



IMPACT OF INTERNAL MIGRATION ON INCOME AND POVERTY: A STUDY ON GOPALGANJ DISTRICT

Azim Chowdhury^{1*} and Sabina Yeasmin²

¹Assistant Director, Bangladesh Bank, Dhaka

²Assistant Teacher, 65 No. Satashia Government Primary School, Kashiani, Gopalganj

KUS: 982: 23052023

Manuscript submitted: May 23, 2023

Accepted: August 6, 2023

Abstract

Rapid industrialization, urbanization, and climate change are all factors that affect migration. This study investigates the impact of internal migration on income level in a southwestern district of Bangladesh. The study employs multistage random sampling and the data is collected from a total of 81 respondents from Kashiani upazilla in Gopalganj district. The study uses descriptive statistics, ordinary least squares (OLS) and logistic regression models to come up with the empirical results. According to the study findings, households with three to four members, on average, have one or more migrants. The regression results also show that internal migration positively affects per capita household income and negatively affects income-poverty. Furthermore, internal migration reduces income-poverty. The logistic regression model shows that migrated people are, on average, 0.194 percent less likely to fall into the income-poverty group compared to the non-migrant people. Policymakers and development practitioners may focus on policies and programs that aim to improve education levels, and increase access to credit and other financial resources to promote sustainable economic growth in the region.

Keywords: Internal Migration, Per capita household income, Ordinary least squares, Logistic regression, Bangladesh

Introduction

With regard to economic growth, fast industrialization, urban centralization, and climate change, migration has earned significant attention from researchers. (Barrios et al., 2006; Brunow et al., 2015; Chen & Mueller, 2018; Valsecchi & Durante, 2021). Data shows that the size of the urban populations in Bangladesh exploded from 30.11 million in 2000 to 44.95 million in 2010 and reached 62.87 million in 2020 (Biswas et al., 2019). The literature considers migration (Golding & Winkler, 2020) as the primary cause of this growing size of the urban populations. Therefore, the literature focuses on urban migration, climate change and the role of migration in household welfare to suggest policy for balancing the rural-urban developments (Ahmed, 2020; Brunow et al., 2015; Chen & Mueller, 2018; Petrova, 2021). Angeels et al. (2013) used urban health survey data to reveal the causes of rural-urban migration and to explore how socio-demographic factors contribute to rural-urban migration. Some factors that are taken into account pull a household's decision to move, while others push it. Most of the time, rural people migrate to areas where a variety of working opportunities are generated, both in the formal and informal sectors. In this migration process, social networking such as relatives and neighbors play a dominant role (Haug, 2008).

Migration is a much-discussed issue in economics, sociology and demography; it primarily focuses on ensuring the sustainability of the cities of a country (Lall & Selod, 2006; Lu, 2010). Sometimes, individual migration decisions can affect the macro issues, e.g., rural-urban gap, income inequality and educational leakage (Kelegama, 2011). For example, Young (2013) finds that the rural-urban gap can explain 40 percent of the country's inequality with cross-country variations, which also triggers the difference in living standards between the rural and urban areas. However, internal migration is determined by the population growth in developed countries (Guilmoto & Sandron, 2001; Marshall & Rahman, 2013).

Lewis (1954) worked on economic development and dual economies that laid the groundwork for understanding the role of migration in income and poverty dynamics. He introduced the concept of the "Lewis

*Corresponding author: <aazimku23@gmail.com>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.53808/KUS.2023.20.02.982-ss>

Model,” which explains how surplus labor from traditional, low-productivity agriculture can migrate to higher-productivity industrial sectors in urban areas. Lewis argued that this internal migration leads to increased income for migrants and helps reduce poverty in the rural areas they leave behind. The Lewis Model highlights migration as a potential driver of economic growth and poverty alleviation.

Todaro and Harris (1970) contributed to understanding rural-urban migration and its impact on income and poverty through the “Todaro Model.” They emphasized the role of perceived wage differentials between rural and urban areas as a critical determinant of migration decisions. According to their model, individuals weigh the potential gains from urban employment against unemployment and urban poverty risks. They found that the expectation of higher urban incomes drives migration, but not all migrants successfully find jobs. This model sheds light on the complexities of migration decision-making and its implications for income and poverty outcomes.

Sen’s work on poverty and development emphasizes the importance of capabilities and agency in understanding poverty (Sen, 1981). He argues that poverty is not merely a lack of income but a deprivation of the ability to access basic human needs and lead a fulfilling life. He emphasizes the significance of human development indicators, such as education and health, in assessing the well-being of individuals. Sen’s capability approach adds nuance to the study of migration’s impact on poverty, considering broader factors beyond income, such as access to opportunities and social services.

