

IOM THAILAND

MULTI-SECTORAL ASSESSMENT OF NEEDS



PHUKET FACTSHEET

MAY - JUNE 2024

 IOM
UN MIGRATION | MIGRATION
DATA AND
RESEARCH UNIT



From
the People of Japan



Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

DISCLAIMER: This map is for illustration purposes only. The boundaries and names shown and the designations used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the International Organization for Migration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
DEMOGRAPHICS.....	2
MIGRATION HISTORY.....	3
DOCUMENTATION.....	4
EDUCATION.....	5
EMPLOYMENT.....	6
FOOD SECURITY AND LIVELIHOOD.....	7
PROTECTION.....	8
CHILD PROTECTION.....	9
HEALTH.....	10
WASH AND SHELTER.....	11

The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the International Organization for Migration (IOM). The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout the publication do not imply expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of IOM concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning its frontiers or boundaries.

IOM is committed to the principle that humane and orderly migration benefits migrants and society. As an intergovernmental organization, IOM acts with its partners in the international community to: assist in meeting the operational challenges of migration; advance understanding of migration issues; encourage social and economic development through migration; and uphold the human dignity and well-being of migrants.

This publication was made possible through support provided by the US Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM), European Union Humanitarian Aid (ECHO), and Government of Japan. The opinions expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the aforementioned parties.

Publisher: IOM Thailand

18th Floor, Rajanakarn Building, 3 South Sathorn Road, Bangkok 10120 Thailand

Tel: (+66) 2-343-9300

Email: DTMThailand@iom.int

Website: <https://dtm.iom.int/thailand>

This publication has been issued without formal editing by IOM. This publication has been issued without IOM Publications Unit (PUB) approval for adherence to IOM's brand and style standards. This publication was issued without IOM Research Unit (RES) endorsement.

Required citation: International Organization for Migration (IOM), 2024. *Multi-Sectoral Assessment of Needs 2023: Phuket Factsheet*. IOM Thailand, Bangkok.

© IOM 2024

Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 IGO License \(CC BY-NC-ND 3.0 IGO\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/igo/).*

For further specifications please see the [Copyright and Terms of Use](#).

This publication should not be used, published or redistributed for purposes primarily intended for or directed towards commercial advantage or monetary compensation, with the exception of educational purposes, e.g. to be included in textbooks.

* <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/igo/legalcode>

Overview of the Multi-Sectoral Assessment of Needs

This factsheet aims to provide a snapshot of multi-sectoral conditions, needs, and challenges among Myanmar migrants in Phuket as captured between May and June 2024 by IOM Thailand’s multi-sectoral assessment of needs. The purpose of this assessment is to provide insights regarding the severity of needs among migrant populations, identify vulnerable population groups and geographic areas with the most acute needs, inform assistance planning and relevant Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) targets, and provide sectoral and inter-sectoral baselines for future assessments.

Methodology

The tool was developed by IOM’s Migration Data and Research Unit (MDRU) in collaboration with various sectoral IOM units specialized in labor, health, protection topics, among others. The survey is conducted at household level, but also includes questions for which the respondent had to answer on behalf of every member of their household (for example, the ages of all members of the household). IOM surveyed a representative sample randomly selected within the population of interest, which included Myanmar migrants in Phuket. IOM sought an equal balance between female and male respondents. Answers from 621 respondents were analysed. Counting all respondents and their household members, 1,525 individuals are represented by this assessment.

Due to the high number of indicators of interest, the survey was split into two tools: tool 1 focusing on questions about multi-sectoral conditions (MSA) and tool 2 on access to services (ASI). Respondents were interviewed using either one of these tools, never both. Some questions, however, particularly those regarding demographics and migration history, were covered in both tools to understand the basic profiles of all participating respondents and their households. As a result, the sample size for data analysis varies between indicators. Questions which appeared only in one of the tools but were answered by all respondents remain representative at a 90 per cent confidence interval with a 5 per cent margin of error. Questions which were covered in both tools have a 95 per cent confidence interval with a 5 per cent margin of error.


Primary data collection period

Data was collected from 19 May to 11 June 2024.

Limitations


Certain indicators may be under-reported or over-reported, due to the subjectivity and perceptions of respondents (especially “social desirability bias”— the documented tendency of people to provide what they perceive to be the “right” answers to certain questions). These biases should be taken into consideration when interpreting findings. In addition, the findings are representative for the assessed provinces, but cannot be extrapolated to other regions of Thailand. Some questions were only asked to a subset of respondents who answered affirmatively to preceding questions. The analysis on subsets of respondents should only be considered as indicative, as the sample size of the subsets does not meet the threshold required to be statistically significant. Also, graph titles with an asterisk denote questions where respondents could provide multiple answers. As a result, the totals for these graphs may exceed 100 per cent. Finally, where the percentage reported is zero, this does not necessarily imply that zero cases were recorded for a particular answer. It can instead indicate that the case number was so low that the results were rounded down to zero.

