomenon occurring over a wide variety of spatial and temporal contents and for various seasons (material and non-material). Economic theorists view migration as a choice of people who wish to improve their economic condition. Early migration theories focused on poverty of places rather than people. This was symptomatic of thinking at the time which saw poverty reduction to be synonymous with national development and GDP growth. Development was posed as a problem of structural transformation of the rural backward sector into the urban modern sector (Lewis 1954). Probably the most important theoretical starting point for migration theories is built on this idea: Harris – Tadaro model (Tadaro 1969, Harris and Tadaro 1970). In this, a prospective migrant weights the difference between the expected earnings from formal sector urban employment, and the expected earnings in the village.

Migration is seen as a form of income and asset diversification by families, with families investing in migrants, migrants in families, and both expecting returns from that. Economic models using this line of theory have been of two types (de la Briere et al. 1997). One types focuses on implicit insurance contracts between the

7

migrant and the household left behind to cope with household risk, and shows the role of remittance as a form of portfolio diversification. A second type builds on literature around bequest motives, and sees remittances as investments in household assets that the migrant will later inherit, supported by analyses of different remittance behaviours between men and women (caused by gender-differentiated inheritance rules).

Marxist perspectives offer a long-tradition of analyzing links between migration on the one hand, and poverty and development on the other, mostly in terms of post- colonialism, apartheid, and uneven capitalist development. Partly in the context of urbanization and debates on the informal sector, but also with its focus on migrant workers within rural areas, this tradition explicitly challenged the individualistic assumptions underlying models like Todaro's, and have described migration as an inalienable part of transition toward or development of capitalism. With respect to international migration too, this tradition has emphasized the exploitation of migrant workers, as beneficial to capital and richer nations, at the cost of labour and poorer nations and regions. Moreover, similar to neoclassical approaches to migration, Marxist models focus exclusively on economic factors. Migration processes can be understood adequately only as the outcome of interaction of a diversity of factors, including social-cultural and economic forces, and gendered and childhood norms and rules- and how migration in turn alters these factors.

The rational choice framework in labour migration theories suggests individuals with better education, skills and labour market experience are more likely to migrate because of their greater ability to capture its rewards (Waddington and Sabates-Wheeler, 2003). The poorest are assumed to be selected out of migration because they cannot afford it, and because, their lower human capital implies lower expected rewards. The "new economics of migration" suggests the poorest do not have access to migration opportunities because of their lower capacity for risk-taking, and literature on kinship networks in migration suggests the poorest lack social capital that facilities migration.

While international migration to the global North captures most of the policy attention, migration within countries, and to countries in the South probably are more relevant for poverty reduction, and are likely to involve much larger numbers of children. First, middle-income countries attract migrants from nearby low-income countries (Hujo and Piper 2007). Migration costs to developing country destinations are lower and therefore more widely affordable. Cross-border migration in zones with

8

particularly porous borders and historical-cultural similarities, such as Nepal-Bangladesh-India, or across much of West Africa, may present even lower barriers for poorer people. Second, the scale of internal migration is many multiples of international migration, and participation in it is probably more widespread throughout the income distribution. For example, remittances from internal migration is estimated to be around $ 30-40 billion in China alone, compared to international remittance of around $ 200 billion worldwide (DfID 2007). In China, while remittances and investments of Chinese abroad have greatly contributed to its economic development, the internal migration of perhaps 200 million people has been one of the key factors in its impressive record of poverty reduction.

International migration studies and internal migration studies tend to be divorced fields of enquiry involving different researchers and concerns (DeWind and Holdaway 2008, 2005), and this may make it harder to capture the poorest migrants in research. The same disconnect, though to a lesser extent, can be noted for research on migration into Northern countries versus South-South migration; and also cleavages between research on rural-urban migration, and that which focuses on diverse patterns of internal migration. This is not to deny that very different issues are raised by the different fields of enquiry; however from the view of a poor household, these may simply be alternative forms of movement. Which type of migration a poor household undertakes depends on household strategies and opportunities, which themselves are partly conditional on the situation of poverty.

The theoretical diversity and the structuring of fields of study, may to a great extent explain the persistence of diverging views on how migration links to poverty, between those who see migration as a key poverty reduction strategy, and those who argue no clear empirical links can be established (de Haan 2006). The different intellectual traditions also have strongly influenced ideologies and perceptions around migration policy. The theoretical diversity has shaped empirical research, and the following section discusses what it is we do know about between migration and poverty.

2.3   Migration and Remittance

Levels of remittance vary widely, depending on various factors as accessibility of the home village, employment opportunities, costs of living, ease of remitting, and the orientation of the migrant. Evaluation of the impact of remittances has shifted

9

since the 1970s, when there was much stress on the conspicuous consumption of migrants and their relative, toward more positive views, focusing, for example, upon the conditions needed to secure the investment of remittances, and at least internationally, the emphasis in reducing transactions costs of sending remittances and how the scale of remittances far exceeds official aid.

Assessment of the way remittances are used also shows diversity, and can be modelled in different ways. There is no doubt that remittances can have negative and positive consequences- evidence suggests that the way remittances are used depends on the form of migration, the characteristics of the migrants and those who stay behind, and conditions for use of remittances and returning migrants. This points to one of the complexities of understanding the impact of migration: the conditions that make remittances be helpful for development or poverty reduction are generally the same conditions that made migrants leave in the first place. Assessment of impact need to be sensitive to the complexity in which this is embedded. First, they need to take account of the fact that this counts only successful migration, and there is a possibility that many migrants have not remitted despite having invested heavily. Second, data on remittance need to take account of reverse flows, of initial investment, but also for example of transfer of food from villages of origin to cities. Third, from a home country public policy perspective remittances need to be off-set against the (public) investment in education and other forms of publicly funded investments.

Migration has to have an impact on inequality between sending and receiving areas, and ought to reduce overall income inequality. However, assessments of this, too are very varied, and are very dependent on unit and indicators of analysis. For example, the multi-donor research programme "Operationalizing Pro-Poor Growth" highlighted a key dilemma in assessing migration: while it generally helps to reduce poverty and increase income of the poor, migration and remittance also can lead to increased inequality within countries. A similar theme was highlighted in Indian Village Studies project in the 1970s, which showed that rural-urban migration did not tend to equalize incomes, between or within regions. Islam's (1991) analysis of effects of migration to the Gulf from villages in Chittagong in Bangladesh shows some of possible negative effects: land became concentrated in the hand of migrant families, who turned into non-farmers, which contributed to a decrease in production.

Land prices went up, and so did the cost of labour, through not so high as to lead to labour saving in agriculture.

Of course, labour market opportunities are key drivers of these dynamics: where large numbers opportunities for unskilled labour exist, as in China and Vietnam, migration is of course more likely to reduce poverty, and less likely to increase inequality within villages of origin. Some forms of migration lead to equalizing income within regions, though not necessarily between sending and receiving regions. In some cases migration increases income inequality, in some cases lowers it, and this relationship may change over time. The unit of analysis matters, too, as increased male income does not necessarily translate into increased well-being of women or children. While in some cases migration and remittances have led to development, in other cases it has not. A key issue appears to be not migration itself but the condition under which people leave and conditions for development generally which determine the impact of migration.

2.4   Migration and Rural Development

The largest part of the households in African countries is for their livelihood sources still dependent on agricultural activities. For instance, at the start of the 21st century more than 75 percent of the labour forces in the Sub-Saharan countries were still employed in the agricultural sectors (IFAD, 2008). However, is an increasing number of places, rural livelihoods are becoming less and less dependent on only one activity, like agricultural farming. This is partially the result of the appearance of rural based alternative employment and income opportunities (Stifel, 2010).

In general, employment in the agricultural sector of developing countries is decreasing. In the last decennia, there appeared many academic studies that confirm this in rural areas. This includes for instance the industrialization of rural areas in the Philippines as a result of the development of metal craft industries (Salayo, 2011). Another example is a study of Tacoli (2005), which investigates substantial livelihood diversification in the form of artificial fruit and flower production in Vietnams Red River Delta. Many rural regions are affected by a process of so-called de-agrarianization, resulting in an increasing group of young labour forces searching for non-farm occupations and pushed by the low rural wage rates and agricultural constraints. More and more people in rural areas diversity their livelihood and reduce risks by working in non-farm activities in or outside their place of living. Literature

11

shows that especially in rural Africa, non- farm income source account for a considerable in the world (Tacoli, 2002). There seems to exist positive relations between non-farm household income and household welfare indicators in the most rural regions of Africa (Barret et al, 2011).

When rural people seek to diversity their income sources and occupations they often go quickly in temporary or long term migration. Several recent studies show that remittances as a result of migration are increasingly important for sending areas and have surpassed farming as the major income source for rural household (Willis, 2010).