Rural-urban migration and the transition from an agrarian to an industrial economy are key factors in how the demography of developing nations like Bangladesh is changing (Seto, 2011; Tacoli et al., 2015). Several studies show the internal and external factors of migration decisions using household-level and cross-country data (De & Ratha, 2012; Sharma & Zaman, 2009). It shows numerous factors such as lack of job facilities in a rural area, sudden disaster shocks, low social safety net coverage, and the vulnerable economic condition of a family may affect the migration decision of an individual (Biswas et al., 2019; Nguyen et al., 2015; Simini et al., 2012). Broadly, the factors are divided into two folds: pull and push elements. According to the push-pull hypothesis of migration, some people move because they are pushed out of their current location, while others move because they are drawn or pulled into another location. However, Farah et al., 2012 reveal that age, education and income are the primary factors that shape the individual's migration attitude. Additionally, pull factors trigger households' migration decisions where the standard of living condition is one of the prominent factors (Kumar & Sidhu, 2005). Akhter and Bauer (2014) state that in Bangladesh, 66 percent of rural residents go to metropolitan areas, 24 percent go abroad, and 10 percent move back to the countryside. This study also exerts that this urban-centric migration rate increases because of lacking lucrative and productive job facilities in the rural areas.

As internal migration continues to play a significant role in reshaping the demography of developing countries, understanding its effects on household welfare is crucial for informed policymaking. The local relevance of the Gopalganj district, coupled with its unique migration dynamics, makes it an ideal case study. The study's implications may extend beyond the region, contributing to endeavors to achieve the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals. Ultimately, this research seeks to shed light on the socio-economic consequences of internal migration and pave the way for targeted interventions to improve the well-being of households affected by migration in the region and beyond.

Researchers largely examined how households in Bangladesh decided to migrate inside their own country in light of health services, sociodemographic factors, environmental factors, changes in health dynamics, and household welfare (Khan & Kraemer, 2009; Streatfield & Karar, 2008). While existing research has explored various aspects of migration in Bangladesh, there needs to be more focus on how internal migration affects income and poverty. Recent research in Bangladesh has, however, hardly ever concentrated on the impact of internal migration on per capita household income and poverty. Hence, the core objective of this study is to investigate how internal migration affects rural people’s income and levels of poverty.

This section briefly discusses the background and research objective. The following section, has focused on the methodological perspective. The authors report the result in section three and briefly discuss the relationship. In section four, conclusions and recommendations are presented in the perspective of the result of this study.

Methodology

Study area and sampling technique

In order to gather data, this study uses a multi-stage sampling approach. To select respondents, the study randomly chooses two unions, Kashiani and Sajail. We then use systematic random selection to choose respondents from both migrant and non-migrant groups. of the sample split is 67 migrants and 14 non-migrants. The migrants are the people who have one or more migrant family members. Based on the results and experience of the pilot survey, an interview schedule was created for the primary data collection in Kashiani, which was pre-tested. During the field survey, main data were gathered through in-person conversations. Additionally, secondary information was gathered from a variety of sources, including academic publications, working papers, the Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics (BBS), and the Bangladesh Economic Review.

Study variables and measurement Scale

This study aims to assess the impact of internal migration on income and poverty in Bangladesh by using cross-sectional data. The explanations of study variables and the measurement scales are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. List of Variables

Variable Name	Symbol	Unit of Measurement	Literature Support
Dependent Variables			
Income-poverty	IP	0=No; 1=Yes	World Bank (2020)
Per Capita Household Income	PCHI	Total Family Income / Household Size	Alamgir et al. (2021)
Explanatory Variables			
Age	Age	Years	Rayhan and Grote (2007)
Education Status	ES	Years of Schooling	Rayhan and Grote (2007)
Number of Earning Persons	EP	Number	Meerza (2010)
Number of Dependent Persons	DP	Number	Ahmad et al. (2011)
Migration Situation	MS	1= Migrant, 0= Non-migrant	Authors Compilation (2023)
Working Days of HH Head	WD	Number	Authors Compilation (2023)
Asset Value	AV	BDT	Authors Compilation (2023)

Source: Authors' Estimation, 2023

Measurement of Dependent Variable

Income-poverty Measurement

The income-poverty measurement is calculated by using the instructions of the World Bank. According to World Bank (2020), earning less than \$ 1.96 per day income, is considered below poverty line, and more than \$ 1.96 per day income, is considered above poverty line. By using the dollar value of \$1 = 81BDT, the threshold level of income is approximately 4,702 BDT per month (81× 1.96 × 30). Thus, this study considers below 4,702 BDT as income-poverty group and above 4,702 BDT as no income-poverty group.

