

Remittances, and Occupational Outcomes of the Household Members Left-Behind

Matloob Piracha
University of Kent and IZA

Teresa Randazzo
University of Bari

Florin Vadean
University of Kent

Abstract

This paper analyses the role of remittances on labour supply and occupational outcomes of the household members left behind. Contrary to existing evidence, we find no ‘dependency’ effect of remittances. Our results show that remittances received by households in Tajikistan have positive effect on generating self-employment opportunities for those remaining behind, without affecting the number of job-specific hours worked. Any positive effect on economic development would be, however, rather limited, as most household investments are in rather small-scale subsistence farming activities that do not generate an income stream. These findings would rather dampen expectations on migration and remittances growth effects in developing countries.

JEL Classification: F22, J24

Keywords: remittances, occupational choice, control function approach, Tajikistan

Corresponding author:

Matloob Piracha
School of Economics
University of Kent
Canterbury, Kent CT2 7NP
United Kingdom
E-mail: M.E.Piracha@kent.ac.uk

1. Introduction

Many empirical studies have underlined the interrelationship between migration and development. One stream of research in this area is focused on occupational choices, especially the possible entrepreneurial tendencies, of return migrants. Given the financial constraints in the country of origin, which hinder the development of entrepreneurial activities, remittances and repatriated savings are a way to finance new projects (Mesnard 2004; Ilahi 2002; Dustmann and Kirchkamp 2002). Furthermore, compared to non-migrants, return migrants or those living in households with return migrants are more likely to be self-employed and, thus, help create employment opportunities in the home country's labour market with positive consequences for growth and development (Giulietti *et al.* 2013; Demurger and Xu 2011; Piracha and Vadean 2010).

While some recent papers have explored the impact of migration, return migration and remittances on the labour markets of sending countries, the effect of remittances on the labour supply and occupational outcomes of non-migrant household members has received less attention. Nevertheless, there are a number of ways in which migration and remittances could affect those remaining in the home country.¹ For instance, since remittances from migrants usually take place under conditions of asymmetric information, there could be a possible moral hazard problem in which the relative in the home country exerts minimal effort, which is not observable by the migrant (see Chami *et al.* 2005). This could, in the extreme, mean that the relative remaining in the country of origin enjoys leisure at the expense of the migrant, and chooses not to work at all. On the upside, remittances can be used by household members in entrepreneurial activities and, thus, generate wealth and employment, especially in the presence of credit constraints (see Woodruff and Zenteno 2007).

Acosta (2007) examines the effect of 'access to remittances' and 'living in a migrant household' on labour force participation, hours worked and occupational choice of those left

behind. He uses a nationally representative household survey from El Salvador and implements an instrumental variable approach to correct for bias due to endogeneity of remittances and migration variables. He finds gender differences in the use of remittances across households: access to remittances produces a disincentive effect on participation and number of hours worked for women, but not for men. Regarding occupational choice, Acosta shows that remittances increase the probability to be self-employed among men, while recipient females are more likely to be microenterprise owners. Across gender, the effect is much stronger in rural areas. The results suggest that international transfers can help boost business and overcome liquidity constraints, particularly in underdeveloped areas. The hypothesis that remittances create access to self-employment activities in the presence of lack of capital is supported, for example, by empirical findings for Pakistan (Adams 1998), Thailand (Paulson and Townsend 2004), Mexico (Woodruff and Zenteno 2007), and the Philippines (Yang 2008).

A somewhat related literature covers the impact of remittances on the labour market *participation* of those left behind. A number of papers have shown that remittance receiving households have a lower tendency to participate in the labour market or tend to reduce the number of hours worked, concluding that remittances generate a dependency effect (Justino and Shemyakina, 2012; Acosta, 2007; Kim, 2007; Funkhouser, 2006). In particular, Justino and Shemyakina (2012) conduct such analysis for Tajikistan and find that adults in remittance receiving households are less likely to participate in the labour market and supply fewer working hours, with the effect much stronger for men.² A different conclusion is supported by Cox-Edwards and Rodriguez-Oreggia (2009) who, in the context of Mexico, find that international remittances have no significant effect on the labour participation of those left-behind.³ Finally, Mendola and Carletto (2012) provide empirical evidence, using Albanian data, on the gender-differentiated impact of current and past migration on the home labour market. They find that having a migrant abroad results in a decrease in female paid labour

supply while increasing unpaid work. Moreover, past international migration experience of household members increases the probability to supply labour in self-employment as well as the number of hours worked in the same occupation, again for women only.