Provinces where the survey was implemented




The gender makeup of respondents was 51 per cent women and 49 per cent men. No respondents identified as other gender. The average age among respondents was 36 years and the average number of people living in surveyed households was 2.4. Regarding vulnerabilities, no households reported having a member with a disability.


RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS



Men



Women



Other gender



Average age

HOUSEHOLD STATISTICS

2.4




Average number of people living in surveyed households

25%







Percentage of households with at least one child

Age pyramid of all individuals in respondent households



Origin regions/states in Myanmar (top 3 labeled)




Among surveyed migrants in Phuket, the top three states or regions of origin were Magway (33%), Tanintharyi (29%), and Mon (12%). Some respondents (35%) reported that their most recent migration to Thailand occurred sometime after the military takeover in Myanmar in February 2021. Of these more recent arrivals, 33 per cent indicated that they had lived in Thailand for a total of three years or longer, 32 per cent had lived in Thailand for around two years total, and 35 per cent around one year total (this includes living in Thailand during prior migrations). Among all respondents, 30 per cent reported having engaged in repeat migration to Thailand. The average cost of migration was 16,464 THB (around 449 USD). Respondents indicated paying for services and components such as brokers (85%), travel (43%), documentation (28%), recruitment agencies (2%), and employers (2%).

Since their most recent migration to Thailand, 32 per cent of respondents have visited Myanmar, including 13 per cent of respondents whose most recent migration took place sometime after the military takeover in Myanmar. Among all respondents, 16 per cent intended to visit Myanmar within the following year. At the same time, 46 per cent responded that they did not know whether they would visit Myanmar in the future and 33 per cent had no intentions of doing so. Meanwhile, 71 per cent intend to return permanently to Myanmar sometime in the future.


Most migrants (82%) reported having the valid documentation required to stay in country, although 18 per cent of respondents are considered to be in an irregular situation due to holding incorrect or expired documentation, or no documentation at all. Among those who do possess documentation, the most common types included having an certificate of identity or temporary passport (53%), labour card (36%), and international passport (27%). However, 8 per cent were not aware of how long their documents permitted them to stay in Thailand.

A share of respondents (5%) indicated having arrived in Thailand under its Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with Myanmar during their most recent migration. Of these, 9 per cent are not aware of the expiration date of their documentation and none indicated that their MoU agreement is already expired. A further 10 per cent are not aware about the expiration of their work permit and 7 per cent indicate that their work permit is already expired.

Based on respondents' information on the documentation status of each individual in assessed households, 80 per cent of households are completely documented, meaning every member has some form of documentation allowing them to stay in Thailand. In 9 per cent of households, over half of all members are documented. However, in 8 per cent of households, less than half of all members are documented, and in an additional 3 per cent of households, no one is documented. Regarding regularization windows that permit undocumented migrants to become documented, respondents were most likely to have begun a regularization process already but have not yet completed it (50%).




Awareness of regularization windows for migrants in Thailand and how to use them




Among adults in assessed households, 43 per cent had less than a primary school education, 34 per cent completed primary school, 17 per cent completed lower secondary school, and 6 per cent had completed upper secondary school or higher. Among all individuals in assessed households, 7 per cent had reached the expected level of education for their age (for example, those between 11 and 15 years old are expected to have completed primary school).

Among children in assessed households, 71 per cent were not attending school or other learning facilities.¹ Overall, 95 per cent of households with primary school-aged children reported experiencing barriers sending children to school. The same was true for 97 per cent of households with secondary school-aged children.




Type of learning spaces attended by children in assessed households




Main barriers to sending children to school^{1,2}


Among primary school-aged girls




Among primary school-aged boys



Among secondary school-aged girls



Among secondary school-aged boys



¹ 25 per cent of households had children (n=158).

² Among respondents who cited experiencing barriers sending children to school (8 primary school-aged girls, 16 primary school-aged boys, 17 secondary school-aged girls, 20 secondary school-aged boys).



9.4


Average number of months respondents were employed in the last year



1.4


Average number of employers respondents had in the 12 months prior to being interviewed

Respondent work sectors*



In addition, 1% of respondents reported working in an unlisted sector.

Possession of contracts among respondents who worked in the past year






400 THB

Median daily wage³ among respondents (around 11 USD). Approximately 40% reported earning below minimum wage (354 THB).

Reception of wages and benefits during employment






Regarding employment, over half of the respondents had been employed for all 12 months in the last year (56%), while 10 per cent were employed for five or fewer months and 8 per cent did not work at all in the last year. Among those who worked within the year prior, the most common work sectors included construction (57%), services (15%), and domestic work (11%). Additionally, 5 per cent reported being self-employed and 2 per cent reported doing sub-contracting work, meaning they would participate in a variety of work sectors and have multiple employers.

Regarding agreements with employers, 42 per cent of respondents who worked reported having made a contract, with 5 per cent having a written contract and 37 per cent having only a verbal one.


