

Sample Survey on FDMN Aspirations, Perception and Influence Agents



Dated January 2018

by
Research and Evaluation Division (RED), BRAC
In partnership with
Amnesty International

Sample Survey
on
FDMN Aspirations, Perception and Influence Agents

Dated: January 2018.

by

Research and Evaluation Division (RED), BRAC

In partnership with

Amnesty International

Sample selection and data collection

The sampling calculation is done based on the response rate on willingness to be repatriated among FDMNs. It is assumed that 50% FDMNs are willing to go back to their home country. Based on this assumption the calculated sample size is 384 at 95% confidence interval. Considering 10% non-response rate, total sample would be end up with 420 households. We consider top five camps according to the population size. Population based proportional sampling technique is followed to determine the sample size for each camp. Every fifth household from south-western corner of the camp would be selected as sample. The data collection personnel would approach anti-clock wise from that corner.

Findings

Respondents' information

Seventy percent of the respondents are found to be male in the survey whereas, 30 percent are female. In Table 1, distribution of respondents' sex in different camps are shown. Data shows, in Nayapara camp around 53 percent of the respondents are female, which is the highest among the camps. In Thangkhali camp, only 12 percent of the respondents are found female, which is the lowest in the distribution. Average age of male respondents is found 41 years whereas female respondents are aged on an average 37 years.

Table 1: Respondents' sex

Camp name	Respondents' Sex (Frequency)		Respondents' Sex (Percent)	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Kutupalong	166	80	67	33
Balukhali	84	22	79	21
Nayapara	8	9	47	53
Unchiprang	9	7	56	44
Thangkhali	22	3	88	12
Total	289	121	70	30

Most of the respondents do not know how to read and write (see Table 2). It is found that 60 percent of male respondents and 88 percent of female respondents cannot read or write. Compared to the female, more of the male respondents can read and write. Data shows that around 39 percent of male respondents can read and write. On the other hand, only seven percent of female respondents reported can read and write.

Table 2: Literacy status of the respondents

Sex	Percent				
	Read	Write	Both	None	Total
Male	0	1	39	60	100
Female	5	0	7	88	100

Household information

A total of 410 FDMN households are surveyed in six camps. Table 3 shows camp wise distribution of sample households. Around 60 percent of total sample households live in Kutupalong camp, which is the highest among six camps. Data also shows, around 26 percent sample households are from Balukhali camp, which is the second highest. Apart from that, six percent households live in Thangkhali camp and around four percent households live in each of Nayapara and Unchiprang camps. Average household size is found 6.3 in the survey.

Table 3: Camp wise distribution of sample households

Camp name	Frequency	Percent
Kutupalong	246	60
Balukhali	106	26
Nayapara	17	4
Unchiprang	16	4
Thangkhali	25	6
Total	410	100

Table 4 shows arrival years of sample households in Bangladesh. Data shows, FDMN households, living in the camps in Bangladesh, first came in 1992. Around three percent of the households reported that they arrived in Bangladesh in 1992. Apart from that, according to data, around five percent households reported 2012 as their arrival year and six percent households arrived in Bangladesh in 2016. Most of the households, which is around 86 percent, entered into Bangladesh after the Myanmar military insurgents in August of 2017.

Table 4: Arrival year of sample households in Bangladesh

Arrival year	Frequency	Percent
1992	11	3
2012	20	5
2016	25	6
2017 (after August)	354	86
Total	410	100

Sample households were resided in different districts in Myanmar, however, most of them (around 85 percent) lived in Muangdaw district (see Table 5). Apart from this, data shows that about seven percent of sample households lived in Butthiduang district. Around one percent sample households came from Ratheduang district and eight percent came from other different districts of Myanmar. It is worth to note that before leaving their home districts their average household size was 7.5.

Table 5: Home district of sample households in Myanmar

Home district in Myanmar	Arrival year				Total	Percent
	1992	2012	2016	2017		
Muangdaw	1	9	18	320	348	84.9
Butthiduang	5	3	2	18	28	6.8
Ratheduang	0	0	2	0	2	0.5
Others	5	8	3	16	32	7.8
Total	11	20	25	354	410	100.0

Table 6 presents the occupational distribution of sample households. Agriculture was the most preferred occupation among sample households. Around half of them (45 percent) chose agriculture as the main occupation of household. About 15 percent households reported business of non-food item was their main occupation in Myanmar. Apart from that, business of food items (nine percent), fishing (nine percent), day-labourer (eight percent), and private service (three percent) including others were their main occupations.

Table 6: Households' main occupation at Myanmar

Main occupation	Frequency	Percent
Agriculture	183	45
Fishing	36	9
Day labourer	31	8
Business (Food)	37	9
Business (non-food)	63	15
Craftsmanship	1	0
Private service	11	3
Govt. service	3	1
Mason	10	2
Others	35	9
Total	410	100

Average monthly income of sample households in Myanmar was 1,088,428 Kyat (USD 805)¹. In Table 7, data shows that households which left Myanmar in 1992 earned 611,091 Kyat (USD452) per month. Sample households which left Myanmar in 2012 and 2016 earned significantly higher in a month compared to the others. Average monthly income of sample households which arrived Bangladesh in 2012

¹ 1 USD = 1351 Kyat. Ref.: www.xe.com. Dated: 8 January 2018.

and 2016 are 2,715,500 Kyat (USD 2,009) and 2,499,733 Kyat (USD 1,850), respectively. Sample households which arrived Bangladesh in 2017 reported their average monthly income in Myanmar was 1,088,428 Kyat (USD 805).