As remittances could affect the migrant sending country in a number of ways, it is important to understand their role on development through the occupational decisions and the number of job-specific hours worked of those left behind.⁴ We analyse such an impact for Tajikistan, a country experiencing a significant outflow of temporary labour migration due to poor living conditions and lack of jobs. We use the 2007 Tajikistan Living Standards Survey (TLSS) and consider five possible occupational outcomes of the household members left behind: a) not working, b) unpaid family worker; c) wage employee; d) own account worker; and e) entrepreneur. Our empirical analysis is focused on a sample of men only.⁵

We find that remittances have a negative impact on working as wage employee. Moreover, when endogeneity is not controlled for, our results confirm findings from previous studies that living in a remittance-receiving household has a positive effect on either not working or performing unpaid family work. However, after controlling for endogeneity, the positive effect of receiving remittances on not working and unpaid family work disappears, but the effect on working as an own account worker turns from nil into positive and significant. This reveals a link between remittances and household investments in self-employment. Any positive effect on economic development would, however, be weak as remittances to Tajikistan do not seem to stimulate household investments in larger entrepreneurial activities.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides some background on the migration and labour market situation in Tajikistan. Section 3 presents the descriptive statistics while Section 4 describes the empirical approach. Results are discussed in Section 5 and the concluding remarks appear in the last section.

2. Labour market and migration in Tajikistan

Tajikistan is classified as one of the poorest countries in the world. Instability after the collapse of the Soviet Union contributed to the slowdown of the development process with a significant consequence on the standard of living. The 1992-1998 civil war compromised the poor physical infrastructure and destroyed much of human and social capital of this already beleaguered economy.

Despite the economic reforms in the last decade, the country has not achieved substantial welfare improvements and poverty is still a threat for majority of Tajiks.⁶ The World Bank (2009) reports that 41 per cent of the population was living below the poverty line at the end of 2007. The most affected by poverty are the rural areas that host about 75 per cent of the population (World Bank 2009). The lack of employment opportunities is a pressing issue in Tajikistan as the labour market has failed to respond to the rapid population growth. According to the official statistics, the labour force participation rate was 51.7 per cent (2,201,000 people) in 2007 and is much lower among females and in the urban areas (European Training Foundation 2010). The main sector of employment is agriculture, whereas the industrial production is weak and concentrated in few regional centres.

The migration trends in Tajikistan reflect the history of the country and one can identify different phases. The early 1990s were characterized by a refugee flow due to political instability and the civil war (1992-1997), which led to a significant change in the ethnic composition of the population. The census conducted in Tajikistan in 2000 revealed that between 1989 and 2000 the share of ethnic Tajiks in the population increased from 62.3 to 79.9 per cent, while those of other ethnic groups decreased substantially (Erich 2006). Russians were the largest group that left the country, as the civil war in Tajikistan made it dangerous for them to stay. Many of them returned to Russia or moved to other ex-Soviet Republics. Also,

many ethnic Turkmen, Kyrgyz and Uzbek fled the country during the civil war and the majority of them did not return or reclassified themselves as ethnic Arabs or Tajiks.

The late 1990s and 2000s saw an increase in labour migration to an unprecedented scale. The International Labour Organisation (2010) reports that an estimated 500,000 to 800,000 Tajik nationals (or about 10 per cent of the total population) have left the country to work abroad, the majority (over 95 per cent) to Russia. Most migration flows are temporary/seasonal, mainly from the lower skilled and informal sectors in agriculture, construction, trade and communal services. Migrants are predominantly young men from rural areas, many of them with completed secondary or vocational education.⁷ The majority of migrants are married, but they seldom migrate with their family, partly because migration is temporary and partly because their wages are low and insufficient to meet family needs in the host country. Nevertheless, their incomes are sufficient for sustaining the family in Tajikistan, where the cost of living is significantly lower.

Migrants' remittances represent an important source of income for many households in Tajikistan. For a considerable number of Tajiks the income abroad is the only way to provide for the basic needs of their families. Migration, therefore, can be seen as a survival strategy for dealing with poverty. According to the State Statistical Committee, only 30 per cent of households with at least one member abroad consider themselves poor compared to 65 per cent of the overall population (Olimova and Bosc 2003). According to Riestler (2012), remittances amounted to \$2.5 billion in 2008 and represented 49.6 per cent of the country's GDP.