On average, respondents reported working 24.1 days in the month prior to assessment. The median daily wage reported in Phuket province was 400 THB per day (11 USD). Furthermore, 40 per cent of respondents were earning below minimum wage (354 THB per day). In addition, 20 per cent reported not receiving all agreed upon wages and benefits during their employment.

³ The median daily wage represents the cut off where 50 per cent of respondents earn less than the median and 50 per cent earn more.

Food-related indicators




Top 3 sources of food*




Livelihood-related indicators



Average change in household economic status in the past year




Average change in household cost of living in the past year



Top 3 sources of income*



Top 3 reasons for debt*



Overall, findings regarding food security showed a positive result for most respondents. The Food Consumption Score was acceptable for 91 per cent of households, and 93 per cent indicated no or little hunger, as measured by the Household Hunger Scale. Regarding expenditures, 4 per cent of households spend a high or very high percentage of their household budget on food. Furthermore, 12 per cent of households scored high on the reduced Coping Strategy Index, which captures how many days a household had to adopt coping strategies to deal with lack of food or money to buy it.

Respondents indicated that, on average, their economic status slightly deteriorated in the past year while their household cost of living somewhat increased. Household debt was not uncommon (36%), with households owing 37,389 THB (around 1,020 USD) on average. Reasons for debt included housing (53%), migration costs (45%), and food 37%). Additionally, the average percentage of household expenditure on debt was 4.3 per cent.

Roughly half (49%) of households reported sending remittances in the last month. Regarding savings, 53 per cent of respondents reported spending more than they earned in the last month.

Savings distribution









Regarding perceptions of safety, the most common risks to adults cited by respondents include substance abuse (48%), forced labour (21%), and domestic violence (21%).

Overall, 61 per cent of respondents were not aware of any services available to them. Among those who were aware, they were most likely to know about medical services (19%).

Respondents were also asked whether they agree or disagree with statements related to gender roles and perceptions about responsibilities in the household. In general, respondents had positive views about gender equality, with the majority agreeing that women should participate in making important decisions in the household (84%) and be able to express their own opinions in the household (86%). On the other hand, 66 per cent agreed that men should be the providers of their families. In addition, 18 per cent agreed that a person should tolerate being beaten by their partner in order to keep the family together.

Based on several proxy indicators, 13 per cent of respondents were classified as living in locations with possible trafficking risks.

Top 3 risks faced by adults*



Child marriage was found to be present in 21 per cent of households with children. Child labour was found in none of the assessed households. At the same time, respondents cited child marriage as primary risks to girls and child labour as a main risk to both girls and boys. Among respondent households, none were hosting a child who was a non-relative of the respondent.



21% Percentage of households with child marriage




1% Percentage of households where children are working over the legal allowances




0% Percentage of households with a child who is not a relative of the respondent

Main risks faced by girls in respondents' locations*




Main risks faced by boys in respondents' locations*



Regarding access to health, 31 per cent of respondents reported having household members who were in need of healthcare services in the last three months. Among these, 69 per cent went to formal healthcare providers, 26 per cent went to informal, and 5 per cent chose not to access healthcare despite their need. Barriers to healthcare were experienced by 12 per cent of respondents, who cited language (53%) as the most common barrier. Regarding children's vaccinations, 71 per cent of children were reported to be up-to-date on their vaccinations and 85 per cent possessed an immunisation card.

Regarding health insurance, 15 per cent of households lacked any insurance. However, in 56 per cent of households, every member had some form of insurance. Among those who reported their health insurance as being difficult or very difficult to use, the main reasons included misunderstandings about what percent of costs is covered and how to make a claim.


Health Access Class*




Health access class is based on where household members have sought healthcare in the last three months. Formal health locations include government, private, or NGO hospitals or clinics. Informal include traditional healers, pharmacies, and others.

Health insurance indicators


Proportion of household members with insurance




Types of insurance among respondents





Average rating of usability of health insurance




Top 3 reasons why using health insurance is difficult or very difficult*






Top 3 barriers to accessing health services*




Diseases among households in the past 6 months*



Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH)-related indicators




Waste disposal methods*




Shelter-related indicators

Shelter-type Class



Payment of accommodation



With regards to WASH indicators, the majority (92%) of respondents lived in areas with safe sources of drinking water. At the same time, 41 per cent lived in the vicinity of visible waste or trash and 34 per cent lived in the vicinity of waste or stagnant water.

Regarding shelter indicators, respondents were asked about the building materials of their accommodation in order to calculate shelter type on a scale of very low to high structural integrity, with 38 per cent found to have poor to very poor structural integrity. Among respondent accommodations, 2 per cent were shared with the respondent's employer. Additionally, 51 per cent were owned by the respondent's employer. Almost half (48%) of the respondents paid rent for their accommodations.

Among surveyed migrants in Phuket, 98 per cent had access to the electricity grid and 19 per cent used renewable energy.



MIGRATION
DATA AND
RESEARCH UNIT