Analytical Strategy: This study has used summary statistics, cross-tabulation, Logistic regression and Ordinary Least Square model (OLS) to trace out the objective of this research. The per capita household income is in the continuous form; thus, OLS is the best suited model here. When dependent variable is considered dichotomous, logistic regression is the most applicable model to interpret data, which is represented in equation (4). The estimation model for OLS is presented in the equation (1), (2) and (3).

Model 1: The model is used to find out the impact of migration on per capita household income. The estimated equation is,

$$\text{LnPCHI} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{MS} + e \dots \dots \dots (1)$$

Model 2: The model is used to find out the impact of migration associated with some variables on per capita household income. The estimated equation is,

$$\text{LnPCHI} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{MS} + \beta_2 \text{Age} + \beta_3 \text{ES} + \beta_4 \text{WD} + e \dots \dots \dots (2)$$

Model 3: The model is used to find out the impact of socio-economic factors with migration variable on per capita household income. The estimated equation is,

$$\text{LnPCHI} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{MS} + \beta_2 \text{Age} + \beta_3 \text{ES} + \beta_4 \text{WD} + \beta_5 \text{LnAV} + \beta_6 \text{DP} + e \dots \dots \dots (3)$$

Model 4: The model is used to find out the impact of migration along with socio economic factors on income poverty. The estimated equation is,

$$\text{Income-poverty} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{MS} + \beta_2 \text{Age} + \beta_3 \text{ES} + \beta_4 \text{WD} + \beta_5 \text{EP} + e \dots \dots \dots (4)$$

Results

Description of Socio-economic Characteristics

The total sample size includes 81 individuals shown in Table 1, of which 14 (17.28%) are classified as non-migrants and 67 (82.72%) are classified as migrants. Non-migrants are defined as individuals who have not moved from their place of birth, while migrants are defined as individuals who have moved from their place of birth to a different location. The proportion of migrants in the sample was notably higher than that of non-migrants. These findings suggest that migration is a prevalent phenomenon in this particular population and may have important implications for understanding the social and demographic characteristics of the community under study. The age distribution of the sample is as follows: 12 people (14.81%) are under the age of 35, 16 people (19.75%) are in the 36–45 age range, 43 people (53.09%) are in the 46–55 age range, and 10 people (12.35%) are over the age of 56. These results indicate that middle-aged people make up the majority of the sample group. The distribution of respondents' education levels (N=81) shows that 23 people (28.40%) have completed their primary education, 43 people (53.09%) have finished their secondary education, 9 people (11.11%) have finished their higher secondary education, and 6 people (7.41%) have finished their education above the higher secondary level. The majority of the sample population has finished secondary school, whereas a lesser percentage has finished elementary school. Only a small percentage had degrees beyond the higher secondary level.

Similar to this, 26 people (32.1%) have per capita household incomes between 4001 and 6000 BDT, 32 people (39.51%) have per capita household incomes between 6001 and 8000 BDT, and 12 people (14.81%) have per capita household incomes beyond 8001 BDT. The majority of respondents reported having a household income per capita between 4001 and 8000 BDT, with only a small minority reporting having a household income per capita below 4000 BDT or above 8001 BDT. These results indicate that the sample per capita household income in Bangladeshi Taka is moderate, with the majority falling within a relatively small range. In addition, 29 people (35.80%) have worked between 16 and 20 hours per week, 34 people (41.98%) have worked between 21 and 25 hours per week, and 7 people (8.64%) have worked more than 26 hours per week. A relatively minor part of the sample has fewer than 16 or more than 26 workdays, while the majority of the population has between 16 and 25 workdays. These results indicate that the sample population's workdays are moderately varied, with the majority falling within the range of 16 to 25 workdays. In addition, 13 people (16.05%) have assets worth less than \$50,000, 35 (43.21%) have assets worth between \$50,000 and \$100,000, 30 (37.04%) have assets worth between \$100,000 and \$150,000, and 3 (3.70%) have assets worth more than \$150,000 BDT. A large fraction of the respondents has assets valued between 50,000 and 150,000 BDT, whereas only a small portion has assets valued at less than 50,000 BDT or higher than 150,000 BDT. According to these results, the sample has a modest level of asset value, with the majority of households having assets worth between 50,000 and 150,000 BDT.