3. Data

We analyse the impact of remittances and migration on individual labour market outcomes and the number of job-specific hours worked using cross-sectional data from the Tajikistan Living Standards Survey 2007 (henceforth TLSS 2007). The data has been collected in two stages

from September to November 2007 involving the National Statistical Committee of Tajikistan, the World Bank and the United Nations Children's Fund. The survey, designed mainly to allow for a reliable assessment of poverty and living standards in Tajikistan, considers different aspects of individual and household characteristics and covers a wide range of topics such as migration, employment, income, expenditure, health and nutritional status, and agriculture. The goal of the survey was to stimulate the wider use of household data for the implementation of policies aimed at reducing poverty in a country in which a large part of the population is not able to meet its basic needs (World Bank, 2009). The total sample, representative at the national level, contains 4,860 households.

The working population in Tajikistan (15 to 62 for men and 15 to 57 for women) consists of 4.2 million individuals, though only half of them are part of the labour force, the other half being inactive (World Bank 2009). Housewife is the category that dominates the inactive group (47 per cent) and a further 26 per cent report to be students. The rest of the inactive individuals are either retired, discouraged in finding a job or working seasonally.

For the purpose of our study we restrict the analysis to working age men, i.e. aged 15 to 62. After dropping individuals outside the labour force (i.e. househusbands, disabled, students, in retirement and military service) as well as observations with missing values for the variables of interest, we end up with a sample of 5,717 men.

Under the hypothesis that remittances can affect the labour market decisions of those left behind, we consider five possible outcomes: not working; unpaid family worker; wage employment (i.e. working for a non-family business); own account worker (i.e. self-employed with no outside employment); and entrepreneur (i.e. self-employed with at least one additional employee). The 'not working' category includes those who at the time of the survey were either unemployed, waiting for a recall by the employer, discouraged because of not finding a job, or waiting for a busy season.

The analysis is focused exclusively on international remittances, defined as monetary and in kind transfers received by the household from abroad during the past 12 months. The information on remittances is collected in two different sections of the questionnaire. The first section contains questions on household members who are abroad at the time of survey, including the amount of remittances received from them. The second includes questions about transfers received from all sources including relatives, friends and institutions based in or outside Tajikistan, but the amount of remittances is reported only for those received from abroad.⁸

Descriptive statistics in Table 1 show that about 15 per cent of working age men live in households receiving international remittances. The average amount of yearly remittances received by these households is about TJS 2,835 (or USD 819).⁹ There is a very strong correlation between living in a remittance receiving household and having household members abroad: 77.2 per cent of men living in a remittance receiving households have a household member abroad, revealing that remittances are predominantly received from very close family members.

We observe that, compared to those living in a non-receiving household, a larger share of individuals living in a remittance receiving household is not working (+8.5 percentage points) or working as an unpaid family worker (+6.6 percentage points), while a smaller share is wage employees (-12.0 percentage points) and entrepreneurs (-3.1 percentage points). The larger share of not working men in remittance receiving households could be explained by the fact that some of them are potentially temporary/circular migrants and mainly work abroad and enjoy leisure while at home, though indeed it is possible that they are living off remittances. The larger share of wage employees and entrepreneurs among non-remittance receiving men could possibly be explained by the higher tertiary education level in this population group.

Regarding hours worked, men engaged in an unpaid family activity work on average fewer hours per week (-4.9 hours) if they live in a remittance receiving household compared to non-remittance receiving household. Fewer hours in the case of family activity could be due to the fact that in remittance receiving households the unpaid workload is shared among a number of family members, hence relieving the load on individual members of the household. No significant difference exists in the number of hours worked for the other types of occupation.

A larger share of men living in remittance receiving households is secondary educated (+4 percentage points), but a relatively smaller share is tertiary educated (-6 percentage points) compared to those living in non-receiving households. Better educated men are more likely to face better opportunities in the labour market in terms of jobs and wages and, therefore, their families are less dependent on remittances. As expected, a larger share of the men living in remittance receiving households is ethnic Tajik (86.5 vs. 77.6 per cent in non-receiving households) and lives in rural areas (78.4 vs. 69.7 per cent).¹⁰ Furthermore, the wealth index, constructed using principle components analysis (see Filmer and Pritchett, 2001), shows that the individuals living in a remittance receiving household are poorer compared to the non-receivers.¹¹

Differences also exist with respect to region of origin. Those from the Region of Republican Subordination and Gorno-Badakhshan are strongly represented in the labour migrant group (Olimova and Bosc 2003), which is why there is a higher share of individuals in remittance receiving households living in those regions (+5.7 and +13.4 percentage points, respectively).

