

Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh  
Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development &  
Cooperatives  
Local Government Division  
Urban Primary Health Care Services Delivery Project  
Project Management Unit

Consulting Services for

Urban Primary Health Care Services Delivery Project  
Service Package No. S-4.1 (Operations Research)

Rural-Urban Migration and Health Statuses of Adults:  
Slums of Dhaka (North and South) and Gazipur City  
Corporations

**Submitted by:**

Abdur Razzaque, PhD  
Principle Investigator

International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research,  
Bangladesh (icddr,b)

June 4, 2017





## Contents

Summary of Key Findings and Implications .....	4
Introduction .....	5
Materials and Methods .....	6
<i>Study population</i> .....	6
<i>Data collection</i> .....	6
<i>Questionnaires</i> .....	7
<i>Score: Physical health and Mental Health</i> .....	8
<i>Conceptual Model</i> .....	8
Statistical Analyses .....	9
Results .....	9
<i>Descriptive Results</i> .....	9
<i>Multivariate Results</i> .....	11
Discussion and conclusion .....	12

## List of Tables

Table 1: Item groupings and abbreviated item content for the SF 36 survey .....	13
Table 2: Reliability analysis of 8 different composite scales.....	14
Table 3: Distribution of migrants <sup>+</sup> and non-migrants by socio-demographic characteristics .....	14
Table 4: Physical and mental health scores <sup>+</sup> of migrants and non-migrants.....	15
Table 5: Physical and mental health scores <sup>+</sup> of migrants and non-migrants disaggregated by age of respondent .....	15
Table 6: Physical and mental health scores <sup>+</sup> of migrants and non-migrants disaggregated by sex of respondent .....	15
Table 7: Physical and mental health scores <sup>+</sup> of migrants and non-migrants disaggregated for marital status of respondent .....	16
Table 8: Physical and mental health scores <sup>+</sup> of migrants and non-migrants disaggregated by education of respondent .....	16
Table 9: Physical and mental health scores <sup>+</sup> of migrants and non-migrants disaggregated by occupation of respondent .....	16
Table 10: Effect of rural-urban migration on physical and mental health, controlling for socio-demographic characteristics.....	17
References .....	18

## Summary of Key Findings and Implications

Urbanization occurs through three interacting processes: a) natural increase, b) rural-to-urban migration, and c) area reclassification; however, high growth of urban population in Bangladesh occurs mainly through migration of the rural poor. Although a substantial number of studies have assessed the health outcomes of immigrants of the developed world, much less attention has been paid to assess the health outcomes of internal migrants of the developing countries.

Using the database of the Health and Demographic Surveillance System (HDSS) of the selected slums of Dhaka (North and South) and Gazipur City Corporations, 1,100 respondents (18 years or more) were selected randomly for this study. The data were collected on perceived physical and mental health statuses using 36-item Short Form. The eight-scale scores were computed with these data and grouped into two categories: physical health and mental health scores.

The study compared both perceived physical health and mental health statuses of migrants to those of non-migrants as well as compared both physical health and mental health statuses of migrants of different durations (short vs long).

Main findings of the study are reported below:

- Both physical health and mental health statuses were better for non-migrants than those of short-duration and long- duration migrants
- Both physical health and mental health statuses were consistently better for short-duration migrants than long-duration migrants
- Both physical health and mental health status were better for:  
Male than female  
More educated than less educated  
Rickshaw puller/labourer than 'other' occupation category.

As physical health and mental health statuses get worse for those living long in the slums, it has implication on health care cost (caring and medical); such health care cost is likely to increase in the urban areas as migrants grow old and more people migrate to the slum.

## Introduction

Globally, slightly more people live in urban than rural area (UN 2014). By 2030, the world's urban population will increase by more than two billion, while the rural population will decline by about 20 million (UN 2003). It has been projected that the population of Bangladesh will increase by 64.6 million to roughly 218 million by 2030; three-fourths of that growth will occur in urban areas. By the middle of this century, Bangladesh will be more urban than rural; more than a third of urban residents will dwell in slum settlements (UN 2014).