Table 7: Monthly income of sample households in Myanmar²

Arrival year	Mean Income (Kyat)	Mean Income (USD)
1992	611,091	452
2012	2,715,500	2,009
2016	2,499,733	1,850
2017 (after August)	911,667	675
Total	1,088,428	805

Table 8 presents the monetary valuation of property loss of sample households. It is observed from data that on an average households lost their property worth of 51,073,732 Kyat (USD 37,795).

Table 8: Loss of property in Myanmar due to the military insurgents

Arrival year	Mean loss (Kyat)	Mean loss (USD)
1992	13,775,455	10,194
2012	9,355,000	6,923
2016	100,472,000	74,349
2017 (after August)	51,101,130	37,815
Total sample	51,073,732	37,795

Despite the property loss, around 19 percent of sample households reported that at least one of their household members was killed in Myanmar during the atrocity before fleeing to Bangladesh (see Table 9). Apart from this, about half of sample households (48 percent) reported that at least one of their household members was physically tortured during the military insurgents. Most important to note that, nine out of hundred households reported at least one of their female household members was raped in Myanmar. According to the latest figure published by IOM in January 2018, the estimated total number of Rohingya in Cox's Bazaar to be 867,500³. Considering the estimated household size 6.25 from this survey there should be around 138,800 households are currently living in different camps in Bangladesh. So, it can be said that in 26,372 households lost at least one of their household members, members of 66,624 households were physically tortured, and at least one female member from each of 12,492 households were raped during the military crackdown in Myanmar.

Table 9: Household members were killed

Arrival year	Yes (percent)	No (Percent)	Total N
1992	0	100	11
2012	15	85	20

² Incomes presented in the table are not inflation adjusted.

³ See: <https://iom.org.bd/news/rohingya-arrivals-bangladesh-hit-655000-winter-weather-brings-new-shelter-health-challenges/>

2016	16	84	25
2017 (after August)	19	81	354
Total	19	81	410

Present situation in camps

It is noted earlier that, on an average there are 6 members in each household living in the camps in Cox's Bazar. Eighty eight percent of surveyed households reported that they are happy or somewhat happy with the current living condition in their camps (see Table 10). Twelve percent household expressed their dissatisfaction about camps' living condition. Data shows that, dissatisfaction is comparatively higher among the households who arrived Bangladesh in 1992. More of the newer households expressed satisfaction regarding camps' living condition.

Table 10: Perception about camps' living condition

Arrival year	Happy (%)	Somewhat happy (%)	Not happy (%)
1992	18.2	36.4	45.5
2012	45.0	50.0	5.0
2016	48.0	44.0	8.0
2017 (after august)	59.6	29.1	11.3
Total	57.1	31.2	11.7

This survey collected average monthly income of households. Households earn mainly from relief and some petty jobs around the host communities. Data shows that households' average monthly income is 4,248 BDT (USD 51)⁴. Around 76 percent of monthly income comes from relief and rest 24 percent comes from members' jobs. However, only 23 percent of sample households reported that current monthly income is adequate to live well (see Table 11).

Table 11: Perception about income adequacy

Income adequacy	Frequency	Percent
Yes	96	23.4
No	314	76.6
Total	410	100.0

Seventy seven percent of sample households feel that current condition of the camps will be improving gradually. They opined that providing more relief, improve basic and health services, opening schools for their kids, and creating job opportunities can improve their current living condition significantly (see Table 12).

⁴ USD 1 = 83.26 BDT. Ref.: www.xe.com. Dated: 9 January 2018.

Table 12: Households' perception on how camps' living condition can be improved

Strategy	Percent
More relief	52
Job opportunities in the camp	10
Improved basic services	56
Improved health services	50
Opened schools	24
Expanded cooperation from the host	10
Others	26

Repatriation

Most of the sample households do not discuss about their returns to the Myanmar (see Table 13). Data shows that around 43 percent of the households do not discuss about repatriation. Only 18 percent households are found to be discussing about repatriation.

Table 13: Frequency of discussion about repatriation among households

Frequency of discussion	Percent
Often	18
Sometimes	39
No	43
Total	100

Another data shows, only half of sample households are aware about the 'repatriation deal' between Myanmar and Bangladesh. They learned it from different sources like friends or relatives, *Majhi*, and social media like YouTube (table 14).

Table 14: Sources of information about the repatriation deal

Source of information	Percent
From Majhi	14
From Friend/Relatives	68
From Imam	3
From Newspaper	3
From YouTube/Radio/etc.	23
Others	20

Only about four percent of sample households said 'yes' replying the question 'are you planning to return soon?' (see Table 15). Sixty four percent opined that they plan to return back to Myanmar if some conditions like citizenship, security of protection, compensation for losses, assurance of justice are met (see Table 16).