There is also nowadays no agreement on the impact of migration for rural development. In general, there can be distinguished two contrasting views. The first view considers migration processes as mainly positive for the sending households, but also for whole communities, regions and even countries. Supporters of this vision support policies aimed at the strengthening of financial, social and economic relationship between migrant and their areas of origin, because they consider migration as a household strategy resulting in economic and social and economic and social flows and networks. They highlight the constructive impact of the resources flows from migrant to the sending areas, likely money transfer, in kind remittances and innovative technique and ideas. These resource transfers result in improvement of the livelihoods of rural households and are in some cases used for investments in non-agricultural activities, which in turn lead to a higher employment rates (Heilman, 2006/ de Haas, 2007). In contrast, supporters of the second views focus on the negative effects of migration for both sending and destination areas. They supporter policies that stimulate economic development in rural areas in order to restricts migration processes (Deshingkar & Grimm, 2005). They emphasize the disturbing effects of the departure of labour forces from rural areas and over loading impact on the urban sector in terms of the increasing employment rates, booming informal sectors and growing poverty (de Hass, 2007). However, both views do not reflect reality, which is more complex. There is a variety of factors that influence the extent in which migration has negative or positive impact on sending areas. The effect of migration for instance are dependent on the duration of the migration, the local context and the amount of remittances (IFAD, 2008).

Most of recent studies on the impact of migration are in line with the discussed livelihood approach and New Economics of Labour Model. They consider

12

migration as a strategic household response to scarcity and poverty conditions, in order to reduce vulnerability and increase income and investment opportunities. Remittance flows play a central role in these studies and are mainly seen as a poverty-alleviating strategy (de Haas, 2007).

2.5 Effects of Migration

Migration is a way to move from their home to another city. With respect to international migration and receiving countries, the consensus seems that immigration has improved economic welfare, including raising tax revenue – given restrictive immigration policies this is unsurprising as receiving countries allow mainly people with skills for which there is an excess demand in the labour market. At aggregate levels, seems to contradict the popular belief that immigration contributes to unemployment, or substantial decrease in wages in host societies, through there is of course micro-evidence that employers can attract migrants to reduce wages and bargaining powers of local workers.

The literature review concludes that migration and remittance modernize the rural sector, both directly and indirectly, through their impact on the production-increasing technological and institution changes in the agricultural sector (Lakshmanasamy's, 1990). Nevertheless, the positive impacts are contingent, and depend on many factors like seasonality of movement, educational levels, length of time spent away, assets and social structures and institutions allowing women and others to pursue activities previously reserved for men and household heads.

For decades, there has been a particular concern about "brain drain". Relevant for the direct impact on poverty, international migration has become increasingly selective, which implies that there may be fewer opportunities for poor people to benefit than in the 19th century. Detrimental effects of the selectively of migration include increased international inequality, particularly if migrants are disconnected from those left-behind. Beneficial effects include remittances, return migration, creation of trade and business networks, and incentive effects on human capital formation at home. Cross-country analysis indicates limited evidence that return migration is significant among high skilled (Docquier and Rapoport 2004), or that they contribute to technology diffusion. (Docquier and Rapoport, 2004) find positive benefits of prospect of migration on human capital formation and GDP growth-leading to a conclusion that "brain drain should not induce developing countries to

13

reduce education expenditures". But they find effects are different for different countries.

Also, the duration of the migration has significant influence on sending migrant areas, particularly in terms of employment. Long-term migration to urban areas or other countries generally means that migrants not frequently return to their original place of living. This type of migrants especially causes labour shortages, resulting in the destabilizing of the traditional household and farming structures (Tacoli, 2002). In several rural regions, migration of young people has resulted in an increase in the mean age of labour forces. This aging has a negative impact on agricultural production and revenues. Furthermore, another consequence of migration is the loss of well-educated and highly- skilled people. However, there is still no agreement on the impact of this 'brain drain' on rural development, because there is a lack of scientific evidence. The negative effects of the loss of human resources can be compensated by a later return of the more skilled migrant or by structural investments in the destination areas.

Most analysis of migration is very temporary, focusing on the top of the migration hump. Impacts, however, can be long-term, and fortunes can reverse. There is some literature on the effects of this. On the one hand, areas of origin function as a safety valve, as seen in Indonesia during 1997 and many transition countries (Romania, Georghiu et al. 2004). Other assessments, for example on the effect of changing South African policies on migrant communities in Lesotho, Malawi, and Swaziland are less positive. Leliveld (1997) describes the effects of declining migration on households in rural Swaziland: employment possibilities in Swaziland are limited, and relatively young households, with few working members, and a weak economic position are among the most vulnerable in this context. Also, there is a considerable literature on the negative effects of sudden barriers to international migration, such as during the Gulf War which had an enormous impact on sending countries.

2.6   Review of Previous Studies

Phnom Penh (2016) studied on migration and socio-economic condition in left-behind households in rural areas in Cambodia. This study aims to describe the familial structure of migrants' households in rural Cambodia and to investigate the association between the household structure and the socio-economic conditions of the

household. Particular attention is paid to households containing one or more children of the migrant and/or one or more older parent of the migrant. The survey analyzed the crump data from rural Cambodia, which consists of 4,500 households, 2,875 of which experienced the recent out-migration of a former household member. This out-migration defines a migrant household at the time of the interview are considered to be the left-behind population of the household.

Chantavanich and Vungsiriphisal (2012) studied on Myanmar Migrants to Thailand: Economic Analysis and Implications to Myanmar Development. The study found that the average remittance amount was just about $180 US per year with 77% of the remittances sent used by the receiving households for daily consumption and basic needs. However, there was some evidence in this survey that the methods of sending remittances was slowly shifting towards more formal methods. This survey found that 20% of remittance were sent via bank accounts, a greater fraction than observed in any previous study. The formal method still dominated, but the use of banks appeared to be increasing. The authors note that registered migrants abroad were the most likely to use formal methods to send remittances to Myanmar; they attribute this to the fact these immigrants were the ones most likely to already have a working bank account where they would be paid by their Thai employers. Therefore, the registration and legalization of work for Myanmar immigrants abroad in all likelihood facilitated the opening of bank accounts and the use of more formal channels for remitting.

Another survey conducted by Kyaw Zin Oo (EMPA-2017) studied that the effect of migrants remittance on living conditions of rural areas in Mon State. Many people migrate internally and externally as they want to improve their livelihoods to follow their family member, for marriage, for education or to avoid poor socio-economic conditions. Mostly, the income and education level of households with migrant workers are highly than others. In Myanmar, this migration flows exist to a very large extent where migration workers, local or foreign, have been sending back remittances for their families back home and where the living standard of these family members have improved.

Khin Soe Soe Moe (EMDevS-2014) studied that labour migration and its socio economics impact on their respective families in Rakhine State. This study is original empirical work to insight discussion on labour migration of rural poor and remittance pattern of households, any positive or negative effect on families left

behind; the study is focused on situation of rural poor and relationship of poverty and illegal migration but also migration effect on families left behind economically and socially. This study attempted to examine driving forces of labour migration from rural poor and its impact on socio economic of the poor community.

Moe Thae Phyu (EMDevS-2016) studied that socio-economic conditions of migrants in hlaingthayar township. This study is mainly based Myanmar is a developing country and most of its people live in rural areas. Day by day unemployment as well as scarcity of land and other resources are increasing rapidly in rural Myanmar. As a result, the socio-economic condition of rural Myanmar goes worsen and poverty is prevailed. Due to such situation an overwhelming number of people opportunities for their livelihood.

16

CHAPTER III
LABOUR MIGRATION IN MYANMAR

3.1 Overview on Labour Migration of Myanmar

Migration within and beyond Myanmar's borders is and has long been mixed. People are moving as migrant workers, traders, refugees, asylum seekers, and stateless people, for marriage and a victims of trafficking. The reasons people migrate are complex, cutting across economic, social and political factors. Limited rural livelihoods, economic opportunities elsewhere, persistent civil conflicts, and social aspirations and desire are all drivers of migration, often in combination with one another.

In the Greater Mekong Sub-region (GMS), more international migrants come from Myanmar than any other country. According to estimates up to 10 percent of the population migrates abroad (IOM, 2016). The Myanmar Government estimate that there are 4.25 million Myanmar nationals living abroad. Regionally, drivers of migration can include higher wages in neighboring countries, conflict and environmental migration due to natural disasters among other factors. It is also reported that up to 70 percent of migrants living abroad are based in Thailand, followed by Malaysia, China, Singapore, Japan, Republic of Korea, India and United State and other (see table 3.1). IOM estimates there could be as many as 3 million Myanmar migrants living in Thailand as at 2016. The highest numbers of migrants, according to the latest census, came from Mon State (427,000), Kayin State (323,000) and Shan State (236,000) (IOM, 2014).

Myanmar signed a new Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with Thailand regarding formal migration channels in regards to labour migration. Documentation has been a particular challenge given that irregular migration flows dominate migration from Myanmar to Thailand. A range of responses have been tired, starting in 1992 with the first registration of undocumented migrants in Thailand. After 2009, the Myanmar government also started to respond to the problem, and coordinated with the Thai authorities to issue temporary passport to migrants holding a Thai

Sample output to test PDF Combine only

migrant worker registration card. In 2017, the Myanmar government will issue Certificates of the migrants with the longer term goal of these migrants applying for a full passport in the future and returning to work in Thailand legally documented. Taking into account the large numbers of undocumented migrants in Thailand, these processes remain challenging and demand on-going processes to allow for all migrants to gradually be documented.