Urbanization occurs through three interacting processes: a) natural increase, b) rural-to-urban migration, and c) area reclassification. However, high growth of urban population in Bangladesh occurs mainly through migration of the rural poor. There is evidence that international migrants are 'positively selected', that is of prime-aged, more educated, and in a better psychological and physical health than non-migrants (Palloni & Arias 2004; Palloni & Ewbank 2004; Feliciano 2005); however, weak support for 'healthy migrant hypothesis' also documented (Luis 2008). The 'healthy migrant hypothesis' predicts that migrants are typically a healthier subset of the population, compared to the average health status of their peers at origin and destination (Palloni & Morenoff 2001). These selection factors impede the attribution of post-migration differences in health status— when compared with non-migrant counterparts— to the effects of migration.

Although a substantial number of studies have assessed the health outcomes of immigrants of the developed world, much less attention has been paid to assess the health outcomes of internal migrants of the developing countries. With rapid urbanization, rural-urban migration is occurring in many developing countries even at larger scales than international migration (IMO 2005). In fact, rural-urban migration affects migrants' economic burdens and opportunities, new environmental risks and benefits, leads to changes in the cultural and social context, and provides access to resources (Nauman et al., 2015). So, the migration process and its consequences can have impacts on migrants' health and well-being both positively and negatively. Lu (2010) reported that rural-urban labour migration increased the risk of psychological disorder and had little impact on physical health in the medium term.

The study used Short Form-36 to assess the effects of rural-urban migration on perceived physical health and mental health of adult migrants (age 18 or more) in selected slums of Dhaka (North and South) and Gazipur City Corporations. In fact, the study compared perceived physical health and mental health statuses of migrants to those of non-migrants as well as compared physical health and mental health statuses of migrants of different durations (short vs long).

## Materials and Methods

### *Study population*

The data for this study has come from the selected slums of Dhaka (North and South) and Gazipur City Corporations, where icddr,b has been operating the Health and Demographic Surveillance System with financial support from the Government of Bangladesh/donors since 2016. In the baseline population and socioeconomic census of 2015-16, 121,912 people were living in 31,577 slum households in three locations. In Dhaka North City Corporation, 10,297 households were included from Korail slum and 6,278 households from Mirpur slum. In Dhaka South City Corporation, 2,082 households were included from Dhalpur slum and 2,398 households from Shayampur slum. In case of Gazipur City Corporation, 3,190 households were included from Tongi slum and 7,332 households from Ershad Nagar slum.

These slums were mainly built on government lands (91%), and about 60% occupants were tenants. Eighty-two per cent households possessed one bedroom with mean dwelling area of 119 sq ft; Roof material was mostly tin (94.0%), while about 70% wall material was tin; 88% floor materials were brick/cement. About 95% households used pipe water for drinking, 30% households had sanitary latrine flush to sewerage/septic tank, while slightly over 50% households used gas from gas line for cooking; sharing of water sources (92%), latrine (90%) and cooking places (60%) were very common in these slums. Use of electricity as a source of light was universal. Most households had electric fan (96%), and mobile phone (85%). Sixty per cent households had television and *khat*.

Among adult (aged 15 or more years), 36.2% males and 42.3% females did not have any schooling. Among children (aged 6-14 years), 14.1% boys and 8.9% girls did not have any schooling. Among aged 8 years or more, 73.5% males were involved in income generating activities compared to 39.6% among females.

In these slums, 30% household heads migrated within 10 years, 24% household heads migrated between 10-19 years, and 35% household heads migrated 20 or years more ago; 8.6% household heads did not migrate, born in Dhaka or Gazipur. The majority of household heads migrated to the slum for work (62.4%), while 20% household heads migrated to join family.

### *Data collection*

Using the database of the urban HDSS, 1,200 respondents aged 18 years or more were selected randomly (600 males and 600 females) for this study. Data were collected by fifteen Field Workers who also work for routine HDSS data collection. Each team consists of a supervisor and five Field Workers. These Field Workers are females, and had at least a Bachelor degree, with a few exceptions.

For the migration survey, the Field Workers were trained for five days: three days in office (training on questionnaires, mock interview, and use of Tab), and two days for field practice. They were trained on data collection instrument, data collection device, and on interviewing skills and administering the consent form.