Additionally, the distribution of the sample (N=81) dependents is as follows: 27 people (33.33%) have less than three dependents, 40 (49.38%) have three to four, 13 (16.05%) have five to six, and 1 (1.23%) have more than seven. The bulk of the sample population has three to four dependents, with a smaller percentage having fewer than three, between five and six, or more than seven. According to these findings, the sample group has a moderate number of dependents, with the majority having between three and four. One earner makes up the household for 51 people (62.96%), two earners for 29 people (35.80%), and three earners for one person (1.23%). One earner makes up the majority of households in the sample group, with two or three earners making up a lesser fraction. These results imply that, with the majority of households having just one earner, the sample group has a comparatively low number of earners per household.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Socio-economic Parameters

Variable Name	Frequency	Percentage
Migration Status		
Non-migrant	14	17.28
Migrant	67	82.72
Age Distribution		
Below 35	12	14.81
36-45	16	19.75
46-55	43	53.09
Above 56	10	12.35
Education Level		
Primary	23	28.40
Secondary	43	53.09
Higher Secondary	9	11.11
Above Higher Secondary	6	7.41
Amount of Per Capita Household Income (BDT/Month)		
Below 4000	11	13.58
4001-6000	26	32.10
6001-8000	32	39.51
Above 8001	12	14.81
Number of Workdays		
Below 16	11	13.58
16-20	29	35.80
21-25	34	41.98
Above 26	7	8.64
Asset value of Household (BDT)		
Below 50000	13	16.05
50000-100000	35	43.21
100001-150000	30	37.04
Above 150001	3	3.70
Number of Dependent Person		
Below 3	27	33.33
3-4	40	49.38
5-6	13	16.05
Above 7	1	1.23
Number of Earning Person		
1	51	62.96
2	29	35.80
3	1	1.23
Total	81	100.00

Source: Authors' Estimation, 2023

Impact of Migration on Per Capita Household Income (PCHI)

Table 2 displays the results of the Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression models used to determine and estimate the magnitudes of the relationship between PCHI and socioeconomic parameters.

Table 2. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis on Per Capita Household Income (PCHI)

Variable Name	Measurement Scale	Model (1)	Model (2)	Model (3)
Migration Status	1= Migrant, 0= non-migrant	0.507*** (0.077)	0.347*** (0.071)	0.113* (0.066)
Age of Household Head	Years		-0.004 (0.002)	0.001 (0.009)
Education of Household Head	Years of Schooling		0.035*** (0.007)	0.0245*** (0.006)
Workdays	Number of Day		0.015** (0.007)	0.012** (0.006)
Ln_Asset Value	BDT			0.348*** (0.045)
Dependent Person	Number			0.007 (0.017)
Constant		8.337 (0.070)	8.063 (0.170)	4.259 (0.526)
R-squared		0.353	0.601	0.781
Number of Observation		81.00	81.00	81.00

Dependent Variable: Ln Per Capita Household Income (BDT/Month)

Note: Parenthesis indicates the standard error; *** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$.

Source: Authors' Estimation, 2023

The model (1) in Table 2 only explains how migration affects per capita household income. According to the results of the analysis, while holding other factors constant, migrants have an average 50.7 percent higher per capita household income than non-migrants, which is significant at a one percent level of significance. Next, the model (2) in Table 2 shows the effect of migration associated with others on per capita household income. According to the findings, migrants have a 34.7 percent higher per capita household income than non-migrants while remaining other variables constant, which is significant at the one percent significance level. The analysis result reveals that the per capita household income of people will rise by 3.5 percent on average if the year of schooling increases by one year, which is significant at a one percent significance level. In addition, in this model, workdays play a pivotal role in generating per capita household income. The result indicates that if the workdays of the household increases by one day, per capita household income will go up 1.5 percent on average, which is significant at a five percent significance level. Finally, the impact of socio-economic variables on per capita household income is explained by the model (3) in Table 2. In accordance with the analysis's findings, when all other factors are held constant, migrants have an average 11.3 percent higher per capita household income than non-migrants, which is significant at the five percent level of significance. Moreover, the results of this model show that per capita household income of people will rise by 2.45 percent on average if year of schooling increases by one year, which is significant at a one percent significance level. In additions, the result indicates that if workdays of the household increases by one day, per capita household income will go up 1.2 percent on average, which is significant at a five percent significance level. After that, if amount of asset value (BDT) increases by one percent, per capita household income on average will rise by 3.84 percent ceteris paribus.