Table (3.1)   Myanmar International Migrants by Destination

Destination	Number	% of All Migrants	Male	%	Female	%
All countries	2,021,910	100	1,233,168	61	788,742	39
Thailand	1,418,472	70.2	812,798	57.3	605,674	42.7
Malaysia	303,996	15	245,772	80.8	58,224	19.2
China	92,263	4.6	53,126	57.6	39,137	42.4
Singapore	79,659	3.9	39,078	49	40,581	51
Other	49,774	2.4	31,108	62.4	18,671	37.6
USA	37,577	1.9	21,937	58.3	15,640	41.7
India	17,975	0.9	10,917	60.7	7,058	39.3
Korea	14,592	0.7	14,118	96.7	474	3.3
Japan	7,597	0.4	4,314	56	3,283	44

Source: ILO, 2014

Myanmar signed a new Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with Thailand regarding formal migration channels in regards to labour migration. Documentation has been a particular challenge given that irregular migration flows dominate migration from Myanmar to Thailand. A range of responses have been tired, starting in 1992 with the first registration of undocumented migrants in Thailand. After 2009, the Myanmar government also started to respond to the problem, and coordinated with the Thai authorities to issue temporary passport to migrants holding a Thai migrant worker registration card. In 2017, the Myanmar government will issue Certificates of the migrants with the longer term goal of these migrants applying for a full passport in the future and returning to work in Thailand legally documented. Taking into account the large numbers of undocumented migrants in Thailand, these

18

processes remain challenging and demand on-going processes to allow for all migrants to gradually be documented.

In Myanmar as elsewhere, migration differs for women and men. Gender impacts on economic and social opportunities and situations and in consequence determines to some extent who migrates and how, and into which sectors in which locations and with what degree of safety and success (Sijapati, 2015). Research conducted on internal migration in Myanmar indicates that men, particularly younger and better -educated men, are substantially more likely to migrate then women. Men tend to work in the informal sector in construction, markets, and restaurants including teashops. Yet women migrate at a significant rate as well, especially to work in the garment factories in Myanmar's industrial zones around Yangon
(World Bank 2016).Thus, as Myanmar seeks to move towards a more manufacturing- and service based economy, the kinds of jobs likely to be created may increase the share of women migrating relative to men. In addition, research in migrant destination communities in Thailand has shown that a strong percentage of workers in garment factories- upwards of 80 percent- are women, particularly young and single women from lowland Myanmar (Kusakabe and Pearson, 2014).

Although studies point out the diversification and polarization of women's migration in recent decades globally – in terms of nationality groups and skilled or less-skilled migrants- the number of women migration compared to men from Myanmar to Thailand has remained relatively stable over time at just under 50 percent (Sijapati, 2014). Similarly, in Myanmar's overall population of international migrants, women account for 47 percent of all Myanmar people migrating internationally (ESA, 2014).

There are more than 110 private overseas employment agencies registered under the overseas employment legislation in Myanmar and thousands of Myanmar workers are assigned to overseas employment every month (Wine, 2008). Myanmar's State Labour Department and the state – run Overseas Employment Company have also been sending selected skilled Myanmar male Singapore, Malaysia and United Arab Emirates. According to government regulations, Myanmar overseas employees are required to remit between 30 percent and 50 percent (depending on the country) of their wages received broad to their families at home via the Myanmar Foreign Trade Bank.

By the end of 2010, 39 percent of Myanmar migrants in Thailand were regular and the other 61 percent were irregular (Huguet et al, 2011). Myanmar migrants overseas work in skilled, semi-skilled, and low skilled jobs. For example, in Singapore skilled engineers, medical personnel, construction planners/architects and electronics and other manufacturing processes. In all destination countries for Myanmar migrants, these workers are employed as manual labour and domestic workers, particularly in fishing, fish processing, construction, agriculture, animal rearing, restaurant/ food services and tourism.

Myanmar became a member of the International Organization for Migration in 2012. At the moment, the Ministry of labour, Employment and Social Security is undertaking a five years (2013-2017) national plan with the support of IOM in relation to the development of Myanmar migrant workers. In order to protect the rights of migrant workers and to cooperate with the relevant national and international organizations, in 2012, the government posted labour attaches to Thailand, the republic of Korea and Malaysia. These officials have been appointed to provided effective information and consular services for migrant workers including and to mother the working conditions of migrant workers in the destination countries (ILO, 2016).

In MoLIP, Myanmar migration governance has a clear lead agency, while other agencies within the government structure play significant roles a well. MoLIP is directly responsible for coordinating and overseeing the implementation of the two most central policy instruments in Myanmar's migration governance: the LROE Law Relating to Overseas Employment and the NPA (as well as the strategy potentially to succeed the NPA). Labour organizations and civil society organizations (CSOs) can play an important role in reaching migrants with accurate information, responding to needs, developing services for their protection and increasing migrants' access to justice, MoLIP is the agency tasked with bringing together these various actors and activities within a coherent governance framework.

The labour migration in Myanmar workers has increased dramatically during the last two decades due to fewer employment opportunities, low wages, political conflicts, and so on in their home country. Most migrant workers from Myanmar migrate irregularly with the help of brokers because regular migration is expensive and burdensome. However, many migrant workers from Myanmar- including regular ones-face tremendous problem in the receiving countries. Since 2011, Myanmar has

undertaken political, economic and social reform processes and has cooperated more actively and widely with the regional and international organizations in relation to migration. Due to the recent reforms introduced by the Myanmar government, and the opening of the country, many irregular migrant workers want to return home to Myanmar, and this has become an option for many. If the government properly manages labour migration and protection of migrant workers, it may achieve a high degree of successful in reintegrating migrants into the labour force. Therefore, managing labour migration effectively has become a top policy priority for Myanmar.

3.2   Migration Policy of Myanmar

Myanmar immigration (Emergency Provisions) Act 1947 states in Article 3.2 that ' *No citizen of Myanmar shall enter without a passport*….' and Article 13.1 states breach of this provision can result in 6 months to 5 years imprisonment or also a 1,000 Kyats fine. This article 3.2 is still adopted till now but the article 13.1 has been removed after 2009, according to notification of Ministry of Labour.

To regulate the migration, there was no a comprehensive and holistic migration policy or an effective migration management body in the past. And only the Overseas Employment Service (Employment and Training Department at the Ministry of Labour) facilitated regular deployment of Myanmar migrants overseas and migration was the responsibility of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. After taking office in 2011, the new democratic government has been through a signification transaction which is reflected in the reform of the legislature, the judiciary, the armed forces and political parties. Political changes in Myanmar have both direct and indirect implications for Myanmar migrant workers in Myanmar borders areas.

Under the new democratic government era, the government initiated the reform measure in legal frame work due to the lack of comprehensive and holistic migration policy. In respect of the policy and planning the government identified the seven important guidelines geared toward future development of employment opportunity: (1) Decent works as a productive factor; (2) A Pro-employment macroeconomic framework; (3) Entrepreneurship and private investment; (4) Improving the productivity and opportunities of working people; (5) Non-discrimination in the labour market; (6) Environmentally and socially sustainable growth; and (7) Employability and adaptability.

In fact, internal migration and international migration (of both economic migrants and displaced persons) are widespread in Myanmar. Thailand is the major recipient of Myanmar migrant and more than 70% of Myanmar migrants (legal and illegal migrants) have moved into Thailand. In 2003, Myanmar signed a bilateral agreement with Thailand to help regulate the flow of undocumented persons across its border. Subsequently, Thai government implemented a program to directly recruit Myanmar workers and a program legalizing undocumented Myanmar migrant workers residing in Thailand through a nationality verification process. Currently, it appears that there are still significant undocumented migration flows from Myanmar to Thailand despite the agreements and programs (Huguet 2007: 9; McGann 2013). The 2011 economic and political reforms are expected to have consequences for internal migration as a result of the government's recent encouragement of new FDI projects.

In 2012, Ministry of Labour, Immigration and Population (MoLIP) summarizes their labour migration policy as a 9 point approach: (1) Facilitating data collection, information management, and research and policy analysis regarding migration; (2) Developing local and overseas labour markets; (3) Simplifying regular channels that allow people to seek jobs abroad; (4) Reducing transaction costs associated with migration; (5) Ensuring basic rights for migrant workers; (6) Improving socio-economic status for migrants and their families; (7) Enabling experiences, skills, and knowledge from mobility and sharing those to other; (8) Collaborating with international organizations, civil society, both international and local on issues regarding migrant workers, and (9) Making mobility an integral part of poverty alleviation strategy.

