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Cities have the potential to be engines of growth and development in Myanmar. New economic opportunity in cities is spurring rapid migration from rural to urban areas. This urbanization presents an unprecedented opportunity for poverty alleviation, but it also comes with enormous challenges. As cities grow government officials must tackle increased congestion, growing demands on public services, rising pollution, ensure economic opportunities for the majority, and work to maintain social cohesion and safety. Responding to the needs of an increasingly diverse urban population is not easy, anywhere in the world. It is particularly difficult in Myanmar because of a lack of reliable data. Good decisions require good information. The goal of the City Life Survey (CLS) is to provide reliable information about the experiences and opinions of urban residents to support the difficult decisions Myanmar’s urban leaders must make to guide their cities to be better places to live and work.

But what makes a city a better place to live and work? Traditionally governments have relied on indicators of economic progress. But around the world there is a growing recognition that these fail to fully capture what matters to people. Governments are therefore investing in measuring and understanding well-being and its determinants. The CLS is a project that seeks to apply the latest scientific research and policy thinking on well-being to Myanmar’s cities. By investigating well-being across multiple cities and through time, this project will allow for comparisons that can provide valuable insight during a period of great political, economic, and social change.

The 2018 CLS builds upon The Asia Foundation’s experience conducting over 300 perception surveys in Asia, the Foundation’s 2017 CLS Pilot Initiative in Myanmar, and in-depth work with municipal authorities across Myanmar. This 2018 survey covers an expanded set of cities and a refined set of questions. This summary report sets out a conceptual framework that captures the key elements of human well-being in cities and connects them to the policymaking process. The data presented in this report is a small fragment of what is available. It will be complemented by five city-level briefings, as well as deeper analysis into specific policy issues and the experiences of particular groups (e.g. the disabled). The full results will be made publicly available through an interactive survey data portal. A key finding of the 2018 CLS is that at this important moment in the democratic transition Myanmar’s cities are blessed with people committed to improving their communities and the city around them. Our hope is that the data within the 2018 CLS will support initiatives that bring government and civil society together to work towards the improvement of their cities.

The CLS project is a partnership with the Yangon School of Political Science. I would like to thank its members for the important role they played in the design and analysis, and in the task of leading the implementation of the survey in five of Myanmar’s largest cities. The 2018 CLS, and this summary report, were generously funded by the United Kingdom’s Department for International Development, the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, and the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation. The views expressed in the publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of The Asia Foundation or the project’s funders.

Matthew Arnold, Ph.D.
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Myanmar
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
The City Life Survey (CLS) is the first of its kind in Myanmar. It is a multi-year, multi-city public perception survey designed to provide policymakers, and others interested in improving Myanmar’s cities, with reliable information about the experience and well-being of Myanmar’s urban residents. The 2018 CLS asked 2,400 respondents of Yangon, Mandalay, Taunggyi, Mawlamyine and Monywa 135 questions over September and October 2018. The results reveal insights that are consistent across all five cities surveyed.

1. Urban residents see infrastructure improvements moving their city in the right direction but they worry about safety and security. In all five cities, respondents are more likely to say things in their city are headed in the right direction than in the wrong direction. Improvements to road conditions and electricity supply are driving optimism among urban residents. Safety and security concerns are the overwhelming reason why some urban residents do not see their city going in the right direction.

2. Respondents inhabit close-knit, socially engaged communities, and enjoy strong personal relationships. Respondents tend to feel welcome in their neighborhoods and show high levels of satisfaction with personal relationships. Trust levels are relatively high and social engagement, including volunteering and donating, are some of the highest in the world.

3. People feel mostly powerless to influence government decisions that affect their lives. Most do not feel safe to express political opinions publicly; just 28% say that their state/region representative represents their interests; and nearly 70% say that they are unable to have any influence at all over decisions made by their municipal authority.

4. Economic uncertainty is widespread (although it differs by income group). Fewer than 40% of respondents expect their financial situation to improve in the next five years and more than a third say that they are unable to afford an unexpected medical bill of MMK 200,000 (approx. USD 130). Wealth inequality is also perceived to be a problem, with nearly two-thirds of respondents saying so, but most are optimistic that hard work can result in improvements in their lives.

5. Self-reported personal well-being is high. Most people have high levels of life satisfaction, happiness and health, and most feel that their life is worthwhile. An incredible 27% of people report being completely happy (10 out of 10).

Two over-arching findings of the 2018 CLS are that where you live and who you are affect your experiences and your sense of well-being. The five cities surveyed here exhibit sizable disparities in well-being between one another as well as between the rich and poor, young and old, men and women, and Buddhist and non-Buddhist, among other characteristics.
WHERE YOU LIVE MATTERS

Where you live has a profound impact on your experiences and well-being. Some differences between cities may result from slow changing environmental or demographic factors, but others may be because of policy differences, opening the possibility of learning between cities. For instance:

PERSONAL WELL-BEING

Taunggyi shows the highest happiness and life satisfaction levels, as well as the highest score on whether life is worthwhile.

Respondents in Monywa report the best health and lowest anxiety.

ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Cost of living varies between cities with many goods and services reported to be easier to afford in Taunggyi, and more difficult in Mawlamyine.

Economic optimism is the highest in Monywa where 51% of respondents feel their financial situation would improve within five years. Only 34% say so in Yangon.

INTER-PERSONAL WELL-BEING

Social trust is high across all cities. Cities with more ethnic and religious diversity show higher levels of social trust between ethnic and religious groups.

Residents of Mandalay and Mawlamyine are the most likely to include their city of residence as one of the two most important elements for their sense of identity.

PHYSICAL WELL-BEING

In Mawlamyine, 17% say that they have had to either skip a meal or cut the size of a meal in the past month because of money. This compares to just 2% in Taunggyi.

Nearly 70% of respondents in Taunggyi say that they feel safe walking alone in their neighborhood after dark, whereas just 48% of respondents in Yangon say so.

URBAN GOVERNANCE

In Monywa, 66% of respondents say that their city is headed in the right direction. Just 30% say so in Mandalay despite respondents in Mandalay being most likely to say that their city government is responsive to the public’s needs.

70% of respondents in Monywa say that they feel safe expressing their opinions about government in public, while just 32% of respondents in Mawlamyine say so.
WHO YOU ARE MATTERS

Urban residents embody many demographic characteristics, each of which may be having some influence on their day to day experiences. The 2018 CLS data allows us to look at the similarities and differences between these groupings. For instance:

**PERSONAL WELL-BEING**

- Personal well-being is closely tied to income and education. Higher-income respondents and the most educated showed higher levels of personal well-being along all measures.
- Men report better health and lower anxiety, while women report better life satisfaction and are more likely to say that their life is worthwhile.

**ECONOMIC WELL-BEING**

- The poor are much more likely to carry large and burdensome debt. Just 1% of the wealthiest respondents say that they have taken a loan larger than their monthly income, compared to 56% of the lowest-income respondents.³
- More than 91% of respondents age 18-30 own a smart phone, while just 63% of respondents over 50 years old own a smart phone.

**INTER-PERSONAL WELL-BEING**

- When asked if they agree that people of other religions can be trusted, respondents with a graduate degree or higher are three times more likely to agree than those with no formal education.³
- Almost one-third of non-Buddhists feel discrimination when seeking help from the police. Women report slightly higher levels of gender-based discrimination than men, especially when going to the hospital.

**PHYSICAL WELL-BEING**

- Across all cities, women are less likely to say that they exercise most or every day. In Mandalay, men are 31 percentage points more likely to say so.
- The poorest respondents are 36 percentage points more likely to say that health care is difficult to afford. Those who self-identify as having a disability are no more likely to say that health care is difficult to afford or access than those who do not identify as having a disability.

**URBAN GOVERNANCE**

- Most respondents tend to believe their city is headed in the right direction because of improvements to road conditions and electricity. Yet there are large differences in responses between those with no formal education and those with at least a graduate degree.
- Higher-income respondents are 20 percentage points more likely to say that corruption is a common practice in their city.

---

a. Wealthiest respondents are those making more than 550,000MMK per month. The poorest respondents are those making less than 150,000MMK per month.
b. The most educated respondents are those with a post graduate degree. The least educated respondents are those with no formal education.
Managing cities is not easy. The problems cities face are many and complex. City governments are constrained by limited resources and technical capacity, political gridlock, and the challenge of getting different organizations to work together towards common goals. There are no simple solutions, so cities throughout the world try different approaches to address their problems. Some are more successful than others.

Myanmar is no different. The 2018 CLS finds that each city surveyed has achieved success in some areas and has room for improvement in others. The 2018 CLS shows where each city performs well and where it may have a lesson to share with those looking to improve their cities. Other cities can offer insight into what policy reforms could be valuable. And just as important, how best to implement them.

AVENUES FOR REFORM: LEARNING FROM OTHER CITIES

MONYWA

- Residents perceive corruption to be lower. Just 3% report having given a bribe in the previous three months.
- Residents are the most likely to say they are optimistic about their city's direction. 66% say that Monywa is headed in the right direction.
- Residents say they feel safe in their city. 67% feel safe walking alone in their neighborhood after dark.

YANGON

- Residents indicate considerable trust in law enforcement. 74% strongly agreed that if they were a victim of a crime, law enforcement would punish the guilty party.
- Food insecurity affects a relatively small proportion of residents. 4% have skipped or cut a meal in the past month because of money.
- Has the highest earners of all five cities. Only 27% of households make less than 250,000 MMK (approx. USD 160) a month.
**Mandalay**

69% of residents believe their city government has a vision and is responsive to the public’s needs. 69% agree the city government is responsive to the public’s needs.

23% of essential goods and services are relatively affordable. 23%, the lowest proportion of any city, say that food is difficult to afford.

60% of residents feel that they could withstand a natural disaster. 60% say that their household is prepared for any future natural disaster.

**Taunggyi**

67% of residents have the highest reported levels of social cohesion and social engagement. 67% agree that most people in Taunggyi can be trusted.

2% of most residents say they enjoy physical security and food security. 2% say they have had to skip or cut a meal in the past month because of money - the lowest proportion of any city.

47% of residents are economic optimists. 47% believe that their financial situation will improve over the next five years.

**Mawlamyine**

75% of residents are the most likely to say that their city leaders have a vision for city development. 75% feel that their city leaders have such a vision.

80% of Mawlamyine receives the highest scores for clean air and clean streets of any city. 80% say that streets are clean in Mawlamyine and 92% say that the air is clean.

74% of residents are the most likely to say they are prepared for a natural disaster. 74% say that their household is prepared for any future natural disaster.
1. INTRODUCTION
The *2018 City Life Survey (2018 CLS)* is an initiative to understand the well-being of urban residents in five cities across Myanmar. Its aim is to support policymaking by providing information about the direct experience of urban residents — including their economic situation, their health, their relationships with other people, and their interaction with government. It is intended for government officials and others interested in policy-making and improving Myanmar’s cities.

As a multi-city multi-year perception survey the CLS is a tool to support horizontal learning between cities across Myanmar. While cities face many common urban challenges, they are adopting different approaches to addressing them. For this reason, cities can be thought of as ‘idea laboratories’ — the diversity of practice can result in some spectacular successes that can be learned from, as detailed throughout this report. The CLS forms part of The Asia Foundation’s extensive work with municipal authorities across the country to capture the examples of where cities are doing things well and to showcase these to others who are looking to reform. The *2018 CLS* data will not tell the full story of how or why things are the way they are, but it can help identify where things are going well, spurring further inquiry from government and others committed to improving the well-being of people living in Myanmar’s cities.

This report is a summary of the survey findings. It does not cover all 135 questions that were asked in the survey and it only provides an initial illustration of how answers vary between groups (e.g. how responses of the poor vary to the rich).

The summary report is one part of a suite of products that report survey findings. It does not lay out prescriptive policy recommendations as the problems cities face are complex and solutions must be tailored to the local context. Instead this report poses policy questions worthy of further study and suggests an approach to policy reform — identifying and learning from ‘positive deviance’. ‘Positive deviance’ refers to the uncommon strategies that have enabled some cities and the organizations within them to find better solutions to their problems than their peers.

**OBJECTIVES OF THE CITY LIFE SURVEY**

1. **Provide policymakers with reliable information about the experience and well-being of urban residents, to support evidence-based policy-making.**

2. **Provide policymakers a social and political barometer that highlights where residents feel their city is doing things well, and where expectations are not being met and tensions may be building.**

3. **Facilitate lesson learning from the experiences of each city, through inter-city comparisons over time.**

**2018 CLS UPCOMING PRODUCTS:**

- Five city-level briefings
- Summary infographics
- Urban governance policy paper
- Youth / disabled well-being policy paper
- Publicly available data portal and data analysis training workshops

**EVIDENCE FOR THE FUTURE OF MYANMAR’S CITIES**

Urbanization—the movement of people from rural to urban areas—is taking place at a rapid rate across the country. The International Organization for Migration estimates that nearly one-third of the rural population will migrate into urban areas within the next 20 years. The rapid influx of urban residents brings with it the potential for improvements in living standards, but it also poses great challenges that require difficult decisions. For example, as the number of cars increases, should the municipal authority build more fly-overs, invest in public transportation infrastructure, or take
a different approach to traffic congestion? With more people searching for affordable housing, should the city convert public parks into housing or preserve green space? As diverse communities converge into cities seeking opportunity, policymakers will have to explore ways to preserve social capital and nurture communities of peaceful coexistence and trust. Policymakers’ decisions on how to address these challenges will have an enduring impact on the long-term livability of Myanmar’s cities and the well-being of those who live in them.