Checking the Diagnostic Test: Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) of the Model

Based on the information provided in Table 3, it appears that there is no multicollinearity problem between the dependent variable per capita household income and the independent variable Migration Status. The Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) for Migration Status is 1.00, which is the minimum value possible and indicates no correlation between this variable and the other independent variables in the regression model. Additionally, the mean VIF for all variables in the model is also 1.00, which is another indication that there is no multicollinearity problem. However, it is important to note that this analysis is based on limited information and further examination of the

data may be necessary to fully assess the presence of multicollinearity. It is recommended to perform additional diagnostic tests, such as examining the correlation matrix of the independent variables or calculating other measures of multicollinearity, to ensure that the regression results are reliable.

Table 3. Multi-collinearity or Diagnostic Test (VIF) for the Model (1)

Variable Name	VIF	1/VIF
Migration Status	1.00	1.000000
Mean VIF	1.00	

Source: Authors' Estimation, 2023

The VIF values shown in Table 4 for the independent variables are within acceptable limits, indicating no significant multicollinearity problem. The highest VIF value is 1.73, which is below the threshold of 2.5, indicating that there is no severe multicollinearity problem. Additionally, the 1/VIF values are also within acceptable limits, with all values above 0.4, indicating that each variable is contributing unique information to the model.

Table 4. Multi-collinearity or Diagnostic Test (VIF) for the Model (2)

Variable Name	VIF	1/VIF
Workdays	1.73	0.576982
Education of Household Head	1.36	0.734121
Migration Status	1.34	0.747623
Age of Household Head	1.02	0.984795
Mean VIF	1.36	

Source: Authors' Estimation, 2023

The threshold level for VIF is usually considered to be 10. When the VIF is greater than 10, it indicates that there is high multicollinearity between the independent variables. In the Table 5, all the independent variables have VIF values below 2.03, which is well below the threshold level of 10. Therefore, it can be concluded that multicollinearity is not a significant problem in your model.

Table 5. Multi-collinearity or Diagnostic Test (VIF) for the Model (3)

Variable Name (Socio-economic Variables)	VIF	1/VIF
Migration Status	2.03	0.492260
LnAsset Value	1.90	0.526101
Workdays	1.82	0.549383
Dependent Person	1.61	0.622392
Education of Household Head	1.49	0.670153
Age of Household Head	1.09	0.917388
Mean VIF	1.66	

Source: Authors' Estimation, 2023

Estimation the Impact of Migration on Income-poverty

Table 6 shows the outcomes of the logistic regression model that explains the impact of some variables on income-poverty which is categorized into two segments namely having income-poverty and no income-poverty based on World Bank.

Table 6. Logistic Regression Analysis on Income-poverty

Variable Name	Unit of Measurement	Marginal Effect (dy/dx)
Migration Status	1= Migrant, 0= Non-migrant	-0.194*** (0.041)
Age of Household Head	Years	0.004** (0.002)
Education of Household Head	Years of Schooling	0.004 (0.008)
Workdays	Number	-0.012*** (0.004)
Earning Person	Number	-0.065 (0.059)
R-squared		0.786
Number of Observation		81.00

Dependent Variable: Income-poverty (0=No; 1=Yes)

Note: Parenthesis indicates the standard error; *** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$.

Source: Authors' Estimation, 2023

Interpretation of Marginal Effect

In accordance with Table 6, at Kashiani upazilla in Gopalganj district, Bangladesh, migrated people have a 0.194 percent on average lower probability of falling into the income-poverty group than the non-migrant people, other things remaining constant, which is significant at a one percent significance level. A one-year increase in age increases the likelihood of falling below the income-poverty line by approximately 0.004 percent, which is significant at the five percent significance level. According to the aforementioned table, it is more obvious that if the number of workdays increases by one day while holding other factors constant, people are 0.012 percent more likely of getting into the income-poverty, which is significant at the one percent level. To sum up, migration has an impact on income-poverty in a way that it helps people withhold the poverty line.

Discussion

This study has examined how education, job hours, and asset value, as well as migration, affect per capita household income and poverty in Bangladesh's southwest. These elements appear to have a favorable effect on household income, according to our data. One of the key conclusions is that migration has a favorable effect on household income per capita. There is a number of explanations as to why migration may increase per capita household income. First, moving helps people to take advantage of work chances that are not present in their current locations. When a result, income may rise when immigrants take on higher-paying jobs in other regions of the nation. Remittances are another way that migrants can support their families and increase household income. Remittances can aid in providing financial support for households, particularly in regions with a lack of jobs and high rates of poverty. Migration can also result in the dissemination of skills and information from migrants to their communities of origin. Long-term household income growth may result from the emergence of new industries and job opportunities as a result of this. Our results are in line with earlier studies on how migration affects household income in developing nations.

Ahmed and Willenbockel (2016) found that international migration had a positive impact on household income in many countries, including Bangladesh. Similarly, Adams and Page (2005) found that migration had a positive impact on household income in several African countries.

The study also found that education, workdays, and asset value had a significant positive impact on per capita household income and a significant negative impact on poverty in the southwestern part of Bangladesh. In particular, the study discovered a considerable increase in asset value, workdays, and education levels was associated with a significant decline in poverty and an increase in per capita household income. These results are in line with earlier research studies carried out in Bangladesh, such as a study by Sarker et al. (2021) which discovered that asset ownership and education were important predictors of household income in rural Bangladesh. A study by Uddin et al. (2020) adds to the body of knowledge on Bangladesh's economic progress and poverty reduction by providing information on this subject. The study indicated that a rise in asset value, workdays, and education levels specifically

caused a substantial rise in per capita household income. Secondly, education is an important factor in increasing household income. Education can provide individuals with the skills and knowledge needed to secure higher-paying jobs. Additionally, education can lead to increased productivity and innovation, which can contribute to economic growth and development. Stutzer and Frey (2006) found that education had a positive impact on income in Switzerland. Emran et al. (2021) found that education and access to credit were important factors in reducing poverty levels in Bangladesh.

Additionally, greater workdays can result in higher income since people may be able to make more money by putting in more time at the office. Working additional hours could also affect your ability to find jobs with higher compensation. Last but not least, a key element in raising household income is asset value. According to Deininger et al. (2015), owning land increased income in rural China, which is consistent with the findings of this study. Assets like land or cattle can generate revenue for households through rental or sale. Assets can also be used as collateral for loans, which can then be used to fund education or the establishment of businesses. Migration has a negative effect on the income-poverty group, which indicates that those who have migrated are less likely to belong to this group and those who have not migrated are more likely to do so. Our results are in line with earlier studies on how migration, aging, and job hours affect poverty in emerging nations. De Haan and De Hann (2000) found that migration had a positive impact on poverty reduction in several African countries. A study by Banerjee et al. (2003) found that age was a significant factor in determining poverty levels in Egypt. Furthermore, a study by Bayliss (2002) found that increased workdays had a positive impact on income and poverty reduction in rural areas of India. This finding may be explained by the fact that migrants often have access to better job opportunities and higher wages in urban areas, which can help lift them out of poverty. Additionally, migrants may have access to social networks and support systems in their new communities, which can help them navigate the challenges of living in a new place. Age is another significant variable that positively impacts income poverty, which means that with increasing age, individuals are more likely to fall into the poverty group. This finding is consistent with previous research that has shown that older individuals are more vulnerable to poverty due to factors such as declining health, reduced earning capacity, and lack of access to social support systems. Devereux (2001) found that poverty rates among elderly individuals in rural Bangladesh were higher than those among younger individuals. Furthermore, workdays also negatively impact poverty, which means that with additional workdays, individuals are less likely to fall into the poverty group. This finding may be explained by the fact that more workdays can lead to higher income, which can help lift individuals out of poverty. Additionally, increased workdays may also lead to improved skills and productivity, which can help individuals to secure better-paying jobs.

Conclusion

According to the findings of this study, household income in southwestern Bangladesh is positively impacted by migration, education, workweeks, and asset value. These findings have significant ramifications for practitioners and policymakers since they imply that supporting these characteristics may help this region's policies reduce poverty and raise living standards. But it's crucial to recognize the limits of our research, particularly the fact that it was restricted to a certain area of Bangladesh. To gain a deeper grasp of the problem, future research should look into how these characteristics affect household income in various parts of the nation. This study shows that age and workdays have respectively positive and negative effects on poverty in southwest Bangladesh, whereas migration has a negative effect on the income-poor group. These findings have significant policy and practice implications because they imply that policies that favor longer workweeks and promote migration may be successful in alleviating poverty in this region.