With respect to the household structure, those receiving remittances seem to have on average a lower proportion of children and elderly. This could be due to the fact that the more recent emigration cohorts consisted of relatively young men (below the age of 30), who are more likely to have fewer children and perhaps working age parents. Moreover, a little over 92

percent of households receiving remittances have at least two male adults. Intuitively, it shows that the household structure, and in particular the presence of more than one adult male in the household, maybe an important determinant of the migrant status of households.

Remittance receivers live in communities with, on average, almost twice as many emigrants compared to non-receivers. Migration and remittances seem, therefore, to be an unevenly spread phenomenon, clustered at community level and with networks playing an important role.

4. Empirical approach

4.1 Occupational outcomes

We use a discrete occupational choice model to assess individual employment outcomes and consider five mutually exclusive alternatives: not working, working in an unpaid family activity, working as a wage employee, working as an own account worker and being an entrepreneur. The utility that individual n obtains from alternative j is given by:

$$U_{nj} = V_{nj}(rem_n, X_n) + \varepsilon_{nj} \quad (1)$$

where V_{nj} is the utility that depends on observed factors (i.e. representative utility), rem_n is an indicator variable that equals to 1 if the individual lives in a remittance receiving household,¹² X_n is a vector of exogenous variables relating to individual, household and regional characteristics, and ε_{nj} is the disturbance term capturing unobserved factors that affect the utility. Assuming that ε_{nj} is random, the probability that individual n chooses alternative j is:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{nj} &= \text{Prob}(U_{nj} > U_{ni} \forall j \neq i) \\ &= \text{Prob}(V_{nj} + \varepsilon_{nj} > V_{ni} + \varepsilon_{ni} \forall j \neq i) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \text{Prob}(\varepsilon_{ni} - \varepsilon_{nj} < V_{nj} - V_{ni} + \forall j \neq i) \quad (2)$$

The indicator variable rem_n is likely, however, to be endogenous. Migration is a selective process and the decisions to migrate and then send remittances back home are likely to be related to unobserved individual and household characteristics that affect labour market decisions as well. For example, less risk averse households are more likely to send migrants abroad who then send remittances home. However, the level of risk aversion is also likely to influence business start-up decisions. Consequently, the unobserved term ε_{nj} is not independent of rem_n .

We use an instrumental variable approach to correct for the potential endogeneity bias of remittances. The system of equations is as follows:

$$Y_{nj} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 rem_n + \beta_2 X_n + \varepsilon_n \quad (3)$$

$$rem_n = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 X_n + \alpha_2 Z_n + \mu_n \quad (4)$$

where Y_{nj} is the individual employment outcome, X_n denotes a vector of exogenous variables, and the vector of covariates Z_n contains a set of instrumental variables that are correlated with rem_n , but not with the employment outcome (Y_{nj}). The error terms ε_n and μ_n are independent of Z_n and X_n , but are correlated with each other.

Following Mendola and Carletto (2012), we estimate a system of linear probability equations using a 3SLS estimator, which allows the simultaneous estimation of the coefficients for the entire system and accounts for the correlation structure in the disturbances across the employment outcome and the indicator equations, producing consistent estimates (see Zellner and Theil, 1962). We run the 3SLS estimation using the user written command *cmp* in Stata 13.0.¹³

The set of exogenous variables (X_n) includes characteristics that control for individual labour market potential (e.g. age and education) as well as individual and household characteristics capturing family attributes and opportunity costs of participating in the labour market (e.g. marital status, household size, and the proportion of children and elderly in the household). We also control for the local economic conditions and labour demand using a dummy for rural/urban residence, the district level unemployment rate, and regional dummies. The wealth position of the household is proxied by a wealth index, constructed using the principal components analysis (see Filmer and Pritchett 2001).¹⁴