Ministry of Labour made efforts to draw up a 5 year National Plan of Action for the Management of International Labour Migration for 2013-2017 with regard to development of Myanmar migrant workers systematically and orderly with the themes: Governance of Migration, Protection and Employment of Migrant Workers, Labour Migration and Development, and Data collection and management.

3.3 Migration Pattern of Myanmar Migrant Workers

The people of Myanmar have long used migration as a survival strategy; for safe refuge and for livelihood. Those who have migrated not only support themselves but also try to remit enough money to allow their families and communities to

22

manage. Many the migrant workers from border areas pay brokers to assist in finding job opportunities in major cities, and sometimes suffer abuse at the hands of these people, and others.

The 2014 Myanmar Population and Housing Census listed them at over 9 million in 2015, equivalent to almost 20% of Myanmar's total population (Department of Population, 2015). This significantly outstrips international migration in Myanmar, with just below 2.9 million Myanmar nationals living abroad (UNDESA, 2017). Nonetheless, the Ministry of Immigration and Population considers to be underreported, and has provided an unofficial estimate of 4.25 million (IOM, 2016). The 2013-2014 Formal Sector Survey found that 38.9% of formal sector workers had migrated from one state to another for work, with the figure rising to 48.7 % when intra-regional migration was included (LIFT, 2014).

Migration within a region is mainly rural-rural or urban-urban, whereas rural-urban migration is more common in migration across states (ILO, 2015). Only 4 in 10 state have a net in-migration, namely Yangon, Shan, Kayan and Kachin, while the main out-migration states are the Dry Zone (Magway and Mandalay), Ayeyarwady, and Bago. Yangon and Mandalay are the primary urban destinations (Helvetas, 2015). 71% of all formal sector migrants are from Ayeyarwady, Yangon, Mandalay and Bago (LIFT, 2014).

More than 2 million Myanmar citizens migrated abroad, according to the latest Myanmar Population Census of 2014. 70.2 % of all migrants were in Thailand, and a smaller number was working in Malaysia, China and Singapore. Other countries of destination include Republic of Korea, Japan.

Since 2012, Myanmar has seen the beginning of a structural transformation away from agricultural and toward a more urban, industrial, and service based economy. These patterns have the potential to have a significant impact on the landless and land-poor workers who account for a large part of the rural workforce. The part of the qualitative social and economic monitoring series, analyzes domestic migration patterns from Ayeyarwady and Magway, two region of Myanmar with large numbers of Myanmar's rural poor, and which are close to two urban centers, Yangon and Mandalay. The study was conducted in 2015 through a partnership between the World Bank, the Livelihood and Food Security Trust Fund (LIFT), Myanmar Survey Research, and Indochina Research.

Ayeyarwady and Magway states have seen high levels of migration in recent years, especially since Myanmar's economic transition started in 2011. One in four household in Ayeyarwady, and one in five in Magway, currently have a family member living as a migrant away from home. Migrants are generally young, predominantly male, and better educated than their peers. In Ayeyarwady region, 60 percent of migrants are men. Women make up one-third of all migrants across both states. 58 percent of migrants move to Yangon, by far the primary choice for relocation.

In urban areas, migrants mostly find work in informal labour markets in construction, restaurants and tea shops. A minority enjoy more formal employment in garment factories. Migrants primarily seek jobs through social networks in their villages rather than through paid brokers.

People in the two states mostly migrate to create a diverse and potentially more reliable income stream. When making decision on migration, people move because of differentials in earnings, job availability, working conditions and lifestyles, against constraints of safety, financial and social costs. Social networks play a prominent role in influencing decision about migration. These networks help migrants identify job opportunities before they leave their village, secure accommodation in destination sites, and lower the psychological burden of moving into an unknown environment. Those who migrate to manage risks and to find a more predictable income as a response to shocks due to health, injury, crop damage or weather shocks; and among the non-poor for upward mobility as they seek opportunities in Myanmar's market economy or to access a better formal education in urban centers or overseas. The financial costs associated with migration are mostly low, enabling people to finance migration themselves or with financial support from their families.

Despite the high rates of migration, the economic impacts are yet to be significant, as most migrants take up low-skilled employment in cities. Remittances are used primarily to supplement food expenses, smooth income and reduce debt. In households with a migrant family member, one-third of those left-behind are required to take on more responsibilities. This includes responsibilities for daily spending decisions and longer-term decisions about education and health care and increasing contributions towards household labour needs.

Critical factors affecting migration outcomes include access to information about jobs and human capital endowments like education and vocational skills during

the pre-migration stage; access to services and vocational, on-the-job training during the migration period; and integrating or reintegrating ability determines whether people return to their homes or will set up permanent new ones.

3.4   Remittance of Myanmar

Remittance are potentially an important source of development financing for emerging economies. While foreign direct investment (FDI) is the largest flow of funds to developing countries, remittance flows are a close second internationally. However, they are less volatile and more resilient to international shocks.

Hundi is the dominant remittance device according to the number of Myanmar migrants workers using it, but it is also the favoured instrument according to value. In this context, hundi's 'lead' over other mechanisms is marginal, and to some extent the most a markable fact observable. According to the IMF, official worker remittances to Myanmar totaled US$ 81.3 million in 2004 (the latest data available), from which must be deducted the remittances of foreign workers in Myanmar (mostly working for multinational corporations and international aid agencies) of US$ 24.5 million – delivering a net remittances surplus of US$ 56.8 million. Of course, these officials flows (the inward component of which is largely due to funds sent home by Myanmar merchant seaman), greatly understate the remittances sent by Myanmar's estimated two million or so migrant workers and refugees who live outside its borders, and which are made (overwhelmingly) via informal payment mechanisms of various types. Such remittances are likely to be three to four times the official flows, and their existence a lifeline that permits the survival of many thousands of families in Myanmar.

Migrant worker remittances everywhere are made and subsequently spent according to hierarchy of needs. According to recent survey, the remittances Myanmar workers send are overwhelmingly used to assist their families in basic survival is their first order of priority. Indeed, many nominated family survival as their only motivation, with some taking the opportunity to annotate the living conditions faced by their families back in Myanmar. The remittance was used to purchase or develop farm land; to establish a business; to meet education expenses; to repay debt; to hire workers and to purchase consumer goods.

Remittances sent from Myanmar migrant workers in overseas directly alleviate the poverty of individuals and households to whom they are sent.

Remittances are also likely to provide for individual benefits in allowing greater access to health services and education. Health and education only weakly appeared as independent motivations for sending remittances, but both are likely to also implicitly reside within the survival rubric too.

However, any national economics development benefits allowed by remittances are largely absent in the Myanmar context. The circumstances of Myanmar's political economy instead undermines the broader processes that might otherwise be apparent:

Remittances and Foreign Reserves: an important benefit often yielded by remittance flows is the extent that they provide sizeable, and relatively stable, flows of foreign reserves. This attribute is greatly undermined in the Myanmar context by the fact that hundi is the most common method by which remittances are made. As demonstrated, hundi works via 'netting' transactions that minimize the flow of foreign exchange.

Remittances and Business Capital: Elsewhere remittances have provided businesses in recipient countries with otherwise scarce capital. Establishing or expanding a business is a strong purpose of remittances in many countries and circumstances. Paying remittances for the purpose of business is not, however, a strong motivating factors in the context of Myanmar. Even if simple survival was not an all-consuming force, Myanmar's dire economic and political circumstances would tell against substantial investment flows. Indeed, given the risks, it is probably in their own best interests that Myanmar's migrant workers are unwilling to expose their hard-earned gains in this way.

Remittances and Financial Development: The 'leveraging up' of the development potential of remittances through formal financial institutions is much celebrated. Similarly highly regarded is the way that remittance flows might in themselves stimulate the development of financial institutions. Unfortunately, these attributes are likewise absent in the circumstances that Myanmar migrant workers find themselves in. This is because, firstly (and as noted above), around 60 percent of our survey recipients do not possess Thai work permits, a fact that would automatically (legally) rule them out from holding an account at a bank in Thailand. Of course, even amongst the 40 percent that do hold work permits, the additional documentation hurdles for opening a bank account remain formidable.

Secondly, and probably more significant that such 'first mile' obstacles, are the 'last mile' problem in Myanmar itself. Put simply, and especially since the

banking crisis of 2003, Myanmar's formal financial system remains distrusted and dysfunctional. Myanmar's banks eke out a marginal existence in an environmental hostile to the survival of financial institutions, and they are not an effective instrument to facilitate remittances or indeed, even to gain from Myanmar are sending back their part of income to their families. But most of them does not use their savings beneficially.

3.5   Labour Migration and Current Economic Condition in Myanmar

The people of Myanmar have long used migration as a survival strategy, for safe refuge and for livelihood. Those who have migrated not only support themselves but also try to remit enough money to allow their families and communities to manage. According to the latest Myanmar Population Census of 2014, more than two million Myanmar citizens migrated abroad. 70.2 % of all migrants were in Thailand, and a smaller number was working in Malaysia, China and Singapore. Other countries of destination include of Korea, Japan, GCC countries.

