

Duality of migrant lives: Gendered migration and agricultural production in Red River Delta region, Vietnam

Nguyen Thi Dien*, Nguyen Thi Minh Khue, Ngo Trung Thanh**, Le Thi Minh Chau*, Philippe Lebailly****

***VNUA, Vietnam; ** ULG, Belgium**

Contact: ntdien@vnua.edu.vn

Introduction

- ▶ Various patterns and dynamics of migration as the results of modernization policies.
- ▶ Complex interactions between migration and agricultural production:
 - + Migration as the driven forces and outcome of agrarian production
 - + Not simply positive or negative effects of migration on agricultural production
 - + Gendered migration as household labor division and livelihood choices
 - + The role of agriculture in household economy in the context of migration
- ▶ **Duality of migrant' lives creates the changes in fixed categories, gender, professional and resident identities**



Objective

- ▶ To explore the duality of migrants through investigating the interactions of gendered labor migration and agricultural production.



Research site: Bac Ninh province in RRD



Methodology

- ▶ Household survey: 215 households are classified into 4 groups:
 - Group 1: Non-migration households: No one in the household is the migrant
 - Group 2: Male migration households: Only male member in the household is the migrant
 - Group 3: Female migration households: Only female member in the household is the migrant
 - Group 4: Both sex migration households: Both female and male members in the household are the migrant
 - ▶ Group discussions,
 - ▶ Participate observation
 - ▶ In-depth interviews
-



The main characteristics of surveyed HH

Indicators	Group 1 Non migration (n=38)	Group 2 Male migration (n=40)	Group 3 Female migration (n=38)	Group 4 Both sex migration (n=99)	Total (N=215)
Family size (<i>mean, pers.</i>)	4.3	4.3	5.0	5.7	5.1
Labor size (<i>mean, pers.</i>)	2.8	3.3	3.5	3.8	3.5
Male labor (<i>mean, pers.</i>)	1.2	2.0	1.5	1.9	1.7
Female labor (<i>mean, pers.</i>)	1.6	1.4	2.1	2.0	1.8
Migration labor (<i>mean, pers.</i>)	0.0	1.2	1.4	2.6	1.6
Male migra. labor (<i>mean, pers.</i>)	0.0	1.2	0.0	1.3	0.8
Fem. migra. labor (<i>mean, pers.</i>)	0.0	0.0	1.4	1.3	0.8
Agricultural land (1993, m²)	2909.7	2805.8	3350.5	3120.3	3065.2
Agricultural land (2014, m²)	7037.9	2422.5	2840.8	2241.3	3228.7



Migrants: age and sex

Age range	Migrant groups				Total	
	Male migrants		Female migrant			
	N	%	N	%	N	%
16-<30	86	48.3	104	59.4	190	53.8
30-<40	49	27.5	52	29.7	101	28.6
40-<50	28	15.7	15	8.6	43	12.2
50-60	15	8.5	4	2.3	19	5.4
<i>Total</i>	178	100.0	175	100.0	353	100.0



Migrants: marital status and education

Indicators		Migrant groups				Total	
		Male migrant		Female migrant			
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Marital status	<i>Married</i>	140	78.7	149	85.1	289	81.9
	<i>Single</i>	38	21.3	26	14.9	64	18.1
Relationship to HH head	<i>Head</i>	43	24.2	3	1.7	46	13.0
	<i>Spouse</i>	6	3.4	37	21.1	43	12.2
	<i>Children</i>	128	71.9	132	75.4	260	73.7
	<i>Other</i>	1	0.6	3	1.7	4	1.1
Education	<i>Primary</i>	11	6.2	14	8.0	25	7.1
	<i>Secondary</i>	64	36.0	61	34.9	125	35.4
	<i>High school</i>	69	38.8	65	37.1	134	38.0
	<i>Higher education</i>	34	19.1	35	20.0	69	19.5

Migrants: migration patterns

Migration patterns	Migrant groups				Total	
	Male migrant		Female migrant			
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<i>Commuting</i>	142	79.8	154	88.0	296	83.9
<i>Seasonal migration</i>	8	4.5	10	5.7	18	5.1
<i>Long - term migration</i>	15	8.4	5	2.9	20	5.7
<i>Permanent migration</i>	8	4.5	4	2.3	12	3.4
<i>International migration</i>	5	2.8	2	1.1	7	2.0