In order to identify the model, we need to include in the first stage equation variables that are correlated with the living in a remittance receiving household dummy, but are not directly affecting the employment outcomes. The instrumental variable chosen are: a dummy equal to 1 if there are at least two men in the household (including members currently abroad), and a municipality-level weighted average measure of regional wages in Russia¹⁵. As argued by Mendola and Carletto (2012) in the context of patriarchal societies, on the one hand, migration is mainly a male phenomenon and, on the other hand, men have specific economic obligations within the household. Therefore, the family gender composition can represent a constraint to the migration choice, without directly affecting the individual occupational outcomes. They argue that if there is only one man in the household he will not be able to abandon male-specific roles within the household, and consequently will be less likely to migrate. However, the presence of more than one man in the household relaxes the gender-specific constraint to migration, without affecting the labour market behaviour of the rest of the household. The exclusion restriction is satisfied as long as controls for household structure are included in the first stage equation. Any impact of the household structure on labour supply decisions is in this case captured by these controls (Mendola and Carletto, 2012).

Following Azonategui et al. (2014), the municipality-level weighted average measure of regional wages in Russia is constructed as:

$$\ln Wrus_p = \ln \left(\sum_i s_{ji} \overline{Wr}_i \right)$$

where s_{ji} is the share of migrants from municipality j in Tajikistan (out of the total migrants from that municipality) residing in the region i in Russia, \overline{Wr}_i denotes the average wage in the Russian region i in the year 2003. A similar approach is pursued by McKenzie and Rapoport (2007), Yang (2008), Amuedo-Dorantes and Pozo (2010), and Orrenius et al. (2010).

4.2 Hours worked

Receipt of remittances may affect not only the occupational outcomes but also the number of hours worked in a particular occupation. For example, self-employed individuals who have used remittances received from migrant household members may feel more under pressure to show results and consequently work relatively more hours per week, as suggested by descriptive statistics (see Table 1). We, therefore, assess the impact of living in a remittance receiving household on the number of job-specific hours worked by occupation outcome as well.

To estimate these effects on the number of hours worked one cannot use simple treatment-control differences. This is because the number of job-related hours worked by an individual are only observed by the researcher when the individual is employed in a particular occupation. This gives rise to a polychotomous sample selection problem (e.g. see Lee 1983; Dubin and McFadden 1984). To overcome this limitation one needs to control for selection into working in a particular occupation. The decision on the number of hours worked if employed in occupation 1 is modelled as follows:

$$H_{n1}^* = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 rem_n + \gamma_2 X_{1n} + \epsilon_{nj} \quad (5)$$

where the hours worked outcome (H_{n1}^*) is observed if and only if the individual n is in a particular occupation 1 (i.e. $Y_{n1} = \max_{j \neq 1}(Y_{nj})$); the disturbance ϵ_{nj} and ϵ_{nj} are correlated given that the number of hours worked in occupation j (H_{nj}^*) is conditional on choosing that occupation; and X_{1n} is a subset of the exogenous controls X_n (see Eq. 3). The variables used to identify the selection process into a particular occupation (i.e. included in X_n but not in X_{n1}) are the controls used for capturing for the local economic conditions and labour demand (i.e. a dummy for rural/urban residence, the district level unemployment rate, and regional dummies)¹⁶.

As for the estimation of employment outcomes, we use a system of linear probability equations using a 3SLS estimator, which allows the simultaneous estimation of the coefficients for the entire system (i.e. Eqs. 3, 4, and 5) and accounts for the correlation structure in the disturbances across the hours worked, employment outcome and the indicator equations, producing consistent estimates.

5. Results

5.1 Occupational outcomes

We first run multinomial logit estimation as a baseline for the analysis of the effect of remittances on occupational outcomes. The estimated marginal effects (Table 2) are in line with the results from previous studies (Giulietti *et al.* 2013; Mendola and Carletto 2012; Demurger and Xu 2011; Piracha and Vadean 2010).¹⁷ Everything else equal, we find a positive relationship between age and working as a wage employee but no effect on own account work and entrepreneurial activity. The possibility of being a wage earner, in a country with high level of unemployment, increases with age because individuals accumulate human capital (see also

Demurger and Xu's 2011). Conversely, either not working or being involved in an unpaid family activity is negatively related to age, confirming the fact that young adults in Tajikistan are the group mostly affected by lack of employment opportunities (see International Organization for Migration, 2006).