Cross-border migration of people from Myanmar are attempting to use official channels to migrate originated from state adjacent to the Myanmar- Thailand border, such as Kayin, Mon and Shan because the impact of migration is positive when migration is viewed as bringing benefits both to the areas of destination and to the areas of origin especially economic status of left-behind families. Migrants and the communities which host them overwhelmingly benefit from migration and the communities that migrants leave also tend to benefit. There are, however, problems associated with migration social conflict, and difficulties associated with the separation of the migrants from their family and community members, labour shortage, in higher migration areas to provide adequate productive employment opportunities especially in agriculture and farming.

According to figure reported by households during the Census 2014, around 2 million persons or 4 percent of the population live outside Myanmar, of who 1.36 million were recent emigrants. Thailand (1.4 million persons) and Malaysia (304,000 persons) were two main destinations. The Government should implement a reliable system of remittance from abroad and within the country. This will not only encourage more remittances but also make it easier to quantify the resources being sent back to the country. The people of Myanmar have long used migration as a survival strategy, for safe refuge and for livelihood. Those who have migrated not

only support themselves but also try to remit enough money to allow their families and communities to manage.

Migrant workers are mainly hired in the sectors of agriculture, construction, fishery and domestic work. Although the government announced that only unskilled migrant workers or labourers can be employed, some workers have entered into less-skilled or semi-skilled work such as manufacturing (garments, plastics, paper), services and sales, transport and trade. As the background of most workers was a farmer, they learn some new skills while working in most countries. Thus, the recipient households in Myanmar use the funds from remittance in flows largely for basic necessities. Beyond internal migration, international migration has also increased gradually and there are approximately 4.25 million Myanmar citizens officially living abroad and for 2015 they remitted approximately $ 3.5 billion to Myanmar amounting to almost 5% of Myanmar gross domestic product.

Migration has developed a significant role in rural development and poverty reduction, the government of Myanmar also strives to develop legal, convenient, affordable and secure channels of migration from which not only migrants themselves, but also their left-behind families and communities, well benefit. This goals focuses primarily on improving quality and access to social services, such as education and health, and the expansion and strengthening of social protection programmes. This goals also priorities improved access to quality food and nutrition, protecting the rights of both inward- and outward-flowing migrant workers, and strengthening positive linkages between migration and local-level development.

CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS ON SURVEY DATA

4.1 Survey Profile

Myebon Township is located in 62 miles away from Sittway. The township is bounded in the east by Ann Township, in the west by Pauktaw Township, in the south by Kyauk Phyu Township and in the north by Minbya Township. 70 % township population are Rakhine ethnic and 25 % are Chin ethnic and 5 % are Bengali. It is a coastal township, which consists of 51 villages and 9 wards. The villagers have traditionally relied extensively on agriculture for their livelihoods and some villagers worked as causal labour at mining and rubber factories in Myebon Township.

Most of the land is used rice paddies and rubber. Socio – economics situation in this village was really bad before and villagers are very poor and lack of economic opportunities. Networking in selected villages are still low due to lack of electricity and poor transportation and infrastructure. There has only primary school and the villagers use small hut as a school building. Only few villagers have access to middle and higher education because they send their children to their relative's houses in town for the education because they send their children to their children to their relative's houses in town for the education. Existing road is earth road and the villagers cannot use it in the raining season and they have to use the boat to get the town in raining season.

Table (4.1)   Information of Selected Villages, Myebon Township, Rakhine State

	Number
Household	766
Family household	786
Population	3505
Male	1612
Female	1895

Source: Selected Village Administrative Office (2019)

Sample output to test PDF Combine only

4.1.1 Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Table (4.2) summarizes the profile of the respondents in the Myebon Township selected for this study.

Table (4.2)   Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Particular		Respondents	
		Number	Percentage
Age of Migrants	16 – 25	73	36.5%
	26 – 35	70	35%
	36 – 45	50	25%
	46 ->50	7	3.5%
	Total	**200**	**100%**
Sex of Migrants	Male	159	79.5%
	Female	41	20.5%
	Total	**200**	**100%**
Marital Status	Single	92	46%
	Married	103	51.5%
	Divorce	4	2%
	Window	1	0.5%
	Total	**200**	**100%**
Educational Level	Primary level	98	49%
	Middle level	66	33%
	High level	30	15%
	University student	6	3%
	Total	**200**	**100%**
Number of children in migrant family	Nil	51	25.5%
	1 - 2	119	59.5%
	>2	30	15%
	Total	**200**	**100%**

Source: Survey data, 2019

At the time interview, (36.5%) of migrant worker were between 16-25 years and followed by age between 26-35 (35%). Between 36-45 age groups follow in 25%.

30

The data indicates most of family head that includes in middle working age is still working in oversea as well as working away from home within a country. According to FDG, many of rural youth are not willing to do traditional agricultural due to low wages well as others under developed social factors they prefers to go out from rural to anywhere to seek better chance for their life.

According to the data analysis and found out that 159 (79.5%) are male migrants and 41 (20.5%) are female migrants. Most of them are earning better than in the village and remittance to their households then being exposed to the wider socio-economic area. The values and attitudes of migrants women/girl may change rapidly along with their changing livelihoods. So, some women/girl move to Thailand because of the job insecurity in the villages and potential higher income. The lowest wages in abroad in more than 5 times compare to the wages in villages during agricultural seasonal causal labour.

As a marital status, 51.5% are married migrants, relatively 46% are single , 0.5% is window and 2% is divorce. It is assessed that financial or livelihood hardship within married migrant families are more serious. It was found out that most of migrants can read and write and 49% of migrants finished primary level education, it means that most of the villages have access to basic education in the villages through both informal and formal way. 33% of migrants have accessed middle level education. According to the improvement of family income and economic condition of villages some adult migrants have accessed to learn higher education and some for the university. There are 15% of migrants have accessed high school. It was noted that the attainment of high school level by the reported migrants is depended on economic status of villages. Before migrants who are poorest families and could not afford for high school fees such as food, cloth, transportation, house rent and other costs in respective township and so most reported migrants received only basic level education relatively.

According to analysis, there are three categories of migrant households who have children, no children, and 1- 2 children. It is showed that (59.5%) of households have at least between 1-2 children, (15%) have above 2 children, and (25.5%) of migrant families have no children.

4.2   Survey Design

This chapter presents research design, to analyze the effect of labour migration on socio-economics status. This study primary and secondary data are collected. A sample 200 was selected from among 766 is chosen simple random sampling method in Myebon Township at Rakhine State. It is used for collecting the data by structure questioners and there are 43 questions for respondents to find out the condition in the study area. There are three parts in the questionnaires; part (a) is about demographic characters of respondents. Part (b) has 10 questions concerning the pre-condition and difficulties before migration in study areas. Part (c) is especially for the economic status of migrant sending households after receiving remittance.

4.3   Survey Result

The migrants' household of respondents for this include analysis on condition of migration, analysis on remittance of channel and improvement on socio-economic status of migrants' households.

4.3.1   Analysis on condition of Migration

The condition of migration include reason for labour migration, destination place of migration, types of occupation, migration expense, supporter of migrant to get money for going abroad, number of migrant start for migration by year.

A. Reason for Migration

Migrate household have more reason is shown on Table (4.3).

Table (4.3)   Reasons for Migration

Reason for Migration	Respondents	
	Number	**Percentage**
Poverty	111	55.5%
To repay old debt/ loan	41	20.5%
Better future for children	20	10%
Less job opportunities	22	11%
Forced labour	2	1%
Low wages/income	3	1.5%
Uncertainly to farm	1	0.5%
Total	**200**	**100%**

Source: Survey data, 2019

As shown in Table (4.3), 55.5% of the household indicated that their member of the households decided to migrate because of the poverty followed by 10% for better future for children. About 20.5% mentioned the reason that to repay old debt. The respondents mentioned that they household members migrated because of the family size 11%, 1.5% due to less job opportunity and low wages in this area, their earning cannot cover for food security and basic needs of families, and 1% forced labour and 0.5% was uncertain income from farm activities. The above main reason is sufficient to migrate to our region and both legally and illegally.

B. Destination place of Migration

In Table (4.4) shows the destination countries of migration. Based on the data, the top destination countries are Thailand, China and Malaysia.

Table (4.4)   Destination Place of Migration

Particular		Respondents	
		Number	**Percentage**
Destination Countries	Thailand	120	60%
	China	64	32%
	Malaysia	16	8%
	Total	**200**	**100%**
Channel of Migration	Formal	17	8.5%
	Informal	183	91.5%
	Total	**200**	**100%**

Source: Survey data, 2019

According to the respondent answers, the most popular destination country for the migrants from selected villages in Myebon Township is Thailand (60%), followed by China (32%) and Malaysia (8%). Almost all the migrants included in this study were unskilled workers and that is a reason for choosing Thailand, China and Malaysia for destinations. According to the data analysis, 91.5% of the migrants' from the selected villages migrated through informal channel. 8.5% of the migrants' from the selected villages migrated through formal channel to Thailand.