The data were collected using portable devices (Tab), and data collection programs were developed accordingly. Some of the consistency checks were incorporated into the data collection program; however, some logical checks were done at the office after

loading/merging the data files. The computer programmer was responsible for providing technical support with respect to the concerns raised during fieldwork and for troubleshooting any issues of the Tab.

For finding a household, the Field Workers also carried printouts of the household listing. Once a household was identified, the Field Workers entered the slum name, area name and household number into the Tab, and verified records with the printouts. Once the respondent was confirmed, the Field Workers explained objectives of the study and got signed an informed consent form, if they agreed to participate in the study.

Each day a Field Worker completed 4-5 interviews in addition to her routine HDSS data collection. As many respondents worked outside home, the Field Workers had to visit these households during lunch-time or in the evening or during a weekly holiday to collect the data. Data were collected between July-August 2016. About 2% samples were checked by the supervisor, and feedback was given to the respective Field Worker for improving data quality.

Every week the Field Worker submitted their completed work (on memory card) to their supervisor. After receiving the data, the supervisor used to transfer the data to his/her laptop and performed basic checking. The supervisor subsequently sent these data to the Field Research Coordinator/Computer Programmer through email attachment for further editing and updating the master database. To maintain security and confidentiality of the data, the data server was restricted by a security password and access was given only to a selected person.

#### *Questionnaires*

Two types of questionnaires were used: a) background characteristics including migration history, and b) measure of perceived physical and mental health statuses. Background data were age, sex, marital status, education, occupation, and history of migration. For perceived health status (physical and mental) data, we used Short Form-36 (SF-36) derived from the Medical Outcomes Study (Stewart, 1992).

The SF-36 was designed for using in clinical practice and research, health policy evaluations, and for monitoring the health of general population sub-groups. The SF-36 includes one multi-item scale that assesses eight health concepts (Table 1): 1) limitations in physical activities because of health problems; 2) limitations in social activities because of physical or emotional problems; 3) limitations in usual role activities because of physical health problems; 4) bodily pain; 5) general mental health (psychological distress and well-being); 6) limitations in usual role activities because of emotional problems; 7) energy and fatigue; and 8) general health perceptions. These data provide a concise method for individuals to express their views about health outcomes that are important to them (Ware et al. 1993; Ware & Gandek 1994).

### Score: Physical health and Mental Health


We followed two-step scoring rules that were used by the RAND 36-item health survey 1.0 (SF-36, [www.rand.org](http://www.rand.org); Ware et al. 1993). First, numeric values were recorded so that a high score indicates a better health state; scores represent the percentage of total possible score achieved. Then items in the same scale were averaged to create 8-scale scores. Analyses of 8 different composite scales showed that reliability of these health measures was high except for mental health (Table 2).

These 8-scale scores were grouped into two categories: a) mean physical health component consists of five scales (physical functioning, role of physical health, bodily pain, general health perceptions, and energy/fatigue), and b) mean mental health components consists of three scales (social functioning, role of emotional health, and mental health).

### Conceptual Model

The conceptual model illustrates a two-stage relationship between health and migration. Firstly, individual health status of the population at origin may influence those who migrate and who stay. These are the selection effects of health on migration. Secondly, during migration process, the new physical, social and environment conditions at destination may cause changes to the migrants' physical and mental health statuses. This stage represents the effects of migration on health.

In Figure 1, the curved line connects the first and last boxes indicating correlations between a priori health status and post-migration health outcomes.



### *Statistical Analyses*

Both bivariate and multivariate analyses were applied to measure the effects of migration on physical and mental health statuses. These two health measures were compared between migrants of different durations to non-migrants, as well as migrants' of different durations.

In bivariate situation, the mean scores of physical and mental health statuses were compared for migrants to non-migrants, as well as between migrants of different durations and tested for significance level.

As a multivariate technique, multiple linear regression models were adopted to assess the effects of migration on physical and mental health statuses. The dependent variables were treated as continuous: a) mean physical health scores, and b) mean mental health scores. The control variables used in the analyses were: age, sex, marital status, education and occupation; except for age, all other explanatory variables in the multivariate analyses were treated as dummies.

## **Results**

### *Descriptive Results*

Table 3 shows the distribution of migrants (per cent) and non-migrants by socio-demographic characteristics. Out of 1,017 respondents, 49.5% were male and 50.5% were female. Among the respondents, 37.7% were long-duration migrants followed by 25.5% medium-duration migrants, 23.8% short-duration migrants, while 12.8% were non-migrants.

The distribution of short-duration migrants and non-migrants differed significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) for age, sex, marital status and education but not for occupation; former category was older, had more female, had more married and had less education. The distribution of long-duration migrants and non-migrants differed significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) for age, marital status, and education but not for sex and occupation; former category was older, had more married, and had less education.

Table 4 shows the physical and mental health scores of migrants and non-migrants. If short-duration migrants (col. a) were compared to non-migrants (col. d), both physical health (63.1 vs 72.5) and mental health (64.4 vs 71.1) scores were significantly better ( $p < 0.01$ ) for non-migrants than short-duration migrants. If long-duration migrants (col. c) were compared to non-migrants (col. d), both physical health (52.1 vs 72.5) and mental health (57.9 vs 71.1) scores were also significantly better ( $p < 0.01$ ) for non-migrants than long-duration migrants.

Table 5 shows the physical and mental health scores of migrants and non-migrants disaggregated by age of the respondents. For each migrant category and those non-migrants, physical health scores got worse as age increased, except for non-migrants of the height age group, where the score was almost similar to that of the middle-age group. For mental health score, a similar pattern was observed as age increased, except for non-migrants of the height-age group, where the score was better than those of middle-age group.

For those in age group 18-29 years, significantly better physical health and mental health scores were observed for non-migrants compared to short-duration and long-duration migrants. For those in age group 30-49 years, slightly better (ns) physical health scores for short-duration migrants than non-migrants were documented, while significantly better physical health scores for long-duration migrants than non-migrants were observed. For mental health, slightly better (ns) health scores were observed for non-migrants compared to short-duration and long-duration migrants. For those in age group 50 years or more, slightly better (ns) physical health and mental health scores were observed for non-migrants compared to short- duration and long-duration migrants.

Table 6 shows the physical and mental health scores of migrants and non-migrants disaggregated by sex of the respondent. For each migrant category and those of non-migrants, both physical and mental health scores were better for male than female.

For male, significantly better physical health and mental health scores were observed for non-migrants compared to short-duration and long-duration migrants. For female, slightly better (ns) physical and mental health scores were observed for non-migrants compared to short-duration migrants, but significantly better physical health and mental health scores were observed for non-migrants than long- duration migrants.

Table 7 shows the physical and mental health scores of migrants and non-migrants disaggregated by marital status of the respondents. For each migrant category both physical and mental health scores were usually better for currently married than not currently married, but for non-migrants, both physical and mental health scores were better for not currently married than currently married.

Among currently married, both physical and mental health scores were significantly better for non-migrants compared to short-duration and long-duration migrants. Among not currently married, a similar pattern, both physical and mental health scores were also significantly better for non-migrants compared to short-duration and long-duration migrants.

Table 8 shows the physical and mental health scores of migrants and non-migrants disaggregated by education of the respondents. For each migrant category and those of non-migrants, both physical and mental health scores were better for more educated group than less educated group, except for non-migrants of higher education group.

For lower education group, both physical and mental health scores were significantly better for non-migrants compared to short-duration and long-duration migrants. For higher education group, a similar pattern, i.e., significantly better physical and mental health scores were observed for non-migrants compared to long-duration migrants; however, while compared non-migrants to short-duration migrants, these differences were not significant.

Table 9 shows the physical and mental health scores of migrants and non-migrants disaggregated by occupation of the respondents. For each migrant category and those of non-migrants, both physical and mental health scores were worse for 'other' occupation group compared to service holder/business man and rickshaw puller/labourer.

For service holder/business man, significantly better physical health scores were observed for non-migrants compared to short-duration and long-duration migrants. For mental health

scores, the pattern was similar to physical health, but significant only for non-migrants compared to long-duration migrants. For rickshaw puller/labourer, significantly better physical health and mental health scores were observed for non-migrants compared to short-duration and long-duration migrants. For 'others' occupation group, significantly better physical health and mental health scores were also observed for non-migrants compared to short-duration and long-duration migrants.