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Adams Jr, R.H., & Page, J. (2005). Do international migration and remittances reduce poverty in developing countries?. *World development*, 33(10), 1645-1669.
- Ahmed, F. (2020). Does migration matter for household welfare in Bangladesh? *Migration and Development*, 1-20.
- Ahmed, S., Go, D.S., & Willenbockel, D. (2016). Global migration revisited: short-term pains, long-term gains, and the potential of south-south migration. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*, (7628).
- Akhter, S., & Bauer, S. (2014). Household level determinants of rural-urban migration in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 8(1), 24-27.
- Alamgir, M. S., Furuya, J., Kobayashi, S., Mostafiz, R. B., & Ahmed, M. R. (2021). Farm income, inequality, and poverty among farm families of a flood-prone area in Bangladesh: climate change vulnerability assessment. *GeoJournal*, 86, 2861-2885.
- Al-Amin, A. A., & Hossain, M. J. (2019). Impact of non-farm income on welfare in rural Bangladesh: Multilevel mixed-effects regression approach. *World Development Perspectives*, 13, 95-102.
- Angeles, G., Al-Sabir, A., Lance, P., Buckner, B., Streatfeld, P., Karar, Z., et al. (2013). Bangladesh urban health survey (uhs) 2013. National Institute of Population Research and Training (NIPORT); *International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research, Bangladesh (icddr,b); MEASURE Evaluation*, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.15139/s3/12274>, UNC Dataverse, V1.
- Banerji, A., El Laithy, H., & Lokshin, M. (2003). Poverty and economic growth in Egypt, 1995-2000 (Vol. 3068). World Bank Publications.
- Barrios, S., Bertinelli, L., & Strobl, E. (2006). Climatic change and rural–urban migration: The case of sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 60(3), 357-371.
- Bayliss, K. (2002). Privatization and poverty: The distributional impact of utility privatization. *Annals of public and cooperative economics*, 73(4), 603-625.
- Biswas, R. K., Kabir, E., & Khan, H. T. (2019). Causes of urban migration in Bangladesh: Evidence from the urban health survey. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 38(4), 593-614.
- Brunow, S., Nijkamp, P., & Poot, J. (2015). The impact of international migration on economic growth in the global economy. In *Handbook of the economics of international migration* (Vol. 1, 1027-1075). North-Holland.
- Castles, S. (2002). Migration and community formation under conditions of globalization. *International migration review*, 36(4), 1143-1168.
- Chen, J., & Mueller, V. (2018). Coastal climate change, soil salinity and human migration in Bangladesh. *Nature climate change*, 8(11), 981-985.
- De Haan, A., & de Haan, A. (2000). Migrants, livelihoods and rights: the relevance of migration in development policies.
- De Haas, H. (2005). International migration, remittances and development: myths and facts. *Third World Quarterly*, 26(8), 1269-1284.
- De Haas, H. (2010). Migration and development: A theoretical perspective. *International migration review*, 44(1), 227-264.
- De, P. K., & Ratha, D. (2012). Impact of remittances on household income, asset and human capital: Evidence from Sri Lanka. *Migration and Development*, 1(1), 163-179.
- Deininger, K., Jin, S., Liu, S., & Xia, F. (2015). Impact of property rights reform to support China? s rural-urban integration: household-level evidence from the Chengdu national experiment. S Rural-Urban Integration: Household-Level Evidence from the Chengdu National Experiment (August 11, 2015). *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*, (7388).
- Devereux, S. (2001). Livelihood insecurity and social protection: a re-emerging issue in rural development. *Development policy review*, 19(4), 507-519.
- Emran, S.A., Krupnik, T.J., Aravindakshan, S., Kumar, V., & Pittelkow, C.M. (2021). Factors contributing to farm-level productivity and household income generation in coastal Bangladesh's rice-based farming systems. *PLoS one*, 16(9), e0256694.
- Eurenius, A. M. (2020). A family affair: Evidence of chain migration during the mass emigration from the county of Halland in Sweden to the United States in the 1890s. *Population Studies*, 74(1), 103-118.