33

C. Occupation before Migration

Before occupation of migrant household, show in the Table (4.5).

Table (4.5)   Before Occupation of Migrant

Occupation of Migrant	Respondents	
	Number	**Percentage**
Agricultural farmer	26	13%
Fisherman	18	9%
Odd Jobs	136	68%
Others	20	10%
Total	**200**	**100%**

Source: Survey data, 2019

68% majority were odd jobs who engage in not only agricultural seasonal labour. Other diversity of casual job nature based on the opportunities of respectively. Followed 13% of migrants were agricultural farmers before they left. The main job is agricultural work but it cannot provide to meet their basic need. This rural households seek diversity of work as a secondary job to fulfill shortage beside their main job. Fishery is additional or side earning source in this area however, many migrants households do fishing but cannot do as main job the burden of high fishing permit and other unofficial tax is constraint for commercial purpose but also price of good quality fishing net and fishing tool, engine boat, and rowing boat are also beyond the capacity of poor families.

D. Migration of Expense

Migration of expense can be seen Table (4.6).

Table (4.6)   Migration of Expense

Migration expense(Kyats)	Respondents	
	Number	**Percentage**
100,000 - 500,000	49	24.5%
500,001 - 1,000,000	120	60%
1,000,001 - 1,500,000	31	15.5%
Total	**200**	**100%**

Source: Survey data, 2019

As shown in Table (4.6), migration cost for travelling depended on available amount of their family. The amount is varying among the migrants. With the regard to the amount of money being spent on migration purpose is 24.5% migrants had spent between kyats (100,000-500,000) to go to abroad especially to Thailand by road. And between (1,000,001-1,500,000) was spend 15.5% to go China. 60% of migrants spent between (500,001-1,000,000) as a travelling expense. According to the answer from respondents, they do not member the extract and actual cost of travel.

E. House Condition of Respondents

Housing condition of respondents can been see Table (4.7).

Table (4.7)   House Condition of Respondents

House Ownership	Respondents	
	Number	Percentage
Own house	178	89%
Rental	1	0.5%
Living with relative	21	10.5%
Total	**200**	**100%**

Source: Survey data, 2019

As shown in Table (4.7), 178 households had their own house and residential land before their family member migrated to abroad and some 21 households living with relative and only 1 households rental. According to the respondents, almost all of their houses were made by wood, bamboo and those kinds of materials are locally available and prices of the materials and constructing are very cheap at that period.

F. Supporter of migrant

In Table (4.8), the migrants' household had to manage money from various kinds of sources.

Table (4.8)   Supporter of Migrant to Get Money for Going Abroad

Supporter of migrant	Respondents	
	Number	**Percentage**
Household saving	29	14.5%
Borrow from friends	12	6%
Loan from money lender	159	79.5%
Total	**200**	**100%**

Source: Survey data, 2019

If they are unable to go to abroad with their won savings. The majority of the respondents, 79.5% (159) household expressed that they have taken loan from money lender with an interest and 6% (12) household borrowed from their family and friends. 14.5% (29) households spent their own saving. The result indicate over 70% of the household took loan for migration purpose with interest rate.

G. Types of Job

In Table (4.9) show types of jobs. It divided by skills labour and unskilled labour.

Table (4.9)   Types of Job

Types of job	Respondents	
	Number	**Percentage**
Skills labour	15	7.5%
Unskilled labour	185	92.5%
Total	**200**	**100%**

Source: Survey data, 2019

A majority of the migrants 92.5% (185) are unskilled labour and working at labour intensive industries such as agricultural, and services. And some 7.5% (15) of migrants are skill labours and working as rubber, carpentry and mason.

H. Migration of period

The respondents were asked when their migrants' households member out from village.

Table (4.10)   Migration Periods

Migration of Periods	Respondents	
	Number	**Percentage**
2003 – 2006	12	6%
2007 – 2010	41	20.5%
2011 – 2014	74	37%
2015 – 2018	73	36.5%
Total	**200**	**100%**

Source: Survey data, 2019

Table (4.10) show that more than (37%) had left between (2011-2014) and follow (36.5%) moved during (2015-2018). (20.5%) of migrants from (2007-2010), (6%) were moved from sample households started between (2003-2006).

4.3.2 Channel of Remittance

Channel of remittance have include use of received remittance, send many to migrants' household and remittance transfer channel of migrant practice.

A. Use of received remittance

In Table (4.11), most of the migrant sending households have to pay off loan and which was taken away for migration purpose before migration at first as possible.

Table (4.11)   Uses of Received Remittance

Received remittance	Respondents	
	Number	**Percentage**
House pair	176	88%
Repay Debt	188	94%
Education expense	108	54%
Contribution for village Infrastructures	99	49.5%
Contribution for religious Affairs	139	69.5%
Others	37	18.5%
Total Sample Households = 200		

Source: Survey data, 2019

According to the respondents, the reason of loan payoff is priority for them and 94% of households repay debt with the help of remittance. Based on the mean amount of remittance, the first and second highest amounts were used for a considerable amount was spent for building houses and repairing houses (88% of household). During village observation, it was found that majority of local people were living in wooden or brick houses.

Interestingly, 54% of households spent on education and they sent their children to the boarding schools situated in Myebon Township. Religious donation is also done and 69.5% of the households contribute certain amount of remittances for pagodas, monasteries, other religious activities and custom affairs. In addition, 49.5% of the households contributed for village infrastructure development such as constructing water supply system, upgrading village earth road and construction of concrete which will connect to the nearest towns. Almost all of the households used remittance for buying electronic appliance such as television, mobile handset and others.

38

B. Remittance transfer channel

Remittance transfer channel can been seen Table (4.12).

Table (4.12)   Remittance Transfer Channel of Respondents

Remittance Transfer Channel	Respondents	
	Number	**Percentage**
Bank	22	11%
Local Agent	178	89%
Total	**200**	**100%**

Source: Survey data, 2019

As shown in Table (4.12), the majority of the migrants' household (89%) received money through local agent. 11% of the migrants using bank to transfer money. The village is not access to link with bank and they are fear to link with bank.

C. Period of remittance transfer channel

Period of remittance transfer channel can be seen Table (4.13).

Table (4.13)   Period of Remittance Transfer Channel

Period	Respondents	
	Number	**Percentage**
Biannually	76	38%
Annually	84	42%
At any necessary	40	20%
Total	**200**	**100%**

Source: Survey data, 2019

Table (4.13) show the number of migrants' households send money to left-behind family. 42% of migrants' households send money at annually and followed 38% at, and to left-behind family. 20% of migrants' households send money at any necessary.

4.3.3 Socio – Economic Condition of Migrants' Household Before and After migration

Socio-economic condition of migrants' household include estimated income per year, ownership for productive and non-productive assets, and effect of migrant on socio economic conditions.

A. Health Condition

The condition of health divided by good, fair and bad in Table (4.14).

Table (4.14)   Health Condition of Migrants' Households

Health Condition	Before migration of respondents		After migration of respondents	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Good	78	39%	168	84%
Fair	110	55%	32	16%
Bad	12	6%	-	-
Total	**200**	**100%**	**200**	**100%**

Source: Survey data, 2019

According to the study, there was no same between before migration and after migration. The respondents mentioned, health service is vital role in human life. Before migration, (6%) of migrants' households reported that they had serious case, as they were not able for medical treatment cost, some family member experied. At the period, Malaria, Tuberculosis and injury case occurred among reported households with serious health case. After migration, (84%) of migrants' households are good health and (16%) are fair and they can't badly occur serious case.

40

B. Education Condition

The condition of education of migrants' households can see in table (4.15).

Table (4.15)   Education Condition of Migrants' Households

Education Condition	Before migration of respondents		After migration of respondents	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Good	9	4.5%	120	60%
Fair	174	87%	80	40%
Bad	17	8.5%	-	-
Total	**200**	**100%**	**200**	**100%**

Source: Survey data, 2019

In Table (4.15), the respondents said that they satisfied improvement of their children education after migration. Before migration, some families could not afford to extend children education especially middle and high school have more costly. Some of children dropped out after completed of primary education level. The multiplier effect of migrants' remittance to save surplus money beside food consumption cost. So, this surplus money was used for consumption of other basic need including education.

C. Estimated income per year

Annual income of household before and after migration was shown in Table (4.16).

Table (4.16)   Estimated Income per Year by Migrants' Households before Migration and After Migration

Amount (Kyats)	Before Migration of Respondents		After Migration of Respondents	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
100,000 – 500,000	46	23%	0	0%
500,001 – 1,000,000	150	75%	20	10%
1,000,001 – 1,500,000	4	2%	172	86%
1,500,001 -> 2,000,000	0	0%	8	4%
Total	**200**	**100%**	**200**	**100%**

Source: Survey data, 2019

41

Total income of migrants' households income per year ranged from 100,000 – 500,000 kyats to 1,000,000 – 1,500,000. Before migrate to the majority of the respondent (2%) had total migrants' households incomes between 1,000,000-1,500,000 kyats per year. After migration, two-thirds of respondents (86%) had total migrants' households between 1,000,000 – 1,500,000 kyats per year. Respondents increase income more than previously after migration because better job opportunities.