On the other hand, which households do not want to repatriate are planning to setup their lives in Bangladesh by getting jobs, start new business, and send their children in schools (see Table 17). However, about half of them do not have any plan but to stay in Bangladesh.

Table 15: Perception about repatriation plan

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	15	3.7
Conditionally	263	64.2
Not sure	59	14.4
No	73	17.8
Total	410	100.0

Table 16: Encouraging factors regarding FDMN households for repatriation

Encouraging factor	Percent
Citizenship	87
Compensation for loss	52
Assurance of justice	37
Free movement and Passport	33
Security and Protection	54
Livelihood support	14
Others	26

Table 17: Planning of households which have no plan to repatriate

Plan	Percent
I hope to get a job	31
I want to learn new skills	3
I plan to start a business	11
I plan to send my children to school	11
I have no plan	46
Others	20

Data analyses show that households with comparatively much higher monthly income in Myanmar want to repatriate with expectation of meeting some conditions (presented in Table 16). Average monthly income in Myanmar of repatriation interested and non-interested households are found to be 1,318,436 Kyat (USD 976) and 604,015 Kyat (USD 447), respectively. In addition to that, 61 percent of households which arrived Bangladesh before August 2017 and 67 percent of households which arrived Bangladesh after August 2017 want to repatriate. Apart from this, an occupation wise distribution of repatriation interested households is given in the Table 18.

Table 18: Occupation wise distribution of repatriation interested households

Occupation	Repatriation plan (percent)			
	Yes		No	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Agriculture	118	64	65	36
Fishing	28	78	8	22
Day labourer	20	64	11	36
Business (Food)	27	73	10	27
Business (non-food)	42	67	21	33
Craftsmanship	1	100	0	0
Private service	6	55	5	45
Govt. service	2	67	1	33
Mason	7	70	3	30
Others	28	80	7	20

Households, which have plan to repatriate upon meeting some conditions (see Table 16), are asked to express their perception whether these condition will be met or not. Interestingly, only nine percent households think that these condition may meet in Myanmar. On the other hand, 66 percent think that these condition will not be met. Twenty five percent households do not have any idea.

Households replied that when repatriation moment will appear they will discuss with *Majhi*, family and friends in camp and Myanmar, and Rohingya leaders including others to take decision (see Table 19).

Table 19: With whom household will discuss about repatriation

	Percent
Majhi	53.9
Family/Friends in the camp	37.6
Family/Friends in Myanmar	5.9
Imam	4.2
Rohingya leaders	15.1
Aid workers	6.8
Others	19.0

Answering the question 'if the GoB/UN wants to consult about your return in Myanmar who should they consult to', sample households noted different names which are presented in the Table 20. It is found that the households will consult about repatriation with Majhi, own self, community/Rohingya leader, aid donors, GoB including others.

Table 20: Person/institution to be consulted about repatriation

Person/ institution	Frequency	Percent
Majhi	201	49
Directly myself	40	9.8
Community Leader/Rohingya Leader	39	9.5
Aid Donors	24	5.9
Bangladesh Govt.	22	5.4
Educated Person	19	4.6
Do not know/No idea	19	4.6
Myanmar Govt.	12	2.9
Head Majhi	12	2.9
Teacher/Imam	12	2.9
Elder Member in the Community	11	2.7
Guardian in Family	7	1.7
Chairman	5	1.2
Muslim/Other Country Leader	5	1.2
NGO worker	5	1.2
Myanmar Military	1	0.2

FDMN households' perception about situation in Myanmar

More than half of sample households (54 percent) are aware about the current situation in Myanmar, however, rest of them have no idea about what is going on in their left places. *Majhi*, friends and relatives in camps and Myanmar, YouTube, and Rohingya leaders are the main sources of information (see Table 21), opined the households.

Table 21: Source of information about current situation in Myanmar

Source of information	Percent
Majhi	6.4
Family/Friends in the camp	60.0
Family/Friends in Myanmar	33.2
Imam	0.9
Rohingya leaders	4.6
Myanmar Newspaper	2.7
YouTube/etc.	16.8
Local Newspaper	0.9
Others	25.5

Households are asked that if they return back to Myanmar whether the *Maghs* will welcome them or not. About 87 percent household thinks that the *Maghs* will not accept them cordially in Myanmar if they

return back. Ten percent of sample households is unsure about the attitude of Maghs and only three percent thinks that the *Maghs* may welcome them in Myanmar.

Most of the households (89 percent) do not hope that they could return to their normal life if they get chances to return back in Myanmar. Security threats, atrocity by Myanmar military, hostility of neighbours, and destruction of assets and livelihoods are the main impediments to live a normal life in Myanmar (see Table 22).

Table 22: Major impediments to live a normal life in Myanmar

Impediments	Percent
Hostile neighbours	48.6
Hostile government agents	58.2
Destruction of assets/Livelihood	30.1
More restriction to basic services	15.0
Security threats	71.9
Others	19.1