In the face of these critical questions, policymakers need information about the nature of the challenge they face. They need to understand its magnitude, who is most affected, and how it is changing. Myanmar is a data-poor environment. Due to limited reliable data and evidence, policymakers often grapple with a less than complete understanding of the challenges they face.

One source of information, that has historically been ignored, is the direct views and opinions of the people of Myanmar. Under Myanmar’s periods of military rule, this meant “the public had little or no influence on problem recognition and issue selection by government”.2 The democratic transition, however nascent, has galvanized many policymakers in government to seek to understand the needs of the people so that they can better respond to them.

The CLS is a source of evidence that can help fill this information gap. The CLS aims to generate robust evidence that can inform three critical stages of government policymaking:

1. **AGENDA SETTING**: This is the process of selecting which issues are discussed and addressed by government. The CLS can help the government see where it is needed and where it can contribute the most.
2. **POLICY FORMULATION**: At the formulation stage, policymakers design and draft policies. The data from the CLS can help to ensure that policy is based on sound evidence rather than simple intuition, anecdote (such as stories from social media), or low-quality data. This supports an alternative to policies that cater to special interests and elites, who may present government with their own impartial evidence and who have historically had undue influence on policymaking in Myanmar.
3. **POLICY EVALUATION**: At the evaluation stage, policymakers assess whether a policy or program did what they hoped it would do. The CLS can be a tool to track public support for government programs and contribute to understanding what impact they may be having.

Data from the 2017 pilot CLS revealed that while a majority of urban residents were willing to pay more property tax, they found the tax system confusing and didn’t know where their money was spent. A full 89% of respondents wanted to know what taxes they were supposed to pay and what their tax money was being spent on.

In Taunggyi, the Development Affairs Organization (DAO) responded to the City Life Survey findings and launched a public communication campaign. As part of the initiative, the DAO released a mobile application, Myo Taw,3 which provides information on DAO services and enables users to put forward contributions on what they’d like to see fixed or improved. It contains a tax calculator and clear information on tax charges and business fees. The DAO also opened an information center and released a municipal “Citizen’s Budget”. The budget, which was the first of its kind in Myanmar, provides a breakdown of the municipal budget in easy-to-understand terms.

Taunggyi 2018 Municipal Citizen’s Budget
While some reliable data exists on economic output and the business climate, there is particularly limited information about what arguably matters most: individual well-being. An effective people-centered government aims to maximize well-being, not only by facilitating economic growth and opportunity, but by nurturing healthy and cohesive communities and individuals. The 2018 CLS offers information about economic development, but also explores other important elements of well-being such as health, relationships, and political agency, so that policymakers can shape urban governance and make cities better places to live and work.

WHY WELL-BEING?

What policymakers choose to measure affects the decisions that they make. There is a growing movement to change the way that governments measure their performance and track their progress. Traditionally, the measures of success for a city, state or country have been primarily economic. These measures are useful for evaluating economic conditions but are often disconnected from people’s lives. They miss elements of life that matter most — relationships, sense of fulfillment, and health, for example. They ignore the psychological benefits of feeling welcome in your community or the health benefits of spending time in nature. They fail to capture the importance of feeling heard by your government or close to your family.

Financial stability and the ability to meet basic needs and wants are important components to living a “good life”, but they are not everything. By only measuring economic conditions, policymakers may be directed to make decisions that ignore other important areas of life. If policymakers hope to understand and improve the elements of life that really matter to urban residents, they must measure more than economic performance.

In search of a better way to measure performance, governments and researchers have increasingly turned to well-being. In 2009, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) began the Better Life Initiative and released one of the first frameworks for measuring well-being. The OECD initiative sought to build a better evidence base for policymaking, develop better measures of people’s well-being, and stimulate debate about well-being. Countries at different levels of development, from the United Kingdom (UK) and Canada to Mexico and Bhutan, have begun to measure well-being and use the data to inform policy decisions.

The definition of well-being differs from place to place because what matters to people differs in different locations. But at its core, well-being is a multi-dimensional measure of the elements of life that are central to living a “good life”.

The framework for how the 2018 CLS measured well-being is outlined below and focuses on personal well-being and three key determinants of personal well-being: (1) economic well-being, (2) inter-personal well-being, and (3) physical well-being. This framework was constructed based on a growing body of research about what is important to well-being, and was tailored to the Myanmar context. The 2018 CLS measured each dimension of well-being so that policymakers can improve the elements of life that are most important to people.

“THE TRUE DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN BEINGS INvolves much more than mere economic growth. AT ITS HEART THERE MUST BE A SENSE OF EMPOWERMENT AND INNER FULFILMENT.”

Aung San Suu Kyi, Freedom from Fear
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METHODOLOGY SUMMARY

The 2018 survey builds upon The Asia Foundation’s in-depth work with municipal authorities across Myanmar and the experience of the 2017 pilot CLS. The 2017 pilot initiative surveyed 1,400 individuals from Yangon, Taunggyi and Hpa-An. Hpa-An was not included in the 2018 survey because of heavy flooding in August 2018. The CLS is an evolving project and the 2018 survey improved upon the 2017 pilot by:

- Expanding from three cities to five cities
- Revising the methodology to ensure it captured a more representative sample of Yangon
- Expanding the sample from 1,400 to 2,400 individuals
- Refining the questionnaire in-line with a new conceptual framework with well-being at its core

YANGON

Population > 5,000,000
- Largest city in Myanmar - and former capital city
- Center of economic activity
- 34 townships under Yangon City Development Council management

MAWLAMYINE

Population > 250,000
- Capital city of Mon State
- Home to Mon, Karen, Bamar and other ethnic minorities
- Mawlamyine Township DAO responsible for much urban management within the city

MANDALAY

Population > 1,000,000
- Business hub of central Myanmar
- Second biggest city
- Major tourist attractions
- 6 townships under Mandalay City Development Council management

MONYWA

Population > 200,000
- Capital city of Sagaing Region
- Major trade and commerce of agricultural products
- Monywa Township DAO responsible for much urban management within the city

TAUNGGYI

Population > 260,000
- Capital of Shan State
- Built on a plateau
- Expanding administrative boundaries
- Taunggyi DAO has direct control of 22 urban wards, and indirect control of Aye Thar Yar and Shwe Nyaung sub-townships
SELECTING THE SAMPLE:
The 2018 CLS was deployed in five cities, comprised of 27 townships and 228 urban wards. In total, more than 2,400 individuals from four religious groups and 48 ethnic groups were interviewed. The survey was deployed in Yangon (806 respondents), Mandalay (405 respondents), Mawlamyine (403 respondents), Monywa (400 respondents) and Taunggyi (400 respondents). Only adult residents of Myanmar who were at least 18 years of age were interviewed. The resulting sample was representative of the adult population of each city. While it was not representative of Myanmar as a whole, or all cities in the country, the five cities are home to nearly 25% of Myanmar’s overall population and are the capital cities of their respective states and regions. These cities were selected because of their economic and social importance, the resources available, and the interest of their governments to better understand the experience of their residents.

ENSURING THE SAMPLE IS REPRESENTATIVE:
The survey was deployed using a rigorous random sampling procedure to ensure that each city sample would be representative of that city. Three-stage randomization was conducted at the ward, household, and individual levels. While wards were randomly

---

**THE 2018 CITY LIFE SURVEY CITIES**

- **Yangon**: 806 respondents
- **Mandalay**: 405 respondents
- **Mawlamyine**: 403 respondents
- **Monywa**: 400 respondents
- **Taunggyi**: 400 respondents
selected, larger wards were more likely to be selected because the survey used a probability proportional to size selection method, which ensures each individual in the city is equally likely to be selected. Within each ward, interviewers randomly selected eight households. Within each household, one adult resident was randomly selected to be interviewed. Further information on the sampling procedure, data quality measures, and interview methodology can be found in Annex I of this report.

**APPLYING WEIGHTS TO THE RESULTS:**
This sampling procedure resulted in a sample that slightly over-represented women. The data was, therefore, weighted to accurately represent each city’s population. The findings section reports some results for the overall sample (all five cities combined). Because Yangon and Mandalay are much larger than the other cities in the sample, responses from residents of those cities were up-weighted. As a result of this weighting procedure, findings that refer to the overall sample will primarily reflect the responses of those from Yangon and Mandalay, given their much larger populations.

**QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN:**
The 2018 CLS questionnaire was developed in partnership with a wide range of stakeholders and after extensive research of public perception surveys from around the world. Some questions were taken from other surveys, such as questions on personal well-being, while others were designed to meet the specific needs of municipal authorities. The Asia Foundation and Yangon School of Political Science consulted government officials, policy analysts, academics, and other experts on surveys, urban issues, and Myanmar when creating the questionnaire.

To capture the holistic determinants of well-being, respondents were asked 135 questions. These included core questions, which covered key elements of urban well-being, as well as a set of thematic policy questions covering a specific area of urban governance. The thematic questions focused on topics that municipal authorities had indicated were of particular importance. In the 2017 survey, thematic questions focused on tax attitudes. In this 2018 survey, thematic policy questions focused on municipal waste collection and residents’ use of digital technologies.

---

**TASTING SOUP – CHOOSING AN APPROPRIATE SAMPLE SIZE**

A sample of 2,400 people may seem small relative to the total population of Yangon, Mandalay, Mawlamyine, Monywa, and Taunggyi. It is, in fact, a large enough sample to provide a representative picture of the total population of each city. The sample sizes selected keep the margin of error to +/-5%. For reference, the average poll in the United States, a country of over 300 million people, is 1,000 individuals. The key is to ask just enough people, and to use robust sample selection techniques, to be confident of the results. The survey approach and statistical methods used to analyze the data require relatively small samples to be able to make generalizations about the underlying population. By analogy, if a soup is stirred properly you do not have to eat the whole thing to know what it tastes like.
The report is structured in the following way. Section I introduces the report. Section II summarizes the conceptual framework, which provides the foundation for this survey. Section III outlines the key findings and a set of accompanying policy implications. The report does not attempt to make a set of prescriptive recommendations for government – the data is intended to guide deeper investigation into important policy questions and encourage investigation into those cities where interventions seem to be working. It is broken into the five components of the conceptual framework, covering: personal well-being, economic well-being, inter-personal well-being, physical well-being, as well as urban governance. The report closes with a set of annexes, including a detailed breakdown of the methodology, profile of respondents and the complete questionnaire.
SECTION II

2

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: MEASURING URBAN WELL-BEING
Well-being is hard to define, and many factors influence it. The 2018 CLS has a conceptual framework that provides a working definition for urban well-being. The framework sets boundaries and explains the logic for why certain components, themes and questions are included, and why others are left out. It attempts to simplify the complex concepts covered by the 2018 CLS and how they relate to one another. It also forms the basic structure of the findings section of this summary report.

The 2018 CLS conceptual framework draws from other frameworks about urban living, but differs in that it focuses on individual well-being. The new Myanmar government has made improving people’s lives (i.e. improving their well-being) a central tenet of policymaking. Through the Myanmar Sustainable Development Plan the Government of Myanmar set out a “people-centered” strategy that “strives to strike the right balance between economic and social development, environmental protection and sustainability … [and] to provide for the safety and security of our people.”

While well-being is widely recognized as important, it is often ignored by policymakers because key elements of well-being, such as the quality of relationships or a feeling of political freedom, are difficult to measure. Even where there is enthusiasm around well-being, there are few examples of policymakers using well-being metrics to shape policy. This is changing. Policymakers across the world are beginning to shape policy and evaluate their effectiveness by assessing public well-being. Governments and researchers are exploring the key determinants of well-being and ways to measure it. This survey seeks to apply this latest scientific research and policy thinking on well-being to Myanmar’s cities. By providing decision makers with a deeper understanding of urban well-being the survey will enable those who have political will to more effectively target their policies and programs at improving well-being.
PERSONAL WELL-BEING

Personal well-being comprises the inner core of the conceptual framework. To measure personal well-being (also known as “subjective well-being”), the survey includes four questions which have been used by the UK Government Office for National Statistics since 2011. These questions are about people evaluating their own life. They directly ask respondents to rate their overall life satisfaction, their health, their anxiety, and whether they feel their life is worthwhile.16 The questions enable readers to understand not only if urban residents feel that they are healthy, happy, and free from anxiety (hedonic well-being), but if they feel they live a life of purpose and growth (eudaimonic well-being17).

The questions are one of several approaches used by researchers studying well-being. This approach was chosen as the best fit for the context, the goals of the 2018 CLS, and the available resources.

DETERMINANTS OF PERSONAL WELL-BEING

Within the framework there are three fundamental determinants of personal well-being: economic well-being, physical well-being, and inter-personal well-being. These determinants of personal well-being do not reveal whether a person feels happy or anxious, but whether they, for example, have enough to eat or feel welcome in their community. They help to unpack why an individual might feel happy or anxious. They investigate material conditions (for example, “what is your income?”), experiences (“how many times do you play sports or exercise per week?”), resilience (“do you have enough money to pay for an unexpected medical bill?”) and other elements of life that may affect well-being.