#### *Multivariate Results*

Table 10 shows the effect of rural-urban migration on both physical health and mental health statuses, after controlling for selected socio-demographic characteristics. The results show that both physical health and mental health statuses were better for non-migrants than those of short-duration and long-duration migrants. Moreover, both physical health and mental health statuses of short-duration migrants were consistently better compared to long-duration migrations.

The results show that both physical health and mental health statuses deteriorated with increase in age. The study also documented better physical health and mental health statuses for male than female, better physical health and mental health statuses for more educated than those of less educated, and better physical health and mental health statuses for rickshaw puller/labourer than the 'other' occupation group.

## **Discussion and conclusion**

Studies measuring the effects of migration on health suffer due to selectivity issue, as migrants are not random. Measure of pre-migration health status allows one to determine the extent to which a priori health problem influences those who subsequently migrated and who stayed at origin. The 'healthy migrant hypothesis' suggests that migrants are physically healthier before they move compared to those who stay at origin. To overcome the issue of selectivity, a longitudinal study design is required that would compare health condition of pre-migrants (origin) and post-migrants (destination) with adequate control variables.

Our study did not have pre-migration health measures, but compared to the migrants at destination of different durations as well as to non-migrants, results show that both physical and mental health statuses of non-migrants were better than those of short-duration and long-duration migrants. These findings contradict with the previous findings those dealt immigrants in USA (Palloni & Arias 2004), and those dealt rural-urban migrations in Thailand (Nauman et al. 2015), where pre-migration health was better for migrants than those who stayed at origin as well as better health for non-migrants at destination; however, the findings of our study correspond to some extent to the findings of an Indonesian study (Lu 2010). This could be due to the fact that the migrants' socioeconomic context of our study was quite different from that of USA and Thailand's studies, i.e., a particular type of migrants those who migrated to urban slum from rural area to find work/to join family, after they had explored all type of possibilities to stay at their origin.

Our study also consistently documented that both physical and mental health statuses were better for short-duration migrants than long-duration migrants. This finding indicates that as migrants stay longer in the slums, their physical health and mental health get worse. This could be due to nature of the work they do, their housing condition, water-sanitation and socio-cultural context where they were exposed. Lu (2010) reported that rural-urban labour migration increased the risk of psychological disorder; however, migration although improved the economic status and living conditions, but increased work-related stressors and barriers to health care utilization.

As physical health and mental health statuses get worse for those living long in the slums, it has implications on health-care cost (caring and medical); such health-care cost is likely to increase in the urban area as migrants grow old and more people migrate to the slum.

Table 1: Item groupings and abbreviated item content for the SF 36 survey

Health scale	Item	Abbreviated Item content
Physical functioning (PF)	PF1	Vigorous activities, such as running, lifting heavy objects, participating in strenuous sports
	PF2	Moderate activities, such as moving a table, pushing a vacuum cleaner, bowling, or playing golf
	PF3	Lifting or carrying groceries
	PF4	Climbing several flights of stairs
	PF5	Bending, kneeling, or stooping
	PF6	Walking more than a mile
	PF7	Walking a quarter mile
	PF8	Bathing or dressing yourself
Role of physical (RF)	RF1	Cut down on the amount of time you spent on work or other activities
	RF2	Accomplished less than you would like
	RF3	Were limited in the kind of work or other activities
	RF4	Had difficulty performing the work or other activities (for example, it took extra effort)
Bodily pain (BP)	BF1	Intensity of bodily pain
	BF2	Extent pain interfered with normal work
General health perceptions (GH)	GH1	Is your health: excellent, very good, good, fair, poor
	GH2	My health is excellent
	GH3	I am as healthy as anybody I know
	GH4	I seem to get sick a little easier than other people
	GH5	I expect my health to get worse
Energy/fatigue (EF)	EF1	Fill full of life
	EF2	Have a lot of energy
	EF3	Feel worn out
	EF4	Feel tired
Social functioning (SF)	SF1	Extent of physical health or emotional problems interfered with your normal social activities
	SF2	Frequency of physical health or emotional problems interfered with your social activities
Role of emotional (RE)	RE1	Cut down on the amount of time you spent on work or other activities
	RE2	Accomplished less than you would like
	RE3	Didn't do work or other activities as carefully as usual
Mental health (MH)	MH1	Did you feel full of life
	MH2	Have you been a very nervous person
	MH3	Have you felt calm and peaceful
	MH4	Did you have a lot of energy
	MH5	Have you felt downhearted and blue
	MH6	Did you feel worn out