- Farah, N., Zafar, M. I., & Nawaz, N. (2012). Socio-Economic and Cultural Factors Affecting Migration Behavior in District Faisalabad, Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Life & Social Sciences*, 10(1), 28-32.
- Golding, S. A., & Winkler, R. L. (2020). Tracking urbanization and exurbs: Migration across the rural–urban continuum, 1990–2016. *Population research and policy review*, 39(5), 835-859.
- Guilmoto, C. Z., & Sandron, F. (2001). The internal dynamics of migration networks in developing countries. *Population: an English selection*, 135-164.
- Haug, S. (2008). Migration networks and migration decision-making. *Journal of ethnic and migration studies*, 34(4), 585-605.
- Kelegama, S. (Ed.). (2011). Migration, remittances and development in South Asia. *SAGE Publications India*.
- Khan, M. M., & Kraemer, A. (2009). Factors associated with being underweight, overweight and obese among ever-married non-pregnant urban women in Bangladesh. *Singapore medical journal*, 50(8), 804.
- Kumar, B. (2019). The impact of international remittances on poverty alleviation in Bangladesh. *Remittances Review*, 4(1), 67-86.
- Kumar, N., & Sidhu, A. S. (2005). Pull and push factors in labour migration: a study of brick-kiln Workers in Punjab. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 221-232.
- Lall, S. V., & Selod, H. (2006). Rural-urban migration in developing countries: A survey of theoretical predictions and empirical findings (Vol. 3915). *World Bank Publications*.
- Lewis, W. A. (1954). Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour. *The Manchester School*, 22(2), 139-191.
- Lu, Y. (2010). Rural-urban migration and health: Evidence from longitudinal data in Indonesia. *Social science & medicine*, 70(3), 412-419.
- Mannan, D. K. A. (2016). Labour migration between developing economy to developing country: A case study of Bangladesh and Malaysia. *International Journal of Migration Research and Development (ISSN: 2411-9695)*, 2(1).
- Marshall, R., & Rahman, S. (2013). Internal migration in Bangladesh: character, drivers and policy issues. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), New York.
- Massey, D. S. (1990). Social structure, household strategies, and the cumulative causation of migration. *Population index*, 3-26.
- Massey, D. S., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouaouci, A., Pellegrino, A., & Taylor, J. E. (1993). Theories of international migration: A review and appraisal. *Population and development review*, 431-466.
- McLeman, R., & Smit, B. (2006). Migration as an adaptation to climate change. *Climatic change*, 76(1), 31-53.
- Moses, E., & Yu, D. (2009). Migration from the Northern Cape. A Southern Africa Labour and Development Research Unit Working Paper Number 32. Cape Town: SALDRU, University of Cape Town.
- Nguyen, L. D., Raabe, K., & Grote, U. (2015). Rural–urban migration, household vulnerability, and welfare in Vietnam. *World Development*, 71, 79-93.
- Petrova, K. (2021). Natural hazards, internal migration and protests in Bangladesh. *Journal of Peace Research*, 58(1), 33-49.
- Sen, A. (1981). Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation. Oxford University Press.
- Seto, K. C. (2011). Exploring the dynamics of migration to mega-delta cities in Asia and Africa: Contemporary drivers and future scenarios. *Global Environmental Change*, 21, S94-S107.
- Sharma, M., & Zaman, H. (2009). Who migrates overseas and is it worth their while? An assessment of household survey data from Bangladesh. An Assessment of Household Survey Data from Bangladesh (August 1, 2009). *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*, (5018).
- Simini, F., González, M. C., Maritan, A., & Barabási, A. L. (2012). A universal model for mobility and migration patterns. *Nature*, 484(7392), 96-100.
- Stark, O., & Bloom, D. E. (1985). The new economics of labor migration. *The American Economic Review*, 75(2), 173-178.
- Streatfield, P. K., & Karar, Z. A. (2008). Population challenges for Bangladesh in the coming decades. *Journal of health, population, and nutrition*, 26(3), 261.
- Stutzer, A., & Frey, B.S. (2006). Does Education Really Matter for Economic Performance? Evidence from Switzerland. *Kyklos*, 59(4), 457-470.

- Tacoli, C., McGranahan, G., & Satterthwaite, D. (2015). Urbanisation, rural-urban migration and urban poverty. London, UK: Human Settlements Group, *International Institute for Environment and Development*.
- Taylor, E. J. (1999). The new economics of labour migration and the role of remittances in the migration process. *International migration*, 37(1), 63-88.
- Todaro, M. P., & Harris, J. E. (1970). Internal migration and urban employment in developing countries. *The American Economic Review*, 60(1), 126-142.
- Uddin, M.N., Pramanik, A.H., Haque, A. and Hamdan, H. (2020). Assessment of Islamic microfinance on poverty reduction in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Islamic Marketing and Branding*, 5(4), 326-346.
- Valsecchi, M., & Durante, R. (2021). Internal migration networks and mortality in home communities: Evidence from Italy during the Covid-19 pandemic. *European economic review*, 140, 103890.
- Wei, W., Sarker, T., Żukiewicz-Sobczak, W., Roy, R., Alam, G.M., Rabbany, M.G., Hossain, M.S., & Aziz, N. (2021). The influence of women's empowerment on poverty reduction in the rural areas of Bangladesh: Focus on health, education and living standard. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 18(13), 6909.
- Wickramasinghe, A. A. I. N., & Wimalaratana, W. (2016). International migration and migration theories. *Social Affairs*, 1(5), 13-32.
- Young, A. (2013). Inequality, the urban-rural gap, and migration. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 128(4), 1727-1785.