

Summary

Paper submitted for consideration for the session 1004 and 1006

At the XXV IUSSP International Conference, 2005

Urban Poverty and In-migration in capital city of Mongolia

Solongo Alгаа /PhD follow, IUSSP member since 1999/

Director

Population Teaching and Research Center (PTRC),

Mongolian National University

SUMMARY

“Urban poverty and in-migration in Ulaanbaatar” is a survey covering 1500 randomly selected households in Ulaanbaatar as well as 4070 people from ger areas and 2777 persons from apartment areas.

The main objectives of the survey are to determine the living standards of the population in Ulaanbaatar based on their income and consumption expenditures and to study the complexity of poverty and migration. In order to reach to the main objectives the following issues are explored:

- To determine the main sources of household income and consumption expenditures;
- To determine the access to and quality of social services;
- To establish basic poverty indicators by type of dwelling and by migrants and non-migrants;
- To find out in Ulaanbaatar, the main reasons of migration, and the accessibility of social services for unregistered migrants;
- To determine the relation between poverty and migration;
- To determine characteristics of poor and identify the people in the greatest need and in order to develop policy recommendation;

The main questions and findings are reported below.

CHARACTERISTICS OF INDIVIDUALS AND HOUSEHOLDS

- The overall level of education of residents of apartment areas is higher than that of residents of ger areas.
- Out of people aged 15-64 years about 14.6 percent migrated during the last four years. The majority of migrants (79.5 percent) live in ger areas.
- Majority of all households had 3-5 members (63.4 percent), and in most households (83.5 percent), there was one nuclear family in the household.
- Out of total households, 17.9 percent live in ger dwelling.

EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME

Key questions

- How is the employment participation rate?

Summary

- How many people are unemployed? How does this look for key-subgroups?
- What are main sources of income?

Key answers and conclusions:

- The employed participation rate is 42.4 percent.
- Unemployment rate is 22.9 percent. Unemployment rate is high among the population in ger area (29.5 percent), females (23.2 percent) and migrants (24.6 percent).
- There is a clear link between education and employment.
- The sources of income are: 67.5 percent of income comes from labour earnings, 18.2 percent from gifts, transfers etc, 8.4 percent from pensions and allowances.

ACCESS TO EDUCATION AND HEALTH

Key questions

- Who are less educated?
- Who does not have access to social services?

Key answers and conclusions

- Education level of men in ger areas are relatively low.
- 38.4 percent of youth aged 26-35 have completed secondary education. They face a lack of possibilities to get a professional job.
- One third of children from households who have migrated to suburban areas have to travel more than two kilometers to get to their schools.
- Due to overcrowded classrooms in the city and lack of schools in the periphery increases the load of the secondary schools.
- The rate of medical insurance coverage for informal employees, men and persons in ger areas is unsatisfactory.
- Of the migrant households in ger areas, 28 percent are located 3 or more km away from a family hospital.
- The focus groups point to a need to improve the quality of the social services.
- More investment is needed for the construction of new schools and kindergartens in ger areas.

AWARENESS, INFORMATION AND SOCIAL CAPITAL

Key questions

- How is the information on socio-economic project as well as the programmes advertised in the city?
- How is the situation of “social capital” for various sub-groups

Key answers and conclusions

- Even though more than half of households were informed of government projects and programmes for the support of livelihood capacity of the population, the beneficiaries of them are estimated to be less than 10%.
- The percentage of beneficiary households is higher with green revolution programme and savings and loan projects than other programmes.
- There appears to be inadequate information about the availability of programmes for improvement of livelihood of the population in the city.
- Low income households have less opportunities to turn trainings into benefits from the training. Even though there is no difference between households in terms of training participation rates, poor households are almost three times less likely than better off households to state that they benefited from the training.
- Well to do households participate less in community work

Summary

- The kinship/khuree supports the livelihood of households, but for migrants, people in ger area, poor and very poor households a kinship/khuree is very limited.

POVERTY

Key questions

- What is the level of poverty in Ulaanbaatar?
- Who are the poor?
- What are the priorities for intervention?

Key answers and conclusions:

- 33 percent of the Ulaanbaatar population lives below the poverty line of 25,300 Tug per capita. 10 percent are very poor (i.e. expenditure below 60 percent of the poverty line).
- Poverty is higher in Ger areas and among migrants (45 percent and 37 percent).
- However, there is less inequality within those living in ger areas. The same can/cannot be said for migrants.
- The poor are typically younger, less well educated and more frequently not married. They live overwhelmingly in ger areas, especially Bayanzurkh. Their household size tends to be larger and they are more frequently headed by females.
- Target groups for intervention should therefore be households with many members in ger areas, and possibly also households where the head of households has not completed secondary school.
- Priorities for action are improving housing and sanitation conditions. Access to health services and education looks comparatively good. The issue there is about improving quality.
- Registration is not an issue that is related to poverty. Poor are registered by the same proportion as poor. Moreover, almost 90 percent are registered.
- 60 percent of the Kazakh population (4.3 percent) are poor. This is an issue worth of further investigation.

MIGRATION

Key questions

- Who are the migrants?
- What are the main reasons for migration? Have they changed over time?
- Does the registration status influence migration flow?
- Is there a link between poverty and migration?
- What are the priorities for intervention of the government?

Key answers and conclusions

- Migrants to the city predominantly live in ger area, with a majority of them having less than complete secondary education.
- A majority of the migrants are in search of employment, better livelihood, further studies and closer access to markets. Over time, employment, better livelihood and closer access to markets have gained in relevance, whereas educational needs have declined. Hence, migration can be considered to be increasingly need driven.
- Out of the migrants, (71 percent) said that their expectations have been met.
- Registration status does not help to reduce the migration flow into Ulaanbaatar (half of the migrants are not registered). However, lack of registration is cited by those migrants without health insurance (one third) as one of the main reasons for not having health insurance (a quarter of those without health insurance stated lack of registration as the reason).

Summary

- Migrants are not poorer because they are migrants, they are poor because they have lower education levels, for example. Migrants seem to face the same opportunities that the non-migrants face, their problem seems to be that they lack some qualifications in a bit greater extent than the non-migrants
- In order to reduce the drive for migration it would be best to improve the economic and education situation in the areas of origin.