Table 2: Reliability analysis of 8 different composite scales

Scale	Description	Cronbach's $\alpha$	
		Urban HDSS	Matlab HDSS
Physical functioning	Limitations in physical activity because of health problems; 10 items	0.86	0.85
Role-physical	Role limitations due to physical health problems; 4 items	0.89	0.96
Bodily pain	Bodily pain; 2 items	0.74	0.92
General health	General health perceptions; 5 items	0.85	0.78
Energy/Vitality	Perceptions of energy and fatigue; 4 items	0.68	0.59
Social functioning	Limitations in social activities; 2 items	0.74	0.73
Role-emotional	Role limitations due to emotional problems; 3 items	0.86	0.94
Mental health	Positive and negative emotional states; 5 items	0.62	0.81

Table 3: Distribution of migrants<sup>+</sup> and non-migrants by socio-demographic characteristics

Scale	Migration status				p-values	
	Short-duration	Medium-duration	Long-duration	Non-migrant (d)	axd	Cxd
	(a) (n=242)	(b) (n=261)	(c) (n=384)	(n=130)		
Age (yrs)						
18-29	52.5	47.1	10.9	68.5		
30-49	32.2	35.8	37.3	26.9		
50+	15.3	17.1	51.8	4.6	p<0.05	p<0.05
Marital status						
Currently married	87.6	85.8	85.9	71.5		
Not currently married	12.4	17.2	14.1	28.5	p<0.05	p<0.05
Sex						
Male	41.3	45.6	55.5	56.2		
Female	58.7	44.4	44.5	43.8	p<0.05	ns
Education (yrs )						
<5	56.6	63.2	68.5	34.6		
5+	43.4	36.8	31.5	65.4	p<0.05	p<0.05
Occupation						
Service/business	27.7	29.9	27.9	39.2		
Labor/rickshaw puller	23.5	21.8	23.2	14.6		
Other	48.8	48.3	48.9	46.2	ns	ns

Note: Short-duration migrant= migrated within 10 years; Medium-duration migrant= Migrated between 10-19 years;

Long-duration migrant= Migrated 20 or more years ago; Non-migrant= Born in city (Either in Dhaka or Gazipur);

<sup>+</sup>Percent

Table 4: Physical and mental health scores<sup>†</sup> of migrants and non-migrants

Scale	Migration status				p-values	
	Short-duration (a)	Medium-duration (b)	Long-duration (c)	Non-migrant (d)	axd	Cxd
	(n=242)	(n=261)	(n=384)	(n=130)		
Physical health	63.1±21.4	61.5±22.5	52.1±23.7	72.5±21.7	p<0.01	p<0.01
Mental health	64.4±17.3	63.3±17.9	57.9±19.4	71.1±17.2	p<0.01	p<0.01

Note: <sup>†</sup>Mean scores; higher score indicates better health (range: 0-100)

Table 5: Physical and mental health scores<sup>†</sup> of migrants and non-migrants disaggregated by age of respondent

Scale	Migration status				p-values	
	Short-duration (a)	Medium-duration (b)	Long-duration (c)	Non-migrant (d)	axd	Cxd
	(n=127)	(n=110)	(n=42)	(n=89)		
Age 18-29						
Physical health	68.9±19.3	67.2 ±21.1	65.7±20.1	76.5±20.6	p<0.01	p<0.01
Mental health	67.0±16.7	66.7±16.8	67.6±17.8	73.1±15.3	p<0.01	p<0.05
Age 30-49						
Physical health	60.1±21.5	62.5±20.2	56.8±22.5	63.4±20.7	ns	p<0.05
Mental health	61.9±18.4	64.0±15.8	60.8±19.1	66.1±19.0	ns	Ns
Age 50 or more						
Physical health	49.1±20.3	46.5±29.9	45.8±23.3	64.9±27.9	ns	Ns
Mental health	60.3±15.7	54.2±21.2	53.8±18.8	70.1±28.3	ns	Ns