Not surprisingly, education plays an important role in the occupational outcome as well. *Ceteris paribus*, tertiary education strongly increases the probability of working as a wage employee (28.6 per cent) and decreases the probability of all other alternatives: working in an unpaid family job (-9.5 per cent), not working (-7.5 per cent), working in an own account activity (-9.2 per cent), and being an entrepreneur (-2.3 per cent). Secondary education has a similar effect on occupation, but to a smaller extent: it increases the probability of wage employment by 5.6 per cent and decreases the probability of working in an unpaid family activity by 3.9 per cent. These results are in line with findings from previous studies on occupational outcomes in developing countries. Piracha and Vadean (2010) find that better educated individuals in the Albanian labour market are less likely not to work or work on own account compared to being wage employees. Similarly, Mendola and Carletto (2012) find that years of education increase the probability of working as wage employee and decrease the probability of being self-employed. Ilahi (1999), using data from Pakistan, also finds that unskilled workers are often left outside the labor market and choose to engage in own account activities that do not require labor market skills, e.g., small trade or workshops. Another possible explanation for these results is that employment in a family business and self-employment might be used by the less skilled as a safety net or as a flexible employment opportunity between migration trips.

Both the head of the household and married men are more likely to work on own account (+5.1 per cent and + 4.9 per cent respectively) and less likely not to work (-7.8 per cent and -6.4 per cent respectively), revealing that family responsibilities are an important incentive

for taking up employment (see also Giulietti *et al.* 2013 and Demurger and Xu 2011). Surprisingly, the household size and structure has only limited effect on the individuals' occupational choice: the increase in household size by one member decreases the probability of wage employment by less than 1 per cent while a 1 per cent increase in the proportion of either women or elderly in the household decreases the probability of being an entrepreneur by 6.4 and 13.8 per cent respectively. Given the risky nature of setting up an entrepreneurial activity, especially in the country like Tajikistan, it might be necessary that more than one household member is involved in setting up and running the business. As mentioned earlier, since most economic activities are performed by men in Tajikistan, it is possible that a larger proportion of either women or elderly in the household represents a disincentive to invest in a family business.

The household remittance status is our main covariate of interest. When the endogeneity of receiving remittances is not taken into account, we find a negative impact of receiving remittances on labour market participation. Everything else equal, living in a remittance receiving household increases the probability of not working by 5.2 per cent and working in an unpaid family job by 3.6 per cent, while it decreases the probability of working as a wage employee by 6.5 per cent and being an entrepreneur by 2.3 per cent. However, as discussed in Section 4, these results are likely to be biased.

We control for the endogeneity of the remittance variable by estimating the system of equations (3) and (4) using 3SLS. The instruments used to identify the model are: a) a dummy for living in a household with at least two adult men; and b) the number of migrants in the local community (i.e. as a proxy for migrants' network). Overall, the model performed well satisfying IV estimation diagnostics of over-identification and weak instruments (F-tests > 10).

The results from the 3SLS estimator are presented in Table 3. The first column reports the first-stage (i.e. the linear probability of living in a remittance receiving household). The

two excluded instruments strongly determine the probability of receiving remittances. *Ceteris paribus*, a larger share of community members in the migrant network in 2004 increases the probability of receiving remittances at the time of survey. This is consistent with the findings of Acosta (2007) who argues that the social network abroad facilitates the migration process and influences significantly the likelihood of being a recipient family. Moreover, as expected, the dichotomous variable capturing whether there are two or more men in the household affects positively the probability of receiving remittances as well.

Receiving remittances is negatively affected by being head of the household (-4.8 per cent) and having tertiary education (-4.5 per cent). A possible explanation is that household heads are more likely to be migrants and, therefore, not present. Moreover, as better-educated individuals are likely to have similarly educated close relatives (i.e., spouse, children, and parents; see Bruze 2011 and Holmlund *et al.* 2011), members of these households would have better employment opportunities in the Tajikistan labour market and be less dependent on labour migration and remittances. As expected, ethnic Tajiks have a higher probability of receiving remittances as they dominate Tajikistan's labour migration. The probability of receiving remittances decreases with the size of the household: each additional household member decreases the probability of receiving remittances by 1.7 per cent, possibly because larger households have a higher number of active individuals and therefore the support of an external source of income is less needed. However, as the share of women, children and elderly increases, the probability of receiving remittances increases as well; women, children and elderly are identified as the inactive categories in Tajikistan and the one to be financially supported. Finally, living in a rural location increases the probability of receiving remittances by 3.5 per cent, while household wealth and local unemployment rate do not seem to contribute to explain remittances.

The last five columns of Table 3 present the estimates of the linear probability model for the different occupational outcomes. We find that the effