



**Papua New Guinea University of Technology,
Department of Business Studies
Economics Section**

BY LONDARI YAMARAK (MR)



**IMPACTS OF MIGRATION ON THE
LIVELIHOODS OF URBAN SETTLERS:
A CASE OF PORT MORESBY.**

OUTLINES

- Introduction
- Objectives
- Methodology
- Results
- Conclusion



INTRODUCTION

- Migration can have significant impacts on affected individuals and households, reducing food and income security in particular.
- In this project we investigated the impacts of migration on individuals who are currently living in Port Moresby those who migrated.



OBJECTIVES

- To find out if migrating Improved (not improved) their Livelihood
- To find out their main livelihood activities whilst in Port Moresby,
- To find out about their income security, food security and their overall well-being.



METHODS

- The conceptual framework employed was a modified version of the sustainable livelihoods framework (SLF).



CONT....

- Our null hypothesis was that there would be no impact of migration on the livelihoods.



CONT...

- Current and retrospective survey data were collected by personal interviews from 56 respondents in Port Moresby, Gerehu.



CONT...

- Measures of household capital were derived using principle component analysis, or directly from survey responses.
- Six mutually exclusive livelihood strategies were identified using cluster analysis.



CONT...

- The augmented difference-in-difference approach was used to evaluate the impacts of migration on measures of household capital, livelihood choice, measures of food and income security and two subjective measures of overall wellbeing.



RESULTS (1) – IMPACTS ON HOUSEHOLD CAPITAL

Regressor [†]	Physical/Financial Capital	Social Capital	Human Capital
Time (T)	0.023 (0.153)	-0.022 (0.142)	0.202*** (0.080)
Migrant (M)	-0.02 (0.157)	-0.322** (0.142)	0.152* (0.081)
T*M	-0.574*** (0.217)	-0.283 (0.204)	-0.403*** (0.113)

[†]Control variables are not shown, * = significant at 10% level, ** = significant at 5% level, *** = significant at 1% level



RESULTS (2) – LIVELIHOOD STRATEGIES

- Livelihood strategies were separated into “urban mixed”, “private sector”, “public sector”, “entrepreneurs”, “agriculture”, and “rural mixed”.
- There were no significant impacts of migration on the choice of livelihood (using multinomial logit model), other than the choice of “urban mixed” livelihood was 5.7 times more likely than “agriculture” livelihood for those impacted by migration ($p = 0.050$).



RESULTS (3) – FOOD AND INCOME SECURITY

Regressor [†]	Food security	Income security
Time (T)	1.438 (0.500)	1.005 (0.987)
Migrant (M)	0.828 (0.302)	0.744 (0.328)
T*M	0.679 (0.339)	0.679 (0.371)

Ordered logit odds ratios are shown, [†]Control variables are not shown, * = significant at 10% level, ** = significant at 5% level, *** = significant at 1% level



RESULTS (4) – OVERALL WELLBEING

Regressor [†]	9-step ladder	Life satisfaction
Time (T)	1.391 (0.241)	1.198 (0.564)
Migrant (M)	0.952 (0.871)	0.721 (0.298)
T*M	0.708 (0.410)	0.535 (0.153)

Ordered logit odds ratios are shown, [†]Control variables are not shown, * = significant at 10% level, ** = significant at 5% level, *** = significant at 1% level



DISCUSSION/CONCLUSIONS

- Migrants who have been involved in informal sector and receiving support from friends and families whilst in Port Moresby show no impacts of migration on food and income security or overall wellbeing, despite negative impacts on household capital remaining apparent.
- Family support, engaging in informal sector appears to be successfully mitigating the impacts of migration.
- These types of family support and government's proactive involvement in regulating informal sector to support migrants would be encouraged.



- End of Presentation