Each domain, and its corresponding question(s), was selected because research has shown it to be related to well-being. In addition to their influence on personal well-being, the three domains influence each other in complex and often subtle ways. For instance, the strength of an individual’s social network (inter-personal well-being) will influence whether they feel able to borrow from a friend to cover the costs of an unexpected health emergency (physical well-being) and their assessment of the job opportunities available to them (economic well-being).
ECONOMIC WELL-BEING:  
	Are residents able to meet their financial needs and wants? Are they able to pursue fruitful professional opportunities? Do they see the economic system as fair and one in which they can thrive?

Economic conditions, especially the ability to find quality work and earn a decent income, are important determinants of well-being.\(^{18}\) They are a key reason people move to cities. Not only do work and income allow for individuals and families to put food on the table and a roof overhead, but they provide meaning and purpose to life. In addition to a series of questions about employment and income, the 2018 CLS investigates respondents’ economic resilience, or ability to bounce back from a loss of income or unexpected expense. When this information is broken down by different income and demographic groups, it allows policymakers to better understand which groups are vulnerable to falling into poverty and how respondents cope with their economic conditions. This information can help policymakers to structure social protection programs. Research also shows that relative wealth, an individual’s perceived social status, and inequality, can affect well-being.\(^{19}\) The survey, therefore, asks whether respondents believe inequality is a problem in their city and whether the current economic system allows for an individual who works hard to get ahead.

INTERPERSONAL WELL-BEING:  
	Do residents have a sense of social or communal belonging? Do they trust others in society? Do they have a reliable social support network and meaningful personal relationships?

Research has consistently found that enjoying meaningful personal relationships and living in a cohesive community in which you feel welcome are important to happiness and well-being.\(^{20}\) One study even suggests that trust is as important to economic growth as education.\(^{21}\) Social capital, defined as networks and shared values that enable cooperation and coexistence between and within groups, is particularly important to growth and stability in places like Myanmar where formal institutions like courts are often unable to effectively mediate disputes.\(^{22}\) To understand the state of social capital and how government can nurture and sustain it, the 2018 CLS asks questions about belonging and identity, participation in community, social alienation, and trust.\(^{23}\)

In addition to questions about society-level relationships, the 2018 CLS asks respondents about personal and community-level relationships. Research indicates that experiencing discrimination and feeling isolated from one’s family and neighbors undermines well-being.\(^{24}\)

PHYSICAL WELL-BEING:  
	Are respondents healthy? Do they feel safe? Are they able to deal with an unexpected sickness, injury, or disease?

Physical well-being is an important determinant of overall well-being. Healthy people consistently show higher levels of life satisfaction and happiness.\(^{25}\) The 2018 CLS asks a range of questions to understand physical well-being. In addition to the personal well-being questions about anxiety, overall health, and security, the 2018 CLS asks about objective determinants of physical well-being, such as the regularity of exercise, ability to afford health care, and direct experiences of violence or crime. Physical resilience, such as the ability to withstand an unexpected sickness or injury without falling into poverty, is another important element of physical well-being that the 2018 CLS explores.
The survey also includes a series of questions about the government’s role in promoting urban well-being. All three determinants of well-being that are outlined above can be influenced by government. Government is not the only thing in urban life that affects well-being – people’s daily lives are influenced greatly by Myanmar’s vibrant civil society, businesses, and community-based and grass roots organizations and networks. But government sets the enabling environment, the formal and informal rules and processes, which influence all other actors. Given that this research aims to inform policymaking, the survey includes a series of questions about the quality of urban governance and the relationship between the public and their municipal authority.

Freedom, especially freedom of choice, and political agency – defined as respondents’ ability to influence political decisions that impact their lives – have consistently shown to be important determinants of well-being and happiness. When people feel their government listens to them, they feel respected. In some research, freedom of choice and political agency have been shown to be more powerful indicators of happiness and well-being than income. Research suggests that having adequate control over one’s life is fundamental to well-being. The survey, therefore, asks respondents about freedom of speech, their government’s responsiveness, and their ability to affect government decisions.

In addition, this section provides the most direct evaluation of government performance. Respondents are asked to evaluate the overall direction of their city, the vision and leadership of government representatives, the quality of their engagement with government, and the quality and accessibility of specific services.
OVERALL FRAMEWORK

**URBAN GOVERNANCE**

**DEFINITION:** Having the right to freely and safely express beliefs and participate in politics and government. Having a government that is responsive to the public and provides quality goods and services that meet the public’s needs. Having leaders with a vision for development.

**ECONOMIC WELL-BEING**

**DEFINITION:** Having financial security that enables an individual and/or household to meet basic needs, including food, housing, health care, transportation, education, clothing, and child care. Having the freedom to make economic choices and pursue fruitful employment, and the resilience to manage economic shocks.

**PERSONAL WELL-BEING**

**DEFINITION:** Having a healthy, happy, satisfied and worthwhile life with limited anxiety.

**PHYSICAL WELL-BEING**

**DEFINITION:** The absence of disease; the ability to avoid preventable diseases and conditions; and the ability to live in a balanced state of body, mind, and spirit without undue fatigue or physical stress. Having a sense of physical security.

**INTER-PERSONAL WELL-BEING**

**DEFINITION:** Having a sense of social belonging and meaningful connections to others in society, community and/or family. The extent to which your most prominent identity is common across societal groups. Enjoying social stability, peace, and trust in others in society.
UNDERSTANDING THE URBAN EXPERIENCE OF MYANMAR’S DIVERSE COMMUNITIES AND MARGINALIZED GROUPS

The 2018 CLS aims to capture differences in the experiences and views of diverse communities, including traditionally marginalized groups. Historically, marginalized groups have had less voice in society and less power over the decisions that most affect their lives. The 2018 CLS explicitly tries to understand the complex ways in which minority experiences are both similar and different from those of majority groups.

It is important to understand not only if people’s lives are improving on average across a city, but how those improvements are distributed. The 2018 CLS interviewed a larger sample than the 2017 CLS pilot to allow for the findings to be disaggregated along key demographic lines. For example, the survey was designed so that analysts could evaluate whether low-income respondents are as satisfied with their garbage collection service as high-income respondents; whether women feel that their city provides them with fewer opportunities for job growth than men; or if recent migrants feel as welcomed on the streets of their neighborhood as those who have lived there for decades. For the 2018 CLS to be useful in policymaking, it must capture the full diversity of experiences in Myanmar’s cities so that policies can be appropriately tailored to residents’ needs.

Historically, policymaking in Myanmar has been carried out behind closed doors and for the benefit of a small elite. As the country continues its transition to an era in which government serves the interests of the entire public, evidence of the experience of those who have poor access to power becomes more important. The legitimacy of the democratic transition in Myanmar depends partly on policymakers understanding and responding to the needs and aspirations of a diverse public. By putting the well-being of urban residents at the center of this survey, the 2018 CLS aims to provide policymakers with a trusted source of evidence to support these efforts.

“MINORITY CAN NO LONGER BE DEFINED MERELY IN TERMS OF NUMBERS. MINORITIES ARE THOSE PEOPLE WITH POOR ACCESS TO POWER.”

Aung San Suu Kyi,
Freedom from Fear
the 2018 city life survey summary report

2. conceptual framework
SECTION III

FINDINGS
3 FINDINGS: PERSONAL WELL-BEING

This chapter summarizes responses by city and key demographic groups along the five direct measures of personal well-being. Respondents were asked to rate, on a scale of 1 to 10, their life satisfaction, happiness, anxiety, health, and how worthwhile their life is. For the question on anxiety, ‘1’ indicates low anxiety and ‘10’ indicates high anxiety. For all other questions, 10 is the best rating and 1 is the lowest rating. Personal well-being questions like this are used in perception surveys worldwide. The wordings for these questions were taken from the UK Government’s Office of National Statistics.

KEY FINDINGS

- Most people have high life satisfaction, find their life worthwhile, are happy and in good health. Anxiety is generally low, but varies between cities.
- Personal well-being is closely tied to income and education. Higher income respondents and the most educated show higher levels of personal well-being along all measures.
- Taunggyi shows the highest levels of well-being for three out of the five measures.
- Men report better health and lower anxiety, while women report better life satisfaction and are more likely to say that their life is worthwhile.

ILLUSTRATIVE POLICY QUESTIONS

While personal well-being is high for most respondents, some people are very satisfied/happy with life, while others are much less satisfied, and less well off. Should government prioritize improving the well-being of the small number of people who are the worst off, or trying to improve well-being for the majority?

Well-being is highest, on average, in Taunggyi. Is this because the city is good for well-being, or because of differences in how the questions are interpreted by respondents there?

Those with higher levels of education also tend to have higher levels of income. So which of these two factors has the biggest influence on well-being? Is it because of direct impacts (e.g. a person regards a high income as an indicator of a successful life) or indirect impacts (e.g. a higher income enables a person to pursue a career they find more rewarding)?

Overall, most respondents reported feeling healthy, with 73% reporting at least 7 out of 10 and 27% reporting 10 out of 10. Happiness levels were slightly lower, with 51% reporting 7 out of 10 or higher. Across the five cities, 30% reported having no anxiety, but 37% reported having anxiety of at least 5 out of 10. Yangon and Mandalay showed consistently lower scores of personal well-being than the three smaller cities.

Responses varied considerably when evaluating by income group and gender. Higher-income respondents scored 0.7 points higher, on average, with the largest divergence on the measure of health, where the wealthiest respondents scored 1.3 points higher than the poorest. Men scored higher on health and anxiety, but women were slightly more likely to say that they were satisfied with their life and that their life was worthwhile.
3. Findings: Personal Well-being

**Life Satisfaction**


**Life is Worthwhile**


**Happiness**


**Anxiety**

- Yangon: 3.3, Mandalay: 3.4, Mawlamyine: 2.4, Monywa: 2.3, Taunggyi: 3.3

**Health**

- Yangon: 7.6, Mandalay: 8.1, Mawlamyine: 7.5, Monywa: 8.3, Taunggyi: 7.9

**Income Group**

- Lowest: 6.6, Highest: 7.1

**Gender**

- Men: 6.6, Women: 6.9
3. Findings: Personal Well-Being

- **Life Satisfaction**:
  - < Middle: 6.8
  - Middle or HS: 7.0
  - Tertiary: 6.8
  - 18-29: 6.9
  - 30-50: 6.8
  - 50+: 7.3
  - Buddhist: 6.9
  - Non-Buddhist: 7.4

- **Life is Worthwhile**:
  - < Middle: 7.0
  - Middle or HS: 7.2
  - Tertiary: 7.1
  - 18-29: 6.9
  - 30-50: 7.0
  - 50+: 7.5
  - Buddhist: 7.1
  - Non-Buddhist: 7.3

- **Happiness**:
  - < Middle: 6.4
  - Middle or HS: 6.6
  - Tertiary: 6.7
  - 18-29: 6.8
  - 30-50: 6.5
  - 50+: 6.6
  - Buddhist: 6.6
  - Non-Buddhist: 7.1

- **Anxiety**:
  - < Middle: 3.3
  - Middle or HS: 3.4
  - Tertiary: 3.3
  - 18-29: 3.3
  - 30-50: 3.5
  - 50+: 3.2
  - Buddhist: 3.3
  - Non-Buddhist: 3.7

- **Health**:
  - < Middle: 7.6
  - Middle or HS: 7.5
  - Tertiary: 7.7
  - 18-29: 8.2
  - 30-50: 8.6
  - 50+: 8.0
  - Buddhist: 7.0
  - Non-Buddhist: 7.8
  - Non-Buddhist: 7.5
The 2018 CLS asked a series of questions to understand economic conditions for urban residents. Economic well-being is an important determinant of overall well-being and is particularly important in places where necessities can be hard to afford. While cities offer benefits of entertainment and employment opportunities, the high cost of living can strain residents’ finances. This section looks at key economic factors that affect well-being, such as employment, income, and affordability.

**KEY FINDINGS**

- Unemployment is low and there are good employment opportunities in most cities.
- Cost of living varies greatly between cities.
- Economic optimism is highest in Monywa and Taunggyi, where 51% and 49% of respondents feel their financial situation will improve. In Yangon only 34% say so.
- Households are vulnerable to financial shocks.
- More than half of women do not work outside the home.31
- Most respondents believe that wealth inequality is a problem. Most also believe that a person who works hard can get ahead in their city.

**ILLUSTRATIVE POLICY QUESTIONS**

The economy is growing and in most cities job opportunities are promising. But a household’s financial situation also depends on other factors. Many groups in the cities studied are struggling with rising costs of living and have such limited savings, so they are vulnerable to economic shocks. *Should the government take a more active role in providing a financial safety net to the most vulnerable, or leave households to rely on their own (generally strong) networks of family, friends and community groups? What is it about individuals in Monywa and Taunggyi that makes them more optimistic about their economic prospects?*

A large proportion of respondents across all cities say that wealth inequality is a problem, yet the vast majority also say that someone who works hard can get ahead. There are only limited differences between rich and poor. *If poorer people feel that hard workers can get ahead, what aspects of inequality do they consider to be problematic?*
42% of respondents did not work, but only 4% of unemployed respondents were currently looking for work. Women constituted the largest segment of the non-working population. 55% of women did not work (outside the home) while 28% of men did not. Taunggyi had the highest rate of employment, with 70% of respondents working. Of those respondents who did work, most worked full time.