Commuting: minimize the living cost and maximize the earnings

Female migrants can taking care their children, family, housing and agriculture as their responsible and bounce



Interaction of gendered migration and agriculture production



Gendered migration and agricultural land use

Land use patterns	Groups of household								Total (N=215)	
	G1: Non migration (n=38)		G2: Male migration (n=40)		G3: Female migration (n=38)		G4: Both sex migration (n=99)			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<i>For agri. Production</i>	36	94.7	34	85.0	37	97.4	91	91.9	198	92.1
<i>Rent out</i>	2	5.3	5	12.5	3	7.9	10	10.1	20	9.3
<i>Rent in</i>	8	21.1	3	7.5	10	26.3	9	9.1	30	14.0
<i>Selling</i>	0	0.0	3	7.5	0	0.0	4	4.0	7	3.3
<i>Buying</i>	2	5.3	2	5.0	3	7.9	4	4.0	11	5.1
<i>Abandon</i>	10	26.3	11	27.5	7	18.4	33	33.3	61	28.4



-
- ▶ Pattern of migration and gender norms explain the highest proportion of the female migration households using their land for agricultural production.
 - ▶ Migration but keeping the land to maintain land use right and for security rather than profit from agricultural production
-
- 

Labor division: aging and feminizing agricultural production

Demographic Indicator		Farm labor	Migration labor				
			Worker	Officer	Laborer	Trader	Artisan
Age <i>(Years old)</i>	<i>Mean</i>	49.6	29.0	33.8	36.2	34.8	31.7
	<i>Max</i>	60.0	60.0	60.0	57.0	48.0	44.0
	<i>Min</i>	18.0	18.0	23.0	20.0	25.0	24.0
Sex <i>(Person)</i>	<i>Male</i>	95	85	20	52	5	16
	<i>Female</i>	129	130	21	12	8	4
	<i>Total</i>	224	215	41	64	13	20





Gender labor division in agricultural activities

Agricultural activities	Principal Members	Groups of household								Total	
		G1:		G2:		G3:		G4:			
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Rice production	<i>No practice</i>	5	13.2	3	7.5	2	5.3	2	2.0	12	5.6
	<i>Male</i>	0	0.0	5	12.5	6	15.8	5	5.1	16	7.5
	<i>Female</i>	16	42.1	18	45.0	17	44.7	35	35.7	86	40.2
	<i>Both MF</i>	17	44.7	14	35.0	13	34.2	56	57.1	100	46.7
Cash crop production	<i>No practice</i>	22	57.9	27	67.5	25	65.8	70	71.4	144	67.3
	<i>Male</i>	2	5.3	0	0.0	3	7.9	0	0.0	5	2.3
	<i>Female</i>	7	18.4	10	25.0	5	13.2	21	21.4	43	20.1
	<i>Both MF</i>	7	18.4	3	7.5	5	13.2	7	7.1	22	10.3
Pig production	<i>No practice</i>	26	68.4	24	60.0	29	76.3	83	84.7	162	75.7
	<i>Male</i>	1	2.6	5	12.5	2	5.3	2	2.0	10	4.7
	<i>Female</i>	2	5.3	8	20.0	6	15.8	6	6.1	22	10.3
	<i>Both MF</i>	9	23.7	3	7.5	1	2.6	7	7.1	20	9.4
Aquaculture production	<i>No practice</i>	34	89.5	33	82.5	31	81.6	84	85.7	182	85.1
	<i>Male</i>	1	2.6	2	5.0	3	7.9	4	4.1	10	4.7
	<i>Female</i>	2	5.3	4	10.0	3	7.9	5	5.1	14	6.5
	<i>Both MF</i>	1	2.6	1	2.5	1	2.6	5	5.1	8	3.7

-
- ▶ Migration does not create the labor shortage in rural communities as for the migrants contribute their labor during peak seasons, work together with their left behind and hire farm labors in other households
 - ▶ Migration is not as a one-way journey from rural out Livelihoods are no longer needed to be localized to either rural or urban areas but rather straddle the two
 - ▶ Farm labors has became the migrant workers but these people still keep “the fundamental characteristics of peasant”
 - ▶ The fear of de-skill and losing interest in agriculture is unwarranted because of the change in agriculture practices itself
-
- 

Future farmer?