D. Estimated Expenditure per month

Monthly expenditure of households before and after migration can see in table (4.17).

Table (4.17) **Estimated Expenditure per Monthly by Migrants Household before and after Migration**

Amount (Kyats)	Before migration of respondents		After migration of respondents	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
10,000 – 50,000	56	28%	-	-
50,001 – 100,000	128	64%	138	69%
100,001 – 200,000	16	8%	44	22%
200,001-> 300,000	-	-	18	9%
Total	**200**	**100%**	**200**	**100%**

Source: Survey data, 2019

According to the table, it is founded that monthly expenditure of households before and after migration. Most of the respondents expenditure increased after migration. Before migrate to the majority of the respondent (8%) had total migrants' households expenditure between 100,001- 200,000 kyats per month. After migration, two-thirds of respondents (22%) had total migrants' households between 100,001-200,000 kyats per month.

E. Ownership for Productive and Non-productive Assets

Table (4.18) shows ownership of productive assets and non-productive assets which owned by the migrants' households before and after migration.

Table (4.18)   Investment of Productive Assets and Non Productive Assets

Productive Asset	Before Migration		After Migration	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Agricultural Farmer	20	10%	66	33%
Cattle	4	2%	19	9.5%
Machinery	-	-	4	2%
Fishing net	18	9%	89	44.5%
Small Rice mill	-	-	2	1%
Livestock	1	0.5%	6	3%
Non-Productive Assets				
Gold		-	80	40%
TV	2	1%	41	20.5%
Bicycle	4	2%	22	11%
Motor cycle	-	-	58	29%
Radio	28	14%	86	43%
Mobile phone	-	-	181	90.5%
Solar Battery		-	16	8%
Total migrants' households = 200				

Source: Survey data, 2019

These articles reported that (33%) of own productive land. (9.5%) farmer own cattle. (4%) farmer purchase machinery for agricultural. (44.5%) fishery purchase fishing net and only (1%) owns small rice mill. Most of (90.5%) migrants' household use mobile phone after migration. Some migrants purchase land with remittance.

Most of migrants' households were poor households of the selected villages. Before migration, they stand hardly for food, lack of access to ability of productive assets and non-productive assets but also lack of investment to do some business. Number of items owned by mentioned households in table as non-productive assets. There are considerable changes on ownership and non-productive assets as well as

access investment for implementation for small business dependent on manageable capacity of individual after migration.

With respect to the benefit or not for community and migrant families that migration to abroad, all respondents recognized that migration is better than working within in the community and that the greatest benefit is financial benefit because of enough earning to meet the family needs, a great access to job opportunity, better future for children education and health, ability to repay debt, increase productive assets, improvement of education for the children and increasing of small scale business after migration and so on. Regarding the opportunities or activities needed to meet better income for their community, most of the respondents answered that the villagers still need the electricity that to get more job opportunity; need to maintain concrete path that to be good transportation for job opportunity in the community; and need to upgrade the village earth road which is connected to the nearest towns for the flow of goods and the development of villages.

CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

5.1   Findings

This study examines condition of migrants' households, and the effects of labour migration on socio-economics status of migrants' households in selected villages, Myebon Township at Rakhine State. The respondent expressed that the various reasons of migration were less job opportunities, low wages, low return from farm, supporting education and health, that create livelihood insecurity and they were always living with debt for every year and that is why they became faced in unable ability to repay old debt. Those reason show the poverty status of the people of the respective villages. So, there was assessed that "poverty" is main cause of migration for these villages. Socio-economic situation in these villages was really bad before migration and villagers are very poor and lack of economic opportunities. Before migration, male is usually household head. After migration most of female become act as a house head instead of male. Household income after migration is much higher than income of staying in the local. The data show that 20.5% of migrants are women migrants both single and married. According to age data of migrants, majority age of migrants are working age period 16 – 57 years. And then 51.5% are married. 49% of migrants was received only primary education.

Before migration, about 20.3% mentioned the reason that to repay old debt and only 1% to forced labour and 0.5% uncertainly to farm. The respondents mentioned that they household members migrated because of the less job opportunity 11%, 1.5% due to low wages in the area, their earning cannot cover for food security and basic needs of families. A majority of the migrants 92.5% (185) are unskilled labour and working at labour intensive industries such as agricultural and services. And some 7.5% (15) of migrants are skilled labours and working as rubber, carpentry and mason and others. Before migration, 98 households were not unable to pay back the debt because of the insufficient income for the family income. This study finds that 94% of households repay debt with the help of remittance.

45

The remittance were used mainly for debt repayment firstly, and then secondary use is for house pair (88% of household) and 49.5% of the households contributed for these villages infrastructure development such as constructing water supply system, upgrading village earth road and construction of concrete which will connect to the nearest towns. The result indicates that the migrants choose informal money transfer system to send remittance to migrants' households.

Almost all of the households used remittances for their children education, and for buying electronic appliance such as television, mobile phone and others. The majority of the migrants' household (89%) received money through local agent. 11% of the migrants using bank to transfer money. The large majority of respondents reported in indicators of migration effect, namely fulfillment of food shortage, ability of debt/loan repayment, improvement of children education, improvement of health and involvement in business experience. Based on survey findings, all respondents in selected villages at Myebon Township, Rakhine State reported in indicators of migration benefit namely fulfillment of food shortage, ability to debt/loan repayment, increase in productive assets, access to job opportunity, improvement of children education and involvement in small scale business/ trading.

5.2   Suggestions

Labour migration from selected villages has made contributed to enhance the socio-economic status of migrants' households because migrants are often among the poorest of the landless workers, dispossessed farmers, unskilled young men and women. Remittance has brought positive change in expenses on children education, repay debt, food shortage, health, productive investment livestock and breeding, donation for these villages infrastructure development and religious matters. The socio-economic of the households at the time of study is much better than pre migration period and the level of expenses among the household is considerable higher than before. Most of the migrant sending households receive the remittance through local agent and bank system and the transfer charges will be expensive than formal transfer channel. Moreover, the facts that the remittances are channeled ways offer another window to dire political economy of the country, the remittance will be easy and safe.

It would be useful to point out that all left-behind household respondents are good enough on the uses of remittance for better living condition and socio-

economics status. Though these villages roads are better than before and the villagers can reduce transportation cost including travel time, vehicle operating cost and leading to the development of the village, the road, electricity, getting more job opportunity in the community still need to be improved. There is still need to upgrade the primary and middle schools building and to maintain concrete path that to be good transportation for job opportunity, to upgrade the villages earth road which is connected to the nearest towns for the flows of goods in the community. Furthermore, there are some small shops to become medium shops to buy the variety of household items. They have a good future expectation for their development of village because of the visit and attention of the Minister of Rakhine State to these villages.

The suggestions are included as follow:

1. To promote the use of saving facilities through there establishment of village banks and saving groups;

2. To encourage the migrants to use formal banking systems to send remittance to the family:

3. To give training for community based resources person and livestock breeding;

4. To support financial assistant , microfinance for promoting livestock breeding for these villages communities including both migrant sending and non-migrant sending households;

5. To improve transportation infrastructure and process for electricity attainment;

6. To establish with inviting international or local investment;

If possible, small industry zone or special economic zone should be established not only Myebon but also Northern Rakhine Area.

REFERENCES

Adams R. H., & J Page (2005). Do International Migration and Remittances Reduce Poverty in Deeping Countries? World Development.

Adewale, J. G (2005). Socio-Economic Factors Associated with Urban-Rural Migration in Nigeria: A Case Study of Oye State, Ajasin University, Nigeria.

Amano, M. (1983): "On the Harris-Todaro Model with Intersectional Migration of Labour", Economic: American Economic Association, US.

Amrith, S. S. (2014). Migration and health in Southeast Asian history. *The Lancet*, *384*(9954), 1569-1570.

Annual Report (2008). International Fund for Agriculture Development (IFAD).

Arjan de Haan (2006). Migration in the Development Studies Literature, Research Paper No.2006/19

Arjan de Haan (DEID) and Shahin Yagub (UNICEF), Migration and Poverty: Linkages knowledge gaps and policy implications, 2008.

Arjan De Hann (2002). Migration and Livelihoods in historical perspective; A case study of Bihar, India

Barrett, C. B., Reardon, T., & Webb, P. (2001). Nonfarm income diversification and household livelihood strategies in rural Africa: concepts, dynamics, and policy implications. *Food policy*, *26*(4), 315-331.

Black, S. E., & Lynch, L. M. (2004). What's driving the new economy?: The benefits of workplace innovation. *The Economic Journal*, *114*(493), F97-F116.

Building Labour Migration Policy Coherence in Myanmar (ILO, 2017)

Chantavanich and Vungsiriphisal (2012). Myanmar Migrant to Thailand: Economic Analysis and Implications to Myanmar Development.