Respondents from Monywa and Mandalay showed the most optimism about employment opportunities, with more than two-thirds of respondents agreeing that there were good opportunities in their cities.

55% of women don’t work outside the home

28% of men don’t work outside the home

56% agree with the statement “There are good employment opportunities in my city.”
Financial well-being is a measure of a household’s financial condition. It considers the number of income earners, their income, the number of dependents within a household, and the cost of living.

Earnings varied significantly by education level. 47% of individuals with a graduate degree made at least 450,000 MMK, whereas just 16% of those with no formal education did so. 60% of respondents with no formal education made less than 350,000 MMK per month. Yangon had the largest concentration of high earners, with 22% of respondents earning more than 550,000 MMK per month, while only 10% of respondents in Taunggyi earned that much. Although Taunggyi had the highest rate of employment, it also had the highest percentage of low earners, with 43% making less than 250,000 MMK per month.

Most households (64%) had at least two earners. The number of earners in a household did not vary much by city.
Given that cost of living is a major downside of living in an urban setting, respondents were asked whether they found essential goods and services difficult to afford. Overall, respondents in Taunggyi were least likely to say that these essential goods and services were difficult to afford. Responses varied widely by income levels.

Respondents were also asked if their current accommodation met the space and quality needs of their family. A large majority of respondents indicated that their housing accommodation met their needs. More than 70% of respondents said so in every city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Yangon</th>
<th>Mandalay</th>
<th>Mawlamyine</th>
<th>Monywa</th>
<th>Taunggyi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Groceries</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Lowest income group</th>
<th>Highest income group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Groceries</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents were asked the degree to which they expected their financial situation to improve in the next five years. Respondents were most likely to say that their situation would not change, though this was driven by greater pessimism in Yangon. Responses differed by education level, with 17% of individuals with at least a graduate level education strongly agreeing that their household’s financial situation would improve in the next five years. That is nearly double the proportion of those with just a high school degree.

More educated respondents were more likely to agree that their job gave them opportunities to develop skills. 76% of individuals with a graduate degree or higher either somewhat or strongly agreed with the statement, which is about 13 percentage points higher than those with just a high school degree, and 23 percentage points higher than those with no formal education.

37% agree with the statement “I expect my household’s financial situation to improve over the next five years.”

34% Yangon
43% Mandalay
39% Mawlamyine
51% Monywa
47% Taunggyi
ECONOMIC RESILIENCE

To gauge whether a household could manage an economic shock, respondents were asked whether they had enough cash or assets to pay an unexpected 200,000 MMK medical bill. 35% of respondents responded that they could not afford such an expense with existing assets. Respondents living in Yangon were the least likely to be able to pay such a bill, with 37% of respondents saying they would be unable to pay.

Respondents were also asked how they would pay such a bill. Respondents were able to provide more than one answer, and the three most common answers were using household savings (49%), selling an asset (38%), and borrowing from a relative (23%). Only 1% of respondents said they would borrow from a bank.

Across all five cities, 70% of respondents had not borrowed from any source other than family in the last six months, while 30% had. Wealthier respondents were less likely to have done so.

Of those respondents who had borrowed in the last six months, the largest portion (32%) borrowed over 550,000 MMK. Lower-income respondents were much more likely to take on large debt. While 1% of borrowers from the highest income bracket took on a loan greater than their income, 56% of borrowers from the lowest income bracket did so.

“In the past six months my household has taken a loan that is larger than our monthly income.”
On average, 64% of respondents agreed that wealth inequality was a problem in their city. Inequality appeared to be most significant in Taunggyi, as 54% of respondents strongly agreed that wealth inequality was a problem. Mandalay residents showed the lowest perceived wealth inequality, with 44% reporting that wealth inequality was not a problem.

Although most said that wealth inequality was a problem, most also believed that a hard worker could get ahead.

“WEALTH INEQUALITY IS A PROBLEM IN MY CITY.”

“A PERSON WHO WORKS HARD IN MY CITY CAN GET AHEAD.”

ON AVERAGE, 64% OF RESPONDENTS AGREE THAT WEALTH INEQUALITY IS A PROBLEM IN THEIR CITY.
THE DIGITAL ECONOMY

Respondents were asked a set of questions about their interaction with the digital economy. Although more than 75% of the sample said that they had a smart phone, a minority had used mobile banking or made an online purchase in the past six months.

Answers varied widely by age group. More than 91% of the youngest group, age 18-30, had a smart phone, and the youngest respondents were about three times as likely to have made an online purchase. Overall, few respondents (15%) indicated that they had made a purchase online in the past six months. Respondents in Yangon and Taunggyi were the most likely to say that they had made an online purchase.

"I have made an online purchase in the past six months." 26% 18-29 40% 50+

"I have used a mobile banking service in the past six months." 9% 24%

Roughly a third of the sample indicated that they had used a mobile banking service (for example, Aya Banking, Wave Money, OK$, MPU, M-Pitesan) at some point over the previous six months. Again, younger respondents were much more likely to say that they had. Respondents in Mawlamyine were the most likely to say that they had used mobile banking. A majority (79%) of those who did not use a mobile banking service said that they didn't because they had no need for it.

“I have used a mobile banking service in the past six months.”

31% Yangon 28% Mandalay 36% Mawlamyine 32% Monywa 28% Taunggyi
Findings: Inter-Personal Well-Being

This section investigates the way in which urban residents interact with one another and with urban institutions. It looks at key elements of the social fabric of urban life such as inter-communal trust, personal identity, and social alienation and inclusion. These relationships are essential to well-being, not only because they are important to economic growth, but because they help bring meaning and purpose to life and support emotional resilience. This section covers questions that government can address directly, such as those about discrimination and social engagement, and those that it can only address indirectly, such as those about inter-communal trust and personal relationships.

**Key Findings**

- Respondents show high levels of social engagement and charitable giving.
- Social trust is high across all cities, but respondents are less likely to say that they trust people of different ethnic or religious groups than the overall population.
- The cities with more ethnic and religious diversity show the highest levels of social trust between ethnic and religious groups.
- Almost all (95%) of respondents are satisfied with their personal relationships.

**Illustrative Policy Questions**

Myanmar’s urban residents are generous and want to help improve their city. Are government actors making the most of the civic-mindedness of their residents?

Trust is fundamental to all social and economic interactions. Does Myanmar’s government and vibrant civil society recognize that strong social capital is an asset worth preserving?

Evidence globally suggests that growth and urbanization tend to deplete social capital. What strategies exist to try and preserve this national asset?

Diverse cities exhibit greater trust between different ethnic and religious groups. Is there a role for government in promoting greater contact between different ethnic and religious groups as a means to maintain or promote social harmony and stability?
Respondents were asked if they agreed that most people in their city could be trusted, and whether most people of other religions and other ethnicities in their city could be trusted. In the overall sample, 48% agreed that most people could be trusted, while 33% of the sample disagreed. These proportions compare favorably to other countries.

Myanmar shows high levels of social trust compared to other countries.34

When asked whether most people of other religions could be trusted, the proportion agreeing dropped significantly: 30% agreed and 42% disagreed. Muslims and Christians were much more likely to say that most people of other religious groups could be trusted. More than 60% of respondents from those two religious groups said so, while just 32% of Buddhists agreed that most people of other religious groups could be trusted. Respondents showed similarly lower levels of trust when asked if people from other ethnic groups could be trusted: 30% agreed and 42% disagreed.

Mawlamyine and Taunggyi, which are the most ethnically diverse cities, showed the highest levels of inter-ethnic trust. Monywa, which is the most ethnically and religiously homogenous city, showed the lowest levels of inter-religious and inter-ethnic trust.

Overall, women tended to be less trusting of others than men, and older respondents tended to be more trusting than younger respondents.
When asked about what characteristics of their life (being someone from Myanmar, ethnicity, religion, city you live in, gender and profession) were most important to their sense of personal identity, the city they lived in was low in the rankings. Residents of Mandalay and Mawlamyine were the most likely to include their city of residence as one of the two most important elements of their sense of identity.

By more than 10 percentage points, Buddhists were the most likely to cite religion as one of the two most important factors in their sense of identity. 63% of Buddhists included religion in their top two, while 52% of Muslims did.35

IDENTITY

When asked to rank the factors most important to their sense of personal identity, respondents in Mandalay and Mawlamyine were the most likely to include the city they live in.
Respondents across all cities expressed satisfaction with their personal relationships. Of the overall sample, 95% of respondents indicated that they were satisfied with their personal relationships, with very little variation between cities or other sub-groups. Mandalay had the lowest levels of satisfaction, with 93%.

A majority of respondents also said that they felt close to people in their neighborhoods. 93% of the overall sample indicated that they enjoyed close relationships with people in their neighborhood. Across the five cities, no fewer than 92% of respondents agreed that they felt welcomed by their neighbors.

**DISCRIMINATION**

Respondents were asked if they felt disadvantaged because of their gender when interacting with the police, hospitals and government offices—i.e. Development Affairs Office, Mandalay City Development Committee (MCDC) or Yangon City Development Committee (YCDC). Most respondents, roughly 73% across the three questions, strongly disagreed.
When asked whether they felt disadvantaged because of their religion or ethnicity, non-Buddhists showed higher levels of perceived discrimination. More than 30% of non-Buddhists felt disadvantaged when engaging with police, which is more than six times the proportion of Buddhists who said so. Similarly, 25% of non-Buddhists said that they experienced discrimination because of their religion or ethnicity when engaging with their municipal authority, while just 5% of Buddhists said so.

"I feel disadvantaged because of my ethnicity or religion when going to the DAO/YCDC/MCDC office.”
Findings revealed very high levels of social engagement. This parallels the findings in *The World Giving Index*, of 2017, in which Myanmar ranked number one in the world in charitable giving and number three in volunteering. Roughly 60% of the overall sample reported volunteering at least every few months, and 92% said that they contributed to charity at least every few months. There was no difference between the regularity of charitable giving or volunteering between income groups.

"I volunteer for a charity, CSO or Government Initiative at least once per month."

- **21%** Yangon
- **23%** Mandalay
- **21%** Mawlamyine
- **21%** Monywa
- **31%** Taunggyi

"I donate to charity at least once per month"

- **48%** Yangon
- **70%** Mandalay
- **42%** Mawlamyine
- **85%** Monywa
- **50%** Taunggyi

In another demonstration of their willingness to make personal sacrifice for public gain, respondents overwhelmingly said that they would be willing to walk further to dump their trash if it meant that garbage trucks could cover more houses and keep the city cleaner. In all five cities, at least 80% of respondents agreed. The overwhelming majority, 74%, also indicated that they were willing to pay more property tax if it meant better public services for them and their city.
This section explores the relationship between urban life and physical well-being. The survey asked questions about environmental and behavioral factors that affect physical well-being, safety, food security, and the ability to prevent, mitigate, and bounce back from negative health events. Respondents were asked a series of questions that were tailored to understand the relationship between government and physical well-being. They were asked about access to quality public parks and nature, affordable health care, safe roads and public transportation, and a clean city.

**KEY FINDINGS**

- About half of respondents say they feel safe walking alone in their neighborhood after dark.
- Road safety is also a concern for respondents, especially in Taunggyi where 82% of respondents say that they are worried for their safety when riding in a motor vehicle on roads.
- A minority of respondents feel prepared for natural disasters, but with considerable variation between cities.
- Many respondents said that health care is difficult to afford.
- In Mawlamyine, 17% say that they had to either skip a meal or cut the size of a meal in the past month because of money.

**ILLUSTRATIVE POLICY QUESTIONS**

Although few have experienced violent crime directly, many residents still feel unsafe walking alone in their neighborhood after dark. Do authorities understand the causes of insecurity and are they testing the effectiveness of different solutions to feelings of insecurity?

Myanmar is highly vulnerable to natural disasters which pose a serious risk to human health and create anxiety for urban residents. To improve preparedness, should the government prioritize updating aging infrastructure, requiring new buildings to be constructed to higher standards, or providing the public with more information about what to do during a disaster?

Many respondents indicate that health care is difficult to afford. Should the government provide more substantial subsidies to lower the cost of health care or focus on supporting job creation and raising incomes?

There are large differences in food insecurity between cities. What factors account for these differences, including the drastically lower food security of residents in Mawlamyine?
EXERCISE AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Overall, 63% of respondents exercised less than once a week. Men were much more likely than women to say that they exercised at least once a week. Just 26% of women said that they exercised most days or every day, whereas 32% of men said so. Taunggyi residents were most likely to exercise at least once a week, with 51% agreeing. Mandalay had the largest gender divide, as men were 31 percentage points more likely than women to say that they exercised at least once a week. Taunggyi had the smallest gender divide, of just 6 percentage points.

When asked if it was easy to find a place to play sports or exercise in their city, answers varied widely by city. Yangon residents had the most difficulty, with just 45% saying it was easy to find a place to play sports or exercise. For all other cities, more than 60% agreed that it was easy. Answers to this question varied by income group, with just 50% of the lowest income group indicating it was easy to find a place to play sports or exercise, whereas 62% of the wealthiest income group said it was easy.