Note: <sup>†</sup>Mean scores; higher score indicates better health (range: 0-100)

Table 6: Physical and mental health scores<sup>†</sup> of migrants and non-migrants disaggregated by sex of respondent

Scale	Migration status				p-values	
	Short-duration (a)	Medium-duration (b)	Long-duration (c)	Non-migrant (d)	axd	Cxd
	(n=100)	(n=119)	(n=213)	(n=73)		
Male						
Physical health	65.5±20.2	66.1±22.5	57.1±22.8	78.6±18.8	p<0.01	p<0.01
Mental health	65.6±15.6	66.8±17.8	60.9±18.8	73.7±16.3	p<0.01	p<0.01
Female						
Physical health	61.3±21.9	57.5±21.8	45.9±23.3	64.6±22.7	ns	p<0.01
Mental health	63.4±18.4	60.2±17.4	54.2±19.5	67.8±17.8	ns	p<0.01

Note: <sup>†</sup>Mean scores; higher score indicates better health (range: 0-100)

Table 7: Physical and mental health scores<sup>†</sup> of migrants and non-migrants disaggregated for marital status of respondent

Scale	Migration status					p-values	
	Short-duration (a)	Medium-duration (b)	Long-duration (c)	Non-migrant (d)	axd	Cxd	
	Currently married						
	(n=212)	(n=224)	(n=330)	(n=93)			
Physical health	64.1±20.7	61.4±21.9	52.9±23.4	69.3±21.6	p<0.05	p<0.01	
Mental health	65.4±16.9	63.6±17.2	58.6±19.5	69.5±18.1	p<0.05	p<0.01	
Not currently married							
	(n=30)	(n=37)	(n=54)	(n=37)			
Physical health	55.5±24.2	61.3±26.3	47.1±24.6	80.5±20.1	p<0.01	p<0.01	
Mental health	56.4±18.4	60.9±21.5	54.1±18.4	75.0±14.1	p<0.01	p<0.01	

Note: <sup>†</sup>Mean scores; higher score indicates better health (range: 0-100)

Table 8: Physical and mental health scores<sup>†</sup> of migrants and non-migrants disaggregated by education of respondent

Scale	Migration status					p-values	
	Short-duration (a)	Medium-duration (b)	Long-duration (c)	Non-migrant (d)	axd	Cxd	
	Schooling less than 5 years						
	(n=137)	(n=165)	(n=263)	(n=45)			
Physical health	57.3±22.0	58.9±22.3	49.1±23.2	71.1±22.4	p<0.01	p<0.01	
Mental health	61.8±17.7	62.1±18.2	55.3±18.8	71.6±17.8	p<0.01	p<0.01	
Schooling 5 or more years							
	(n=105)	(n=96)	(n=121)	(n=85)			
Physical health	70.5±17.9	65.7±21.6	58.6±23.5	73.2±22.4	Ns	p<0.01	
Mental health	67.6±16.2	65.3±17.2	63.6±19.3	70.8±16.9	Ns	p<0.01	

Note: <sup>†</sup>Mean scores; higher score indicates better health (range: 0-100)

Table 9: Physical and mental health scores<sup>†</sup> of migrants and non-migrants disaggregated by occupation of respondent

Scale	Migration status					p-values	
	Short-duration (a)	Medium-duration (b)	Long-duration (c)	Non-migrant (d)	axd	Cxd	
	Service/business						
	(n=67)	(n=78)	(n=107)	(n=51)			
Physical health	68.7±20.9	64.3±22.2	58.2±23.0	75.1±20.9	p<0.05	p<0.01	
Mental health	67.4±17.9	65.7±18.7	62.5±19.6	71.9±17.3	Ns	p<0.01	
Rickshaw puller/laborer							
	(n=57)	(n=57)	(n=89)	(n=19)			
Physical health	63.9±18.4	65.7±20.3	61.5±20.7	81.0±15.0	p<0.01	p<0.01	
Mental health	64.5±15.4	66.1±16.5	63.0±17.1	76.1±10.3	p<0.01	p<0.01	
Others							
	(n=118)	(n=126)	(n=188)	(n=60)			
Physical health	59.4±22.3	57.7±23.0	44.2±22.7	67.6±23.1	p<0.05	p<0.01	
Mental health	62.5±17.7	60.4±17.6	53.0±19.1	68.8±18.6	p<0.05	p<0.01	