De Haas, H. (2007). Turning the tide? Why development will not stop migration. *Development and change*, *38*(5), 819-841.

De Haas, Hein, (2007). Impact of International Migration on Social and Economic Development in Maroccan Sending Regions: Review of Empirical Literature. Working Paper 3, International Migration Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford.

De la Brière, B., De Janvry, A., Lambert, S., & Sadoulet, E. (1997). *Why Do Migrants Remit?: An Analysis for the Dominican Sierra* (No. 583-2016-39540).

Deshingkar, P., & Grimm, S. (2005). *Internal migration and development: A global perspective* (No. 19). United Nations Publications.

DeWind, J., & Holdaway, J. (2005, October). Internal and international migration in economic development. In *Fourth Coordination Meeting on International Migration, United Nations, New York* (pp. 26-27).

DeWind, J., & Holdaway, J. (Eds.). (2008). *Migration and development within and across borders: Research and policy perspectives on internal and international migration*. Hammersmith Press.

Docquier, F., & Rapoport, H. (2004). *Skilled migration: the perspective of developing countries*. The World Bank.

Farrington, J., Carney, D., Ashley, C., & Turton, C. (1999). Sustainable livelihoods in practice: early applications of concepts in rural areas (Vol. 42, pp.1-2). London: ODI.

Harper T. Amirth, S, Histories of Health in Southeast Asia, (2014).

Helvetas, (2015). Bioenergy and climate change mitigation: an assessment. *Gcb Bioenergy*, *7*(5), 916-944.

Hickey, M., Narendra, P., & Rainwater, K. (2013). A review of internal and regional migration policy in southeast asia. *Migrating Out of Poverty Working Paper*, *8*.

Htay, M. W. M. M. (2016). Labor Migration in Myanmar.

Hujo, K., & Piper, N. (2007). South–South migration: Challenges for development and social policy. *Development*, *50*(4), 19-25.

Human Migration in historical perspective William H. McNeill, (1984). Population and Development Review.

Khine Soe Kyi, (2018). The Impact of Migration works on the Socio-economic of left-behind families of Myanmar Migrant Workers.

Kusakabe, K., & Pearson, R. (2014). Burmese female migrant workers in Thailand: managing productive and reproductive responsibilities. In *Migration, Gender and Social Justice* (pp. 69-85). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

Lakshmanasamy, T. (2003). Testing the unitary and Nash bargaining household models in India. *Journal of Social and Economic Development*, *5*(2), 197-217.

Lewis, W. A. (1954). Economic development with unlimited supplies of labour. *The manchester school*, *22*(2), 139-191.

Manning C Bhatnagar, Cross, border labour Flows Within Southeast Asia, (2006).

Manning, C., & Bhatnagar, P. (2006). Coping with cross-border labour flows within Southeast Asia. In *Mobility, labour migration and border controls in Asia* (pp. 52-72). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

McNeill, W. H. (1984). Human migration in historical perspective. *Population and Development Review*, 1-18.

Migration and its enemies: Global capital, migrant labour and the nation-state. Routledge (ILO, 2016).

Prof: Fir RE: Mgration: an historical perspective, (2017).

Salayo, N. D., Perez, M.L., Garces, L.R., & Pido, M. D. (2010). Mariculture development and livelihood diversification in the Philippines. Marine Policy, 36(4), 867-881.

Saw Yu May, (2015). Migration as a Challenge for Myanmar's socio-economic development: International Conference on Myanmar Studies, Chang Mai University, Thailand.

Sijapati-Basnett, B. (2014). *State of migration in Nepal*. Kathmandu: Centre for the Study of Labour and Mobility.

Smuggling of Female Migrant Workers from Myanmar to Thailand (ESA, 2014).

Stifel, D. C. (2010). The rural non-farm economy, livelihood strategies and household welfare.

Stifel, David. C (2010). The rural non-farm economy, livelihood strategies and household welfare.

Supang Chantavanich, (2012). Policy Review on Myanmar Economy, Bangkok Research Centre.

Tacoli, C. (2002). *Changing rural-urban interactions in sub-Saharan Africa and their impact on livelihoods: a summary* (Vol. 4). IIED.

Tacoli, C. (2005). *Livelihood diversification and rural-urban linkages in Vietnam's Red River Delta* (Vol. 11). IIED.

Tanner, T. M., Hassan, A., Islam, K. N., Conway, D., Mechler, R., Ahmed, A. U., & Alam, M. (2007). ORCHID: piloting climate risk screening in DFID Bangladesh. *Institute of Development Studies Research Report, Brighton, UK: IDS*.

The politics of migration and immigration in Europe (IOM, 2016).

The socio economic status of Rakhine State Working Paper (LIFT) Find 2018.

Todaro, M. P. (1969). A model of labor migration and urban unemployment in less developed countries. *The American economic review*, *59*(1), 138-148.

Vargas-Lundius, R., Lanly, G., Villarreal, M., & Osorio, M. (2008). International migration, remittances and rural development.

Waddington, H., & Sabates-Wheeler, R. (2003). *How does poverty affect migration choice: a review of the literature*. Development Research Centre on Migration, Globalisation and Poverty.

Wine (2008). Burmese labour migration into Thailand: governance of migration and labour rights. *Journal of the Asia Pacific Economy*, *15*(1), 33-44.

APPENDIX 1
" A STUDY ON THE EFFECT OF LABOUR MIGRATION ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF MIGRANT'S HOUSEHOLDS"
(Selected Villages in Myebon Township at Rakhine State)
Survey Questionnaire Socio-Economic characteristics of Migrant's Households

	Data Collecting Date	(-------- / --------- / --------)				
	Respondent No.					
1	Relation with Migrant	Relation	Male	Female	Age	Education
2	Age of Migrant					
3	Gender (Migrant)	Male		Female		
4	Education level of Migrant	Graduated	University Student	High School	Middle School	Primary School
5	Marital status of Migrant	Married	Single	Widow	Divorce	
6	Family members in Migrant Household	Adult (M)	Adult (F)	Child (1&2)	Above 2 children	
7	Number of Student in Migrant family	Graduate	University student	High	Middle	Primary
8	Former Job or Occupation of Migrant	Agricultural farmer	Fisherman	Odd job	Others	
9	Estimated income per year by household	Before		After		
10	Land Ownership	Farmland	Gardening	Cultivated land	Others	
11	Other ownership					
12	Reason for labour migration					
13	Monthly Expense	Before		After		

14	Education	Good	Fair	Bad
	Health	Good	Fair	Bad
	Invest for Business	Good	Fair	Bad
	Debt	Repay	Non	Unable
	Saving	Good	Fair	Bad
15	Economic status of the family	Fair	Normal	Poor
16	Properties owned by family	Own House	Rental	Living with Relative
17	Social Relationship	Good	Fair	Bad
18	What is reason of Migration?			
19	When did you start for migration?			
20	How much money was spend for arranging ticket, car, air, ect,…...? (MMK)			
21	How did migrant meet migration expenditure?	Household saving		
		Borrow from friend		
		Loan from Money		
		Others		
22	Who support to link for starting migration?			
23	How did migrant reach that country?	Formal (------)		Informal (-------)
24	What is the country of migration?	Thailand	China	Malaysia	Others
25	Who support migrant to get the job?	Family	Friend	Broker	Others
26	Types of Job	Skills labour	Unskilled labour	Others, if any
27	The frequency of remittance to family			

28	The amount of remittance to family			
29	What are the uses of received remittances?	House pair		
		Repay Debt		
		Education expense		
		Productive Investment		
		Contribution for village infrastructure		
		Contribution for religious affairs		
		Others		
30	Household's ownership of productive assets	Before -		After -
31	Household' s ownership of non-productive assets	Before -		After -
32	Good Enough in the Use of Remittance on Health Expenditure normal	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
33	Land purchasing	Farmland	Gardening land	Cultivated land	Others
	Expenses for agricultural sector	Cattle		Machinery	Others
	Investment amount	Business	Livestock	Fishery	Trading	Others	Total
34	Expenditure of luxury item	Motor cycle	Bicycle	TV	Radio	Phone	Others
35	Access to livelihood opportunity of training for family	Very good	Good	No Change	Bad
36	Frequency of home visits	Period (---------)		Frequency (----------)	
37	Changes in social relationship before migration	Very good	Good	No Change	Bad
38	Changes in social relationship after migration	Very good	Good	No Change	Bad

39	Satisfaction for remittance of migrant	Very good	Good	No Change	Bad
40	What is expected your plan to meet your family target?	Very good	Good	No Change	Bad
41	Which remittance transfer channel migrant practice?	Hundi	Company	Local Agent	Others
42	There is any benefit or not for community and migrant families that migration to abroad, why ?	Yes	No	Reason-	
43	Do you provide overall your observation on that migration to abroad be better than working within your community? Do you consider which opportunities or which activities are needed to meet better income for your community?				

Thank you so much for your kind cooperation !