The lowest income group reported spending less time than the wealthiest group in nature. The lowest income group spent, on average, 1.1 hours per week in nature, while the highest income group spent 1.9 hours per week.

When asked about city cleanliness, Yangon residents were the least likely to say that their city had clean air, streets, and waterways. Street dogs were also a problem for many respondents. In Mawlamyine, 77% agreed that street dogs were a problem in their neighborhood. 54% of the overall sample said that the dogs were a problem.
Overall, nearly half of respondents felt prepared for any future natural disaster, with considerable variation between cities. Higher-income respondents were more likely to indicate that they felt prepared for disasters than lower-income respondents. Just 37% of respondents from the lowest income group felt prepared, whereas 49% of the highest income group felt prepared.

“I feel prepared for any future natural disaster that may occur in my area.”

The ability to access and afford health care is fundamental to being able to withstand a serious illness or injury. The ability to afford health care is related to income. More than 56% of lowest-income respondents indicated that it was difficult to afford health care, while just 20% of the highest-income respondents said so.

Those who self-identified as having a disability were no more likely to say that they were unsatisfied with the accessibility of clinics and hospitals, and were more likely to say that health care was affordable.

In all five cities, a majority of respondents said that they would be able to pay for a 200,000 MMK medical bill using cash or savings. 26% of the lowest income group indicated they would have to go to a moneylender for support, while just 7% of the highest income group said that they would do so.

"It is difficult to afford health care."
SAFETY

Respondents across all cities indicated that they felt safe in their home after dark. In no city did fewer than 80% say that they felt safe in their home after dark. Taunggyi and Monywa had the highest proportion say that they felt safe, with 94%, whereas Yangon had the lowest proportion to say so, with 81% saying that they felt safe. Responses did not vary between income or gender groups.

A much smaller proportion indicated that they felt safe when walking alone in their neighborhood after dark. Fewer than 50% of Yangon respondents said so. Men and older respondents were more likely to say that they felt safe walking alone after dark. In Mandalay, men were 13 percentage points more likely to say they felt safe than women.

“I feel safe walking alone in my neighborhood after dark.”

IN MANDALAY, MEN WERE 13 PERCENTAGE POINTS MORE LIKELY TO SAY THEY FELT SAFE THAN WOMEN.
Although some respondents were concerned about their safety when walking at night, few reported having experienced crime directly. Respondents from Mandalay were by far the most likely to say that they or a family member had been a victim of violence or a crime in the past year.

“I or someone in my family have been a victim of violence or a crime in my home or neighborhood in the past year.”

Road safety was also a concern for respondents. Road safety was of particular concern for Taunggyi residents, where 82% of respondents said that they worried for their safety when riding in a motor vehicle on roads in their city. Fewer than 50% of respondents said so in Mawlamyine. A majority of respondents in all cities agreed that public transportation was safe in their city.
When asked if they had to cut the size or skipped a meal over the past 30 days because of a lack of money, answers varied by income group. Among the lowest income group, 13% reported having had to cut or skip meals because of money. Just 4% of the wealthiest group said that they had to skip or cut a meal over the past 30 days because of money. Respondents in Mawlamyine were the most likely to say that they had done so.

More than one quarter of respondents indicated that it was difficult to afford groceries. Respondents from Mawlamyine were the most likely to say that groceries were difficult to afford, with 33% saying so. In Yangon 62% of the poorest respondents, those making less than 150,000 MMK last month, said that groceries were difficult to afford.

**IN MAWLAMYINE, 33% SAY THAT GROCERIES ARE DIFFICULT TO AFFORD.**

"In the past 30 days, I have cut the size of a meal or skipped a meal because there wasn’t enough money.”

**MORE THAN ONE QUARTER OF RESPONDENTS INDICATE THAT IT IS DIFFICULT TO AFFORD GROCERIES.**
The 2018 CLS included a range of questions to understand how respondents experience and engage with government. The survey included a set of questions that evaluated political agency, defined as respondents’ ability to influence political decisions that impact their lives. A sense of political agency has consistently been shown to be an important indicator of overall well-being, as when people feel listened to they feel respected. The survey also included a series of questions about public services and government leadership. These questions, which investigate the public’s experience with government, provide the most direct assessment of government performance.

**KEY FINDINGS**

- In all five cities, most respondents believe things in their city are headed in the right direction.
- Improvements to roads and electricity supply are the primary reason respondents see their city going in the right direction across all subgroups and cities.
- In every city, among those who say that their city is headed in the wrong direction, most cite safety as the primary reason.
- Respondents suggest that they would allocate a third of the budget to roads and drainage, if they were in charge of their municipal authority.
- Most respondents agree that their state/region government is responsive to their needs.
- A minority say that they feel safe expressing their opinions about government publicly, and in most cities few believe that they could have any influence over government decisions.
- Few respondents report knowing who their state/region MP is.
- In all five cities at least 77% think the more numerous ward administrators represent their interests.
- There is strong belief across cities that law enforcement will punish perpetrators of crimes.
- At least 92% of respondents agree that paying tax is a civic duty in every city, and 74% agree that they would pay more property tax if it meant better public services.
ILLUSTRATIVE POLICY QUESTIONS

While respondents support the government’s decision to prioritize improving roads, some groups remain underserved. What is the right balance between developing more strategically important sections of roads and ensuring all residents benefit from improved road conditions?

Municipal authorities’ prioritization of road upgrading is in line with what urban residents want. Is the government meeting the high demand for better drainage? And what should be made of the finding that there is demand for publicly available high-speed internet, even if this is the lowest in respondents’ ranking of municipal priorities?

State and Region governments have limited resources but are considered responsive to the needs of residents in four out of five of the cities surveyed. Is this sufficient evidence to support an acceleration of the decentralization reforms initiated under the 2008 Constitution?

Most respondents agree that ward administrators represent their household’s interests. Yet they have small offices with limited financial resources and a small number of clerical staff. Is the important role that they play in local administration recognized? Are they deserving of greater resources and capacity building?

Most residents recognize the role of taxes and are willing to pay more property tax to improve their city. Yet municipal tax cadasters are not up to date and so many households are not asked to pay the tax. And the amounts collected per household are tiny relative to incomes. What strategies do cities have in place to reform the property tax system so that coverage is expanded, the system is fairer and so that municipalities have more resources to fund the municipal services that the people want?

“MOST RESIDENTS RECOGNIZE THE ROLE OF TAXES AND ARE WILLING TO PAY MORE PROPERTY TAX TO IMPROVE THEIR CITY. YET MUNICIPAL TAX CADASTERS ARE NOT UP TO DATE AND SO MANY HOUSEHOLDS ARE NOT ASKED TO PAY THE TAX.”
# Government Performance

The following table provides a summary of respondents’ perception of government performance along key urban governance indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Yangon</th>
<th>Mandalay</th>
<th>Mawlamyine</th>
<th>Monywa</th>
<th>Taunggyi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City is headed in the right direction</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City is headed in the wrong direction</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why right direction</td>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why wrong direction</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Business opportunity</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders have a vision</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/R Govt is responsive</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Govt is responsive</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP represent my HH’s interests</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had given a bribe past 3 months</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption is a common practice</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, just 45% of women believed things were headed in the right direction, while 51% of men said so. In every city, older respondents and employed respondents were more likely to say things are headed in the right direction.

In every city except for Taunggyi, respondents indicated that improvement to road conditions was the primary reason they saw their city headed in the right direction. This was followed by electricity, safety, education and health care. Responses were similar between men and women, except women were more likely to cite improvements in education as a reason for the city moving in the right direction. There were much greater differences in views between those with no formal education and those with a graduate degree and above. Those with no formal education were more likely to cite electricity, roads, and safety. They were four times more likely to cite safety as a reason for city improvement than those with a graduate degree or above. In Taunggyi, improvements to safety was the primary reason cited.

Lower-income respondents who said things were headed in the right direction, were less likely to say that the reason for this was because of roads and electricity. In fact, lower-income respondents who said that their city was headed in the wrong direction were most likely to say the reason was because of road conditions and electricity.

In every city, among those who said that things were headed in the wrong direction, safety was the most regularly selected reason for why things were headed in the wrong direction. There were few differences between men and women and much larger differences due to educational attainment.

"OLDER RESPONDENTS AND EMPLOYED RESPONDENTS WERE MORE LIKELY TO SAY THINGS ARE HEADED IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION IN EVERY CITY."
Reasons for **POSITIVE** city direction:

- **Health care**: Male 5%, Female 6%, Graduate and above 14%, No formal education 10%
- **Education**: Male 9%, Female 13%, Graduate and above 13%, No formal education 9%
- **Safety**: Male 11%, Female 10%, Graduate and above 4%, No formal education 16%
- **Electricity**: Male 25%, Female 24%, Graduate and above 17%, No formal education 24%
- **Roads**: Male 34%, Female 33%, Graduate and above 18%, No formal education 21%
- **Waste management**: Male 3%, Female 3%, Graduate and above 10%, No formal education 7%

Reasons for **NEGATIVE** city direction:

- **City Leadership**: Male 1%, Female 2%, Graduate and above 2%, No formal education 8%
- **Business opportunities**: Male 10%, Female 12%, Graduate and above 7%, No formal education 7%
- **Job opportunities**: Male 6%, Female 5%, Graduate and above 4%, No formal education 1%
- **Flooding**: Male 5%, Female 5%, Graduate and above 3%, No formal education 9%
- **Waste management**: Male 6%, Female 6%, Graduate and above 7%, No formal education 1%
- **Roads**: Male 6%, Female 7%, Graduate and above 4%, No formal education 18%
- **Electricity**: Male 3%, Female 3%, Graduate and above 1%, No formal education 15%
- **Safety**: Male 56%, Female 57%, Graduate and above 65%, No formal education 34%
Most respondents agreed that their state/region government was responsive to their needs. A majority of respondents said so in every city except for Taunggyi. Residents of Monywa were the most likely to say that their state/region government was responsive, with 66% agreeing that it was.

Roughly the same proportion agreed that their municipal authority (i.e. YCDC/MCDC/DAO) was responsive. Older respondents were more likely to say that their municipal authority was responsive in all cities. In every city except Taunggyi, male respondents were more likely to say that their municipal authority was responsive.

A majority of respondents in all five cities indicated that they did not know what services their municipal authority was responsible for providing. It could be hard for residents to rate the responsiveness of the municipal authority to the public’s needs if they did not know what services it was responsible for. In Myanmar municipal authorities are not responsible for electricity, health and education.

When asked if they agreed that their ward administrator represented their household’s interests, respondents overwhelmingly agreed, with at least 70% agreeing in all cities. Male-headed households were no more likely than female-headed households to agree with this statement, despite women being significantly underrepresented in this position.

Few respondents felt that their MP representative in the State/Region Hluttaw represented their household interests. Notably, most respondents didn’t know who their MP was. On average, those who knew who their MP was were 18 percentage points more likely to say that their MP represented their household’s interests.
Female-headed households were less likely to say that their MP represented their household’s interests. In Yangon, for example, 34% of male-headed households agreed that their MP represented their household’s interest, while just 23% of female-headed households agreed. The Yangon Region Parliament includes 17 women representatives out of 123 seats.  

**LEADERSHIP**

Across all cities, those who said that their government had a vision were more likely to say that things were headed in the right direction than those who said the government did not have a vision. This could indicate support for the governments’ visions or a preference for a vision over the uncertainty of not having one even if they didn’t support it.
PRIORITIZATION OF MUNICIPAL BUDGETS

Respondents were given a hypothetical in which they could distribute the municipal authority budget according to their preferences. This is an indication of the importance respondents attach to these services and their perceptions of the costs involved in meeting those needs. In all cities, respondents allocated the most resources to roads and drainage suggesting that municipal governments have been right to prioritize focusing on roads and drainage. To test whether the responsibilities of the municipalities should evolve in the digital era respondents were told that they could allocate budget to publicly available high-speed internet, despite this not currently being provided by any municipal authority. Internet received the lowest proportion of the budget in every city, though there was still some demand for the service.

When asked if they would support a plan to turn one of their city parks into a mall, respondents in all cities were more likely to oppose the plan than support it.

"How would you distribute the municipal authority budget?"

WHEN ASKED IF THEY WOULD SUPPORT A PLAN TO TURN ONE OF THEIR CITY PARKS INTO A MALL, RESPONDENTS IN ALL CITIES WERE MORE LIKELY TO OPPOSE THE PLAN THAN SUPPORT IT.
JUSTICE & CORRUPTION

Respondents were asked if they agreed with the statement, “If I were a victim of a crime, law enforcement would punish the guilty party”. Across the five cities, an average of just 5% disagreed with this statement. In Taunggyi, 93% of respondents indicated that they strongly agreed with the statement.

When asked if they had given a bribe in the past three months, more than 10% indicated that they had. Roughly 15% of respondents in Mandalay said that they had given a bribe during this period, while just 3% of respondents in Monywa said that they had.

The perceived level of corruption was high across all cities. A majority of respondents in Mawlamyine and Yangon said that corruption, defined as the abuse of public office for private gain, was a common practice in their city. Respondents in Monywa were the least likely to say that corruption is a common practice, with just 40% saying so. Higher-income respondents were almost 20 percentage points more likely to agree that corruption was a common practice.

POLITICAL AGENCY

Across all cities, most respondents said that they were unable to influence their municipal authority’s decisions. When asked what the best way was to influence a municipal authority decision, most said that they would talk directly to staff at the DAO/YCDC/MCDC or to their ward administrator. In Taunggyi respondents were twice as likely to say “write a comment on the DAO Facebook page” than any other city, with 15% giving that response.

“I have little to no influence over DAO/MCDC/YCDC decisions.”

78% Yangon 79% Mandalay 63% Mawlamyine 94% Monywa 87% Taunggyi

In most cities few respondents indicated that they had ever attempted to influence their municipal authority’s decisions. Yet in Mandalay, 45% of respondents had attempted to influence MCDC decisions, the highest proportion of any city.
“I have never attempted to influence a DAO/MCDC/YCDC decision.”

Respondents were mixed as to whether they felt safe expressing their opinions about government in public. More than 70% of respondents in Monywa agreed that they felt safe. No other city had more than 45% agree.

“I feel safe expressing my opinions about the government in public.”

GOVERNANCE AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

When asked if the government had been successful in improving the economic conditions for most people, more respondents agreed than disagreed, but only by a small margin. Significant differences arose when comparing cities. In Taunggyi, 63% of respondents did not believe the government had been successful in improving economic conditions. In Mawlamyine, by contrast, 54% believed that the government had been successful in doing so. New migrants were more likely to say that the government had been successful in improving economic conditions. In the overall sample, 49% of new migrants agreed, while just 42% of the remaining respondents agreed.
TAXATION

There was a wide range across cities of those who said that they paid property tax in the past six months. Just 28% say that they did in Yangon, rising to 61% in Mawlamyine, 69% in Monywa, 69% in Mandalay and 78% in Taunggyi. As with the 2017 survey, property tax payments were extremely low. By looking at what the median tax payer reported paying, we can see what half of respondents paid (at most) within each city.

Although there was variation across cities in property tax payment, there was limited variation within cities, even when examining different income groups. The poor paid a similar amount as the rich. The difference between the median tax for the top 20% of income earners in Yangon and the bottom 20% was just 350 kyat. That difference was 600 kyat in Mandalay, 400 kyat in Mawlamyine, 725 kyat in Monywa and 650 kyat in Taunggyi. This illustrates that the current design of the property tax system is not working as intended, as the wealthiest homes pay little more than the poorest.

A sizable majority of respondents across all cities indicated that they would be willing to pay more property tax if it meant better public services. The wealthiest respondents were 20 percentage points more likely than the poorest respondents to say that they would be willing to pay more tax if it meant better services.

Respondents from all cities indicated that they saw paying tax as a civic duty. At least 92% of respondents agreed that paying tax was a civic duty in every city.

WHAT IS PROPERTY TAX?

A regular tax payment based on a property’s estimated value collected by the municipal authority. In Myanmar, the valuations are low and are calculated from the physical characteristics of a property (e.g. its size and whether it is made of wood or brick) and in some cases where it is located. A tax rate is then applied to this estimated value to arrive at the amount of tax due. It is paid every six months in most cities and funds municipal services and infrastructure.

Property tax payment paid by the median payer

- 1,375 kyat Yangon
- 4,500 kyat Mandalay
- 600 kyat Mawlamyine
- 2,000 kyat Monywa
- 1,000 kyat Taunggyi
Property tax payment distribution

**OVERALL**

```
<200  <400  <600  <1000  <1500  <3500  <7000  >7000
10%   10%   10%   20%    20%    10%   10%    10%
```

**YANGON**

```
<200  <400  <600  <1000  <1500  <3500  <7000  >7000
10%   10%   10%   10%    20%    20%   10%    10%
```

**TAUNGGYI**

```
<200  <400  <600  <1000  <1500  <3500  <7000  >7000
10%   10%   10%   20%    20%    10%   10%    10%
```

“It is every citizen’s civic duty to pay their fair share of taxes.”

- 97% Yangon
- 92% Mandalay
- 95% Mawlamyine
- 96% Monywa
- 95% Taunggyi
ANNEXES
ANNEX 1: DETAILED METHODOLOGY

This section outlines the detailed technical methodology that was used for the 2018 CLS. It outlines the process of developing the survey, selecting the sample, conducting the interviews, and undertaking quality controls, in Yangon, Mandalay, Mawlamyine, Monywa and Taunggyi.

SURVEY DEVELOPMENT

The 2018 CLS questionnaire was developed in partnership with a wide range of stakeholders and after extensive research of public perception surveys from around the world. The survey features questions that are taken directly from other surveys, such as the direct measures of personal well-being. Other questions were developed by The Asia Foundation and the Yangon School of Political Science and sharpened through consultation with a team of analysts from within The Asia Foundation and from government officials, policy analysts and academics in Myanmar. The questions were ultimately reviewed by a panel of experts on surveys, urban issues, and Myanmar. Following backward translation, the questions were tested on urban residents and further refined.

SAMPLING PROCEDURE

The objective was to select a sample from each target city’s population in a way that made their responses representative of that of the city. The respondents in each city were Myanmar citizens, male or female, aged 18 or above. The goal was not to select a representative sample of all of Myanmar’s cities. However, the five cities are home to nearly 25% of Myanmar’s overall population and are the capital cities of their respective states and regions. They were selected because of their economic and social importance, the resources available and due to the willingness of their governments to better understand the experience of their residents.

In Myanmar, cities are not clearly defined, and reliable population estimates are not readily available. This survey defined urban areas the following way: In Mandalay and Yangon, the urban area was defined as all wards and village tracts that fall within the municipal jurisdiction of the Mandalay City Development Council and the Yangon City Development Committee. For Mawlamyine, Monywa and Taunggyi, since these cities are composed of only one township, the urban area was defined as all urban wards within that township. Village tracts surrounding Mawlamyine, Monywa and Taunggyi were not surveyed, while some village tracts in Mandalay and Yangon were surveyed. In the 2018 survey, the urban sample for Taunggyi also included the sub-townships of Ayetharyar and Shwe Nyaung, as these now fell under the responsibility of the Taunggyi DAO.

Determining the sample size: The sample size for each city was selected to keep the margin of error to +/-5%. At a confidence interval of 95%, proportion of key characteristics at 50%, the sample was set at 400 for the cities of Mandalay, Mawlamyine, Monywa and Taunggyi. Only in Yangon the sample size was increased to 800 in order to allow for a more detailed study of the city findings by variables like gender, age, income, etc. The actual achieved sample sizes for each city at the end of the survey were the following:

- Yangon: 806
- Mandalay: 405
- Mawlamyine: 403
- Monywa: 400
- Taunggyi: 400

After the sample size was calculated, the following steps were considered to identify the sample.

Step 1: Selection of Wards

Sampling Frame: In each of the cities, all wards were listed in descending order by population. The list of wards in each city along with their population was taken from the Census of Myanmar 2014. This was the...
**YANGON**

Population > 5,000,000
- Largest city in Myanmar - and former capital city
- Center of economic activity
- 34 townships under Yangon City Development Council management

**MAWLAMYINE**

Population > 250,000
- Capital city of Mon State
- Home to Mon, Karen, Bamar and other ethnic minorities
- Mawlamyine Township DAO responsible for most urban management within the city

**MANDALAY**

Population > 1,000,000
- Business hub of central Myanmar
- Second biggest city
- Major tourist attractions
- 34 townships under Mandalay City Development Council management

**MONYWA**

Population > 200,000
- Capital city of Sagaing Region
- Major trade and commerce of agricultural products
- Monywa Township DAO responsible for most urban management within the city

**TAUNGGYI**

Population > 260,000
- Capital of Shan State
- Built on a plateau
- Expanding administrative boundaries
- Taunggyi DAO has direct control of 22 urban wards, and indirect control of Aye Thar Yar and Shwe Nyaung sub-townships

* the 2018 CLS added Ayetharyar and Shwenyaung sub-townships and their respondents made up 39% of the Taunggyi CLS sample. We urge caution making direct comparisons between the results of the 2017 CLS pilot and 2018 CLS.

**TAUNGGYI TOWN BOUNDARIES**

2018 survey: all 3 areas

2017 survey: Taunggyi area only
sampling frame for the selection of wards. These wards were the primary sampling units or PSUs.

**Sample Distribution:** In each selected PSU, eight households were selected for interviews. In Yangon, where the sample size was 800, 100 PSUs were selected for the interviews. In each of the other cities, where the sample size was 400, 50 PSUs were selected.

**Sampling Methodology:** To select which PSUs would be sampled, a Probability Proportional to Size (PPS) sampling method was used. After sampling, 100 PSUs in Yangon were spread across 87 wards in 27 townships. In Mandalay, the 50 PSUs were spread across 48 wards in 6 townships. In Mawlamyine, the final selection included 26 wards; in Monywa, 24 wards; and in Taunggyi, 34 wards.

In each selected PSU, a starting point for where interviews would be initiated was selected. These starting points were prominent landmarks within the select ward or PSU. The interviewers made a record of the landmarks selected in each location and the route that he or she followed.

In each PSU, two interviewers conducted interviews. The starting point was selected in the following manner. Maps of each selected ward were procured from city authorities and were used to identify two opposite corners (e.g. North-East corner and South-West corner) as the starting point locations. In each corner, a landmark was identified as the exact starting point. The closest residential area from that landmark was selected for the start. The route followed by each interviewer from this point was planned in a way that kept them within the same selected ward.

**Step 2: Selection of Households**
In each selected PSU, eight households were selected for data collection. The interviewers followed the right-hand rule of field movement (i.e. always moving to residential structures on their right-hand side). After every successful interview, interviewers skipped five households in order to maintain a spread within each location.

In situations in which a resident refused to be interviewed or if the house was locked at the time of the survey, the very next house was approached for the interview.

**Step 3: Selection of Respondents**
In each selected household, only one eligible respondent was selected for the interview. If any of the households had more than one eligible respondent (i.e. respondents above the age of 18) then only one of them was interviewed. The process of selecting the individual who would be sampled from each household was automated and random. The objective was to reduce interviewer bias or discretion in the sampling process.

The interviewer first asked an adult household member for the names, ages, and gender of all the household members, 18 years and above, who lived in that household regularly. An application on the mobile tablet then selected, at random, one of these members as the respondent. Only this selected member was interviewed. If the selected respondent was unavailable, then the interviewer fixed an appointment for a later time or day. If the respondent was not available after three attempts, the respondent was not interviewed. The respondent was replaced by another from a separate household. In no circumstances was an unavailable respondent replaced by a respondent from the originally selected household.

**Step 4: Weighting**
The selection process outlined above yielded gender proportions in our sample that differed from the gender proportions in the census data. Women were slightly over-represented in the sample and men were under-represented. To present the data in a way that would represent the views of the city population, weights were applied to the data in order to represent the genders accurately and give them their due importance. Responses by male respondents were up-weighted and responses by female respondents were down-weighted.

In addition to weighting by gender, the sample was weighted by city. City weighting was done because larger cities account for a larger proportion of the overall population than their proportion in the sample. Given this weighting, findings about the overall sample primarily reflect responses from Mandalay and Yangon. City-level findings are unaffected by city weighting.

The actual proportions of the gender in the population and those achieved in our sample as laid out in the table on the next page.

In order to reflect the right proportions of each gender in the population the weights were added to each sample according to their gender.

**Interview Format**
A computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI) technique was used for data collection. The questionnaire was scripted using the Sawtooth Software’s Lighthouse Studio platform. This allowed the questionnaire to be downloaded on an Android electronic tablet, which was used in all interviews. The questionnaire was administered using tablets and uploaded to a central server by interviewers. This allowed real-time transfer of data.
The tablet displayed the questionnaire in English and Myanmar languages.

**Trainings and Pretesting**
After the finalizing of the questionnaire and uploading it to the tablets, a survey specialist from Kadence International, with support from The Asia Foundation, led a two-day classroom training for members of the core team of field managers from the Yangon School of Political Science, who led the fieldwork. The training covered the survey purpose, the sampling procedure, and methods of troubleshooting enumeration challenges, among other topics. After the classroom training, the YSPS team went out to conduct test interviews in a nearby area to help fine-tune the tool. Pre-testing also helped to estimate the length of the interview, which was useful in constructing interview teams.

**Team Composition**
After testing, the team estimated the interview would take about one hour. One interviewer could be tasked with completing four interviews in a day. Each team would, therefore, comprise four interviewers accompanied by a supervisor. Each team conducted 16 interviews, or two PSUs, each day. Team composition differed in Yangon, though, because of the larger sample size. In Yangon, there were two teams of four interviewers, each lead by a supervisor.

**Team Training**
Interviewers and supervisors for all the cities participated in a multi-day training in Yangon, which was led by YSPS. After the trainings the interviewers conducted test interviews in nearby locations. Debriefing sessions were conducted to fine-tune their understanding and interviewing skills.

---

**Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Male</th>
<th>% Female</th>
<th>% Male</th>
<th>% Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yangon</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>1.1597</td>
<td>0.8899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandalay</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>1.3086</td>
<td>0.8165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mawlamyine</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>1.1608</td>
<td>0.8862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monywa</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>1.1140</td>
<td>0.9175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taunggyi</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>1.2135</td>
<td>0.8606</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weights by gender**

The tablet displayed the questionnaire in English and Myanmar languages.