Income indicators of surveyed households

Indicators	Unit	Groups of household				Total	P values
		Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4		
Annual income	<i>Mean</i>	87.3^a	121.2 ^a	114.2 ^a	162.1^b	132.8	0.00***
	<i>SD¹</i>	59.5	100.3	53.2	120.1	102.2	
Farm income	<i>Mean</i>	32.7 ^a	23.0 ^{ab}	28.5 ^{ab}	19.0 ^b	24.0	0.13*
	<i>SD</i>	30	20.1	25.4	15.0	20.0	
Off-farm income	<i>Mean</i>	54.5 ^a	98.2^b	85.6 ^{ab}	143.1^c	109.0	0.00***
	<i>SD</i>	48.2	87.1	50.2	122.5	102.5	
Farm income (%)	<i>Mean</i>	36.3 ^a	21.3 ^{bc}	25.0 ^b	14.6 ^c	22.0	0.00***
	<i>SD</i>	20.0	19.0	20.4	10.9	19.5	
Off-farm income (%)	<i>Mean</i>	63.7 ^a	78.8 ^b	75.0 ^{bc}	85.4 ^c	78.0	0.00***
	<i>SD</i>	31.7	20.0	26.4	19.0	24.5	
Monthly income per household	<i>Mean</i>	7.2 ^a	10.1^a	9.5 ^a	13.5^b	11.0	0.00***
	<i>SD</i>	4.9	8.3	4.4	10.0	8.5	
Monthly income per worker	<i>Mean</i>	2.6 ^a	4.0 ^b	2.9 ^a	3.7 ^a	3.4	0.2
	<i>SD</i>	1.6	3.0	1.3	2.4	3.0	
Monthly income per capita	<i>Mean</i>	1.8 ^a	2.6 ^b	2.0 ^a	2.4 ^a	2.3	0.2
	<i>SD</i>	1.1	2.5	1.6	1.8	1.8	

-
- ▶ Migration has positive effect on income generation for farm households
 - ▶ Migration of male labors contributes a higher income to households than migration of female labor
 - ▶ Considerable disparity among high income households
-
- 

Remittance: volume

Groups of surveyed households	Remittance (mean, million VND)
Group 1: Non-migrant households	0
Group2: Male-migrant households	51.9 ^{ab}
Group 3: Female-migrant households	66.3 ^{ab}
Group 4: Both male and female migrant household	120.8 ^c



Remittance investment in agricultural production

Using remittance for agricultural investment	Groups of household								Total	
	Non migration		Male migration		Female migration		Both sex migration			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	0	0.0	18	45.0	23	60.5	42	42.4	83	38.6
No	38	100.0	22	55.0	15	39.5	57	57.6	132	61.4
Total	38	100.0	40	100.0	38	100.0	99	100.0	215	100.0



-
- ▶ The volume and frequency of remittances sent back are largely determined by the level of income earned at the destination and the commitment within households
 - ▶ Smaller share of households which use part of their remittance for agricultural productive investments
 - ▶ Highest proportion of female-migrant-households investing remittance in agriculture as for better in combination migrating with doing agriculture
-
- 

Conclusion

- ▶ Migration enables the farm households to gain access to cash income in urban areas while allows them to keep their foots in rural areas
- ▶ Although remittance constitutes the main part of household income, agriculture production is still a fundamental livelihood activity for household security
- ▶ Female migration has positive impact on agricultural production while male migration contributes the large part of household income
- ▶ Migration does not support the “de-agrarianization” process because of the changing in agricultural production technologies.
- ▶ The interactions of gendered migration and agricultural production created the reality that male and female migrants take the roles of their counterparts. The migrant worker keeps defining themselves as the peasant and as village members regardless their residence. The impacts of migration on agrarian change are immensely variable, reflecting the complex and conflicting processes.



Thank you for your attention!