Note: <sup>†</sup>Mean scores; higher score indicates better health (range: 0-100)

Table 10: Effect of rural-urban migration on physical and mental health, controlling for socio-demographic characteristics

Factors	Perceived health measures	
	Physical health ( $\beta$ )	Mental health ( $\beta$ )
Constant	99.310***	86.620***
Age of respondent (cont)	-0.638***	-0.327***
Migration status		
Short-duration (ref=Non-migrant)	-4.376**	-4.283**
Medium-duration (ref=Non-migrant)	-4.990**	-4.783***
Long-duration (ref=Non-migrant)	-7.283***	-6.462***
Sex		
Male (ref=Female)	8.198***	4.359***
Marital status		
Currently married (ref=Not currently married)	0.931	2.412
Education (completed yrs of schooling)		
Five or more yrs(ref=Less than five yrs)	4.071***	2.695**
Occupation		
Service/business(ref=Rickshaw puller/labor)	-1.228	-0.080
Others(ref=Rickshaw puller/labor)	-6.058***	-3.644**

Note: \*p<0.10; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01

## References

Elizabeth Nauman, Mark VanLandingham, Philip Anglewicz, Umaporn Patthavanit, and Sureeporn Punpuing. Rural-to-Urban Migration and Changes in Health Among Young Adults in Thailand, *Demography*, February 2015, Volume 52, Issue 1, pp 233–257; DOI: 10.1007/s13524-014-0365-y

Feliciano C. Educational selectivity in US immigration: how do immigrants compare to those left behind? *Demography*, 2005; 42: 131-152.

International Organization for Migration (2005). *World Migration Report 2005: Costs and Benefits of International Migration*. Geneva: International Organization for Migration.

Lu Y. Test of the 'healthy migrant hypothesis': a longitudinal analysis of health selectivity of internal migration in Indonesia. *Social Science and Medicine*. 2010; 70(3): 412-419.

Luis N. Rubalcava, Graciela M. Teruel, Duncan Thomas, Noreen Goldman. The healthy migrant effect: New findings from the Mexican family life survey. *Journal of Public Health*, 2008; 98(1): 78-84.

Palloni A, Arias E. Paradox lost: explain the Hispanic adult mortality advantage. *Demography*. 2004; 41: 385-415.

Palloni A, Morenoff JD. Interpreting the paradoxical in the Hispanic paradox. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*. 2001;954:140–174.

Palloni A, Ewbank DC. Selection process in the study of racial and ethnic differentials in adult health and mortality. In: Anderson NB, Bulatao RA, Cohen B, eds. *Critical Perspectives on Racial and Ethnic Differences in Health in Late Life*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2004: 177-226.

Stewart AI, Ware JE, editors. *Measuring functioning and wellbeing: the medical outcomes study approach*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1992. pp. 345-371.

Thirty-six- Item Short Form Survey (SF- 36), Scoring Instructions;  
[www.rand.org/health/surveys\\_tools/mos/36-item-short-form.html](http://www.rand.org/health/surveys_tools/mos/36-item-short-form.html)

United Nations Population Division. 2003. *World urbanization prospects: the 2003 revision*: New York: United Nations.

United Nations Population Division. 2014. *World Urbanization Prospects: The 2014 Revision*.

Ware JE, Snow K, Kosinski M, Gandek B, editors. *SF-36 health survey: manual and interpretation guide*. Boston, MA: Health Institute, New England Medical Center, 1993.

Ware JE, Gandek B. The SF-36 health survey: development and use in mental health research and the IQOLA project. *Int J Ment Health* 1994; 23:49-73.