---

**Quality Check Plan**

1. **Quality Control**
   - Well-trained interviewers
   - Accompaniments/spot checks
   - Physical back-checks
   - Portal check
   - Telephonic back-checks

2. **Quality Assurance**
QUALITY CHECKS
Several quality check measures were used to ensure that the data collected in the field was of good quality.

1. Quality Control
Well-trained Interviewers: The interviewers were selected based on an initial assessment of their capability and then trained to meet the requirements of the 2018 CLS.

Quality Checks in the Field
Accompaniments: A supervisor accompanied all interviewers in his or her team to determine if the interviewer was comfortable with the flow of the questionnaire, was asking the questions as they should, and was recording responses correctly.

Spot-Checks: The supervisor also made surprise spot-checks of on-going interviews to make sure that the interviewers were conducting the interviews in correct locations and with only eligible respondents as per the acceptable protocol.

Back-Checks: The supervisor also visited locations where interviews had already taken place and asked a few simple questions to confirm that the interviewer had conducted the interview in its entirety and that all responses were recorded accurately.

The below table shows the actual number of quality checks that were conducted by the field teams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yangon</th>
<th>Mandalay</th>
<th>Mawlamyine</th>
<th>Monywa</th>
<th>Taunggyi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accompaniment/spot Checks</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back-Checks</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephonic Checks</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total interviews checked</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 3.7% of the data that was back-checked or checked over the telephone some minor errors were noted in the recording of the data. Most errors related to demographic questions such as education level or household details. Quality checks did not reveal any systematic errors in the sampling procedure.

2. Quality Assurance
Portal Check: Real-time Status of Interview
Since interviews were uploaded the same day that they were conducted, regular checks were made on the length of interviews, time of interviews (start time / end time) as part of the quality control. Using the tablet allowed for a third party to track the length of time an interview took, and its location. If it lasted only a few minutes, for example, this was a sign of an error that required further evaluation. A third-party data firm tracked key indicators of errors in interviews and notified the YSPS if any irregularities arose.

Telephonic Call-Backs
The YSPS team conducted telephonic call-backs on a portion of the sample to determine if surveys were properly done. Respondents who had provided contact numbers were randomly selected and called. During the call, the YSPS asked a select number of questions from the survey to determine if responses matched the originally recorded data.
The sample included a larger proportion of women than men, with nearly 60% of the sample identifying as women. Following several tests, we found that there was no evidence that this skew resulted from sampling error. The 2014 Census found the population to be roughly 54% women and 46% men.

Only individuals over the age of 18 were included in the sample, and most were older than 36 years old. The overall sample average was 45 years old. The oldest respondent was 99 years old.
A majority of respondents in every city was married. **66% of the overall sample had at least one child** younger than 18 in their household.

**54% of respondents had less than a high school education.** Taunggyi and Yangon had the highest proportion of respondents with a high school education or more, and Mawlamyine had the lowest proportion of respondents with at least a high school education.

Roughly **42% of the sample across all five cities did not work outside of the home.** Of those who did not work outside of the home, **92% were not seeking work.** The unemployment rate was **3.6%.** Roughly **38% of the overall sample were employed full time.**

The proportion working full time varied widely across cities, with 50% of respondents from Taunggyi working full time and just 35% of Yangon respondents saying that they did. In the full sample, **55% of women indicated that they did not work (outside the home), but only 3% said that they were looking for work.**

Results from Taunggyi indicate that it had a strong labor market, with **less than 1% male unemployment** and the highest rates of employment for both men and women among the five cities. Yangon showed the lowest rates of employment and relatively high rates of unemployment.

Respondents were asked to identify which of six income brackets they fell within. **Yangon had the highest proportion to say that they earned more than 550,000 MMK last month, with 12%.** Taunggyi had the lowest proportion in this bracket and the highest proportion who earned less than 150,000 MMK, at 13%. Income differed significantly between education groups. Whereas **35% of respondents in Yangon with more than a graduate degree earned more than 550,000 MMK, only 17% of those with no formal education did.** The differences between the highest and lowest education group were even more significant in other places.
### Economic profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Working</th>
<th>Not working</th>
<th>Unemployment rate</th>
<th>Average of HH earners</th>
<th>Median income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yangon</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandalay</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mawlamyine</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monywa</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taunggyi</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Employment profile

- **Daily labor**: 4% (Yangon), 2% (Mandalay), 7% (Mawlamyine), 5% (Monywa), 3% (Taunggyi)
- **No, I don’t work**: 17%, 10%, 16%, 23%, 17%
- **Part time**: 35%, 51%, 41%, 37%, 50%
- **Full time**: 40%, 34%, 36%, 34%, 29%
- **Prefer not to say**: 4%, 3%, 1%, 1%, 1%
14% of the sample had lived in their city of residence for fewer than 10 years and 8% had lived in their city of residence for fewer than 5 years. Yangon had the highest proportion of residents who had lived in the city for fewer than 10 years, with 21%. In Taunggyi and Mawlamyine, just 8% had lived there for fewer than 10 years.

54% of respondents identified as the head of their household, which is defined as the individual who is chiefly responsible for managing the affairs of the household and makes most decisions on behalf of the household. 71% of men identified as head of household, whereas 39% of women identified as such. Female heads of household were not more likely to be employed than women who were not heads of their household and were much less likely to be employed than male heads of household. Mandalay had the highest proportion of women who identified as head of household, at more than 45%. In no other city did the proportion of women who identify as head of household exceed 40%.

**Time Allocation**
The tables below show the number of hours that respondents from each city and gender group spend on each activity each day. Men tend to spend more time each day traveling and working than women, while women spend significantly more time caring for the home, children, and the elderly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yangon</th>
<th>Mandalay</th>
<th>Mawlamyine</th>
<th>Monywa</th>
<th>Taunggyi</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income-Generating Work</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Chores</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring for Children or Elderly</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleeping</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveling</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX 3: 2018 CITY LIFE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>What is the respondent's home made of?</td>
<td>Bamboo walls, Wood, Brick, Brick - multi stories, Reinforced concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14</td>
<td>How many household members are living in this house?</td>
<td>_______ Household members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15</td>
<td>How many household members are there living in this house who are aged 18 or above?</td>
<td>_______ Household members 18 and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16</td>
<td>Fill household roster</td>
<td>Record Name, Age, Gender for each household member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>What is your age?</td>
<td>____ years, prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Would you describe yourself as the head of the household?</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>What is your gender?</td>
<td>Man, Woman, Gender neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>What is your marital status?</td>
<td>Single/never married, Married, Divorced/separated, Widowed, Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>What is your ethnicity?</td>
<td>OPEN ENDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Which of these best describes your religion?</td>
<td>Buddhism, Christianity, Muslim, Hindu, Other, No religion, Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>What is the highest education level you have achieved?</td>
<td>Post graduate, Graduate, High school, Middle school, Primary school, No formal education, Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>What year did you first move to this city?</td>
<td>In the year __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>How do you currently work?</td>
<td>Daily labour, Part time, Full time, No, I don’t work, No, I don’t work but am looking for a job, Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Who is your employer?</td>
<td>Self-employed, Government, Private company, Civil Society Organisation, Non-profit (NGO or INGO), Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10 | Where do you work? Please name the ward and township | Ward:__________________________  
|    | Township __________________________ |
| 11 | Who owns the home you live in? | I own it  
|    | My spouse owns it  
|    | My parents / other family members own it  
|    | A private landlord who is not related to me owns it  
|    | Government housing |
| 12 | Which of the following types of mobile phones do you own? | None  
|    | Basic phone (only allows calling, and messaging)  
|    | Feature phone (has a camera, radio)  
|    | Smart phone (has touch screen, can download apps) |
| 13 | On a typical week day how many hours do you spend doing the following activities? | Work that contributes to household income (e.g. paid job or preparing goods to sell at the market)  
|    | Household chores (including shopping for household)  
|    | Childcare/ care for elderly person  
|    | Leisure  
|    | Sleep  
|    | Volunteering  
|    | Traveling from one place to another |
| 14 | On a typical week day which mode/ modes of transport do you use? You can select more than one answer. Think about all the different modes of transport you may use. | Bus  
|    | Train  
|    | Personal car  
|    | Taxi  
|    | Motorbike taxi  
|    | Bike  
|    | Motorbike  
|    | I walk  
|    | Other |
| 15 | How long does it take you to get to work? | Under 15 minutes  
|    | 16-30 minutes  
|    | 31-1 hour  
|    | Over an hour to 90 minutes  
|    | 91 minutes to 2 hours  
|    | Over 2 hours |
| 16 | If you or a family member had to pay a MMK 200,000 medical bill, does your household have enough assets (e.g. kyat, gold,USD) set aside to cover it? | Yes, easily  
|    | Yes, barely  
|    | No  
|    | Don’t know |
| 17 | Do you suffer from poor eyesight, poor hearing, limited mobility or difficulty concentrating? | Yes  
|    | No  
|    | Prefer not to say |
| 18 | Rank the following in terms of their importance to your sense of self-identity | Being someone from Myanmar  
|    | My ethnicity  
|    | My religion  
|    | The city I live in  
|    | My gender  
|    | My profession |
| 19 | Overall, how satisfied are you with your life nowadays? | 0 = not at all ; 10 = completely  
|    | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 20 | Overall, to what extent do you feel that things you do in your life are worthwhile? | 0 = not at all ; 10 = completely  
|    | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 21 | Overall, how happy did you feel yesterday? | 0 = not at all ; 10 = completely  
|    | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 22 | Overall, how anxious did you feel yesterday? | 0 = not at all ; 10 = completely  
|    | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 23 | How is your health in general? | 0 = not at all in good health ; 10 = completely good health  
<p>|    | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>In the past 30 days, did you ever have to cut the size of a meal or skip a meal because there wasn't enough money for food?</td>
<td>Yes, often, Yes, sometimes, Yes, rarely, No, Don't Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IF RESPONDENT SAYS 'YES' THEN ASK - 'was this 'often', 'sometimes' or 'rarely'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>In a typical week, how many hours would you spend in a garden, park or other place with nature for leisure?</td>
<td>___ hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>How many times per week do you play sports or exercise?</td>
<td>Never, Less than once per month, Less than once per week, Once or twice a week, Most days, Every day, Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>When I want, I can easily find a place in my city to play sports or exercise</td>
<td>Strongly agree, Somewhat agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Somewhat disagree, Strongly disagree, Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Your household is prepared for any future natural disasters that may occur in your area</td>
<td>Strongly agree, Somewhat agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Somewhat disagree, Strongly disagree, Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Your household receives useful information from government representatives warning you about future environmental risks</td>
<td>Strongly agree, Somewhat agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Somewhat disagree, Strongly disagree, Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I am worried for my physical safety when riding in a motor vehicle on the roads of [city].</td>
<td>Strongly agree, Somewhat agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Somewhat disagree, Strongly disagree, Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>[City] has clean air</td>
<td>Strongly agree, Somewhat agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Somewhat disagree, Strongly disagree, Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I feel safe in my home after dark</td>
<td>Strongly agree, Somewhat agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Somewhat disagree, Strongly disagree, Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I feel safe walking alone in my neighbourhood after dark</td>
<td>Strongly agree, Somewhat agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Somewhat disagree, Strongly disagree, Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Have you or has anyone in your family been a victim of violence or of some criminal act in your home or neighbourhood in the past year?</td>
<td>Yes, no, Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35. If your household was faced with a MMK 200,000 medical bill, how would you pay for it?

- Out of household cash savings
- Sell asset (e.g. gold or motorbike)
- Borrow from relative
- Borrow from friend
- Borrow from neighbour
- Borrow from money lender
- Loan from bank
- Other

I will read out a set of statements. Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with these statements. Also whether strongly or somewhat.

| 36 | It is difficult to afford food and groceries | Strongly agree
|    |                                            | Somewhat agree
|    |                                            | Neither agree nor disagree
|    |                                            | Somewhat disagree
|    |                                            | Strongly disagree
|    |                                            | prefer not to say

| 37 | It is difficult to afford utilities (e.g. electricity and water) | Strongly agree
|    |                                                               | Somewhat agree
|    |                                                               | Neither agree nor disagree
|    |                                                               | Somewhat disagree
|    |                                                               | Strongly disagree
|    |                                                               | prefer not to say

| 38 | It is difficult to afford my current housing | Strongly agree
|    |                                             | Somewhat agree
|    |                                             | Neither agree nor disagree
|    |                                             | Somewhat disagree
|    |                                             | Strongly disagree
|    |                                             | prefer not to say

| 39 | It is difficult to afford education | Strongly agree
|    |                                | Somewhat agree
|    |                                | Neither agree nor disagree
|    |                                | Somewhat disagree
|    |                                | Strongly disagree
|    |                                | prefer not to say

| 40 | It is difficult to afford health care | Strongly agree
|    |                                  | Somewhat agree
|    |                                  | Neither agree nor disagree
|    |                                  | Somewhat disagree
|    |                                  | Strongly disagree
|    |                                  | prefer not to say

| 41 | My current accommodation meets the needs of me and my family in terms of space and quality | Strongly agree
|    |                                                   | Somewhat agree
|    |                                                   | Neither agree nor disagree
|    |                                                   | Somewhat disagree
|    |                                                   | Strongly disagree
|    |                                                   | prefer not to say

| 42 | The financial well-being of my household has improved, as compared to 1 year ago | Strongly agree
|    |                                                     | Somewhat agree
|    |                                                     | Neither agree nor disagree
|    |                                                     | Somewhat disagree
|    |                                                     | Strongly disagree
|    |                                                     | prefer not to say

| 43 | I expect my households financial situation to get better in the next five years | Strongly agree
|    |                                                     | Somewhat agree
|    |                                                     | Neither agree nor disagree
|    |                                                     | Somewhat disagree
|    |                                                     | Strongly disagree
|    |                                                     | prefer not to say

---
|   | The government has been successful in improving the economic conditions for most people in my city | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
|---|---|---|
| 44 | There are good employment opportunities in [city] | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
| 46 | My job gives me opportunities to develop my skills | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
| 47 | An individual who works hard in [city] can get ahead | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
| 48 | Wealth inequality in [city] is a problem | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
| 49 | I am satisfied with my personal relationships | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
| 50 | In general, most people in [city] can be trusted | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
| 51 | In general, most people of religions other than my own, in [city], can be trusted | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
| 52 | In general, most people of ethnicities other than my own, in [city], can be trusted | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
| 53 | I feel close with people in my neighbourhood | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55 I feel welcomed by my neighborhood</td>
<td>Strongly agree, Somewhat agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Somewhat disagree, Strongly disagree, prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 55b Which kind of family arrangement from the following do you think is better for society? | - One of the parents works to provide for the family and the other takes care of the house and children.  
- Both parents work for money and both take care of the house and children.  
- I have no strong preference / don't mind |
| 56 Thinking over the last year, how often do you donate to charity?      | Never, On special occasions, Every few months, Monthly, Weekly, Prefer not to say |
| 57 Do you volunteer your time to any charities, Civil Society Organisations or government initiatives? | No, never, Yes, on special occasions, Yes, every few months, Yes, monthly, Yes, weekly, Prefer not to say |
| 58 In general, would you say things in your city are heading in the right direction or the wrong direction? | Right direction, Wrong direction, Some in right, some in wrong direction, Don't know |
| 59 Why do you say right direction? Please tell me the top three reasons for saying this. | Improved..., Safety, Electricity, Education, Health system, Road conditions, Waste management, Less flooding, Job opportunities, Entertainment options, Business opportunities, City leadership, Other |
| 60 Why do you say wrong direction? Please tell me the top three reasons for saying this. | Worse..., Safety, Electricity, Education, Health system, Road conditions, Waste management, Flooding, Job opportunities, Entertainment options, Business opportunities, City leadership, Other |
| 61 The leaders of [city DAO / YCDC / MCDC] have a vision for the city's development | Strongly agree, Somewhat agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Somewhat disagree, Strongly disagree, prefer not to say |
| 62 | [DAO/YCDC/MCDC] has communicated what they are planning for the city over the next year | Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree
prefer not to say |
| 63 | I have a clear understanding about what urban services [the DAO / YCDC / MCDC] is responsible for | Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree
prefer not to say |
| 64 | I feel safe expressing my opinions about the government in public | Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree
prefer not to say |
| 65 | The [State and Region government] is responsive to the needs of the people | Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree
prefer not to say |
| 66 | [YCDC/MCDC/DAO] is responsive to the needs of the people | Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree
prefer not to say |
| 66b | I feel that my MP representative in the State/Region Hluttaw represents the interests of my household. | Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree
prefer not to say |
| 67 | How much influence do you think someone like you can have over [YCDC/DAO/MCDC] decisions? | A lot
Some
Very Little
None at All
Don’t know |
| 68 | What is the best way that someone like you could influence decisions made by [YCDC/DAO]? | Talk to DAO/YCDC/MCDC staff
Write a letter to the DAO/YCDC/MCDC
Make a donation to the DAO/YCDC/MCDC
Write a comment on the DAO/YCDC/MCDC Facebook page/group
Talk to my ward administrator
Talk to a community elder
Talk to my MP
None of the above |
| 69 | Which of these have you used? | None
Talk to DAO/YCDC/MCDC staff
Write a letter to the DAO/YCDC/MCDC
Make a donation to the DAO/YCDC/MCDC; Write a comment on the DAO/YCDC/MCDC Facebook page/group
Talk to my ward administrator
Talk to a community elder
Talk to my MP
Talk to a middle man |
| 70 | [If select “write comment on DAO facebook page/group”] Approximately how often do you submit written comments or submit a picture? | More than twice a week
Twice a week
Once a week
Once every two weeks
Once a month
Less than once a month |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71 Have you ever contacted your MP for help in solving any personal or local problem?</td>
<td>Yes, No, I don’t know who my MP is, Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 The [DAO / YCDC / MCDC] provides my household ... piped water</td>
<td>Yes, No, Don’t know, Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 The [DAO / YCDC / MCDC] provides my household ... sewage disposal</td>
<td>No, Yes, sewage is piped from my household, Yes, sewage in my septic tank is collected by [the DAO / YCDC / MCDC], Don’t know, Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will now read out some services that the city provides you. To what extent are you satisfied with the following in your city?</td>
<td>Very satisfied, Somewhat satisfied, Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, Somewhat dissatisfied, Very dissatisfied, prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 Quality of schools</td>
<td>Very satisfied, Somewhat satisfied, Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, Somewhat dissatisfied, Very dissatisfied, prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 Quality of clinics and hospitals</td>
<td>Very satisfied, Somewhat satisfied, Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, Somewhat dissatisfied, Very dissatisfied, prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Quality of police services</td>
<td>Very satisfied, Somewhat satisfied, Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, Somewhat dissatisfied, Very dissatisfied, prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 Quality of the roads</td>
<td>Very satisfied, Somewhat satisfied, Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, Somewhat dissatisfied, Very dissatisfied, prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 Availability of street lighting</td>
<td>Very satisfied, Somewhat satisfied, Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, Somewhat dissatisfied, Very dissatisfied, prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 Management of markets</td>
<td>Very satisfied, Somewhat satisfied, Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, Somewhat dissatisfied, Very dissatisfied, prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 The management of parks</td>
<td>Very satisfied, Somewhat satisfied, Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, Somewhat dissatisfied, Very dissatisfied, prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 Public spaces freely available for all residents</td>
<td>Very satisfied, Somewhat satisfied, Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, Somewhat dissatisfied, Very dissatisfied, prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Piped water provided by the [DAO / YCDC] to households.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Sewage removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Drainage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>The quality and accessibility of footpaths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Imagine you are in charge of the DAO / YCDC / MCDC. You have 100 tokens that you can allocate towards different municipal services in accordance with how important they are for you and your city. How many would you allocate to each of the following DAO/YCDC/MCDC functions? This is not a test. We wish to understand what services you value or would like to see improve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87b</td>
<td>Now imagine the same situation where you have 100 tokens for allocating to various available municipal services. But, now there is an extra service which is ‘provision of high speed internet’ which is available to you for allocation. Would you change the allocation that you have done previously or would you let it remain the same. If you would allocate some tokens to ‘high speed internet’ which service would you move out tokens from.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>A property tax consists of a regular tax payment every 6 months to [the DAO/YCDC/MCDC] based on an assessment of the physical characteristics of a property (e.g. what material your home is made of). Has your household or your landlord paid this tax within the last 6 months?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>If so, approximately, how much did your household or your landlord pay?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>If I needed to, I could easily access clinics and hospitals in my city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>If I needed to, I could easily access police services in my city</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 92 | If I were a victim of a crime, law enforcement would punish the guilty party. | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
| 93 | I would pay more property tax if it meant better municipal services for me and my city. | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
| 94 | It is every citizen's civic duty to pay their fair share of taxes. | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
| 95 | My Ward Administrator represents the interests of my household. | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
I don’t know who my ward administrator is  
Prefer not to say |
| 96 | I enjoy walking on the streets of my neighbourhood | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |

Some people feel disadvantaged in certain situations because of their ethnicity or their religion or their gender. Kindly tell me whether you agree or disagree with some statements I will read out to you concerning this.

| 97 | I feel disadvantaged because of my ethnicity or religion in the following situation. Seeking help from police | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
| 98 | I feel disadvantaged because of my ethnicity or religion in the following situation. When going to the YCDC/MCDC/DAO office | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
| 99 | I feel disadvantaged because of my ethnicity or religion in the following situation. When going to hospital | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
| 100 | I feel disadvantaged because of my gender in the following situation. When seeking help from police | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Agree Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 101 | I feel disadvantaged because of my gender in the following situation. When going to the YCDC/MCDC/DAO office | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
| 102 | I feel disadvantaged because of my gender in the following situation. When going to hospital | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
| 103 | To what extent do you agree that... the [City] has nice public parks and gardens | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
| 104 | ...[City] has clean streets and public areas | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
| 105 | ...[City] has clean rivers / streams / canals | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
| 106 | ...I feel welcome (or comfortable) going to parks and festivals around my city | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
| 107 | In [your city], transport that can be used by the public is affordable | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
| 108 | In [your city], transport that can be used by the public is convenient | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
| 109 | In [your city], transport that can be used by the public is safe | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
| 110 | Electricity supply in [city] is reliable | Strongly agree  
Somewhat agree  
Neither agree nor disagree  
Somewhat disagree  
Strongly disagree  
prefer not to say |
Corruption is a common practice in our city. *Corruption is defined as the abuse of public office for private gain.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Corruption is a common practice in our city. Corruption is defined as the abuse of public office for private gain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Did you or your family give some money or gift as bribery in the last three months? (ex. paying tea money, pocket money or a small gift to a clerk to speed up the registration of your vehicle.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>How many income earners are there in your household?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Approximately how much was your household's income over the last month?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Have you borrowed money from any source other than your family within the past 6 months?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>[If yes] Approximately how much did you borrow?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>How is garbage removed from your property?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>How regular is garbage collection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Who takes care of garbage collection for your household?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Are you aware of what the collection schedule is?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Do you pay a specific fee to have your garbage collected, or is it covered by your property tax payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>What amount is paid as the fee for garbage collection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>To what extent are you satisfied with the garbage collection service that your household receives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>If you dispose in a bin, how long do you have to walk to reach the garbage bin?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**I will again read out a few statements. Tell me whether you agree or disagree with them. Strongly or somewhat.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would be willing to walk further to dump my garbage in a bin or a garbage truck if it meant the trucks could cover more households and help make my city cleaner.</td>
<td>Strongly agree, Somewhat agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Somewhat disagree, Strongly disagree, prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal dumping is a problem in my ward</td>
<td>Strongly agree, Somewhat agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Somewhat disagree, Strongly disagree, prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic waste (such as food waste and plants) takes up a lot of space in landfills in Myanmar and increases the risks of a dumpsite fire. When collected separately it can be turned into compost to be used to grow food or to create energy. I would be willing to separate organic and non-organic waste if the DAO collected it separately</td>
<td>Strongly agree, Somewhat agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Somewhat disagree, Strongly disagree, prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the option were available and I was shown how to do it, I would prefer to pay my electricity, water and property tax bills through my phone, rather than in person</td>
<td>Strongly agree, Somewhat agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Somewhat disagree, Strongly disagree, prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my city drug addiction is a problem</td>
<td>Strongly agree, Somewhat agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Somewhat disagree, Strongly disagree, prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you like to receive regular updates of your YCDC/MCDC/DAO activities?</td>
<td>Yes, No, Don't know (DO NOT READ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you like to receive this information on YCDC/MCDC/DAO activities?</td>
<td>Newspaper, Radio, Facebook, Viber, TV, Interview, On my phone, Website, Face to face with YCDC/MCDC/DAO staff, Ward administrator, Other (Please specify) __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the past 6 months, have you made a purchase online (including on a mobile device) for a good or service?</td>
<td>Yes, No, Don't know, Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the past 6 months, have you used a mobile banking service such as Aya Banking, Wave Money, OK$, MPU, M-Pitesan?</td>
<td>Yes, No, Don't know, Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For what reason did you not use a mobile banking service</td>
<td>I distrust mobile banking services, I don't have the appropriate technology, I have no need to use a mobile banking service, I have limited or no knowledge about the facility, other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a developer has proposed turning one of your city parks into a shopping mall, what would your view be?</td>
<td>Would strongly oppose, Would oppose, neither oppose or support, Would support, Would strongly support, Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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29. The sample did not include enough Christians or Hindus to make a precise estimate.

30. The sample of respondents to these questions was too small to disaggregate by city.

31. The sample of non-Buddhists in missing cities is too small to make a precise estimate.

32. The samples for Christians and Hindus were too small to provide reliable estimates. The Christian, Hindu and Muslim groups are, therefore, combined to provide some information about the experiences of non-majority religious groups in these five cities.

33. This finding is similar to the latest labor force participation statistic by the Central Statistical Organization, which showed that 51.6% of women participate in the workforce: Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security and the Central Statistical Organization. In collaboration with the International Labour Organization.

34. These findings are lower than a national-level analysis by Transparency International that found that 40% of the public had paid a bribe at some point over the past 12 months to access a public service: Transparency International. “Global Corruption Barometer: Citizens’ Voices from Around the World”. 14 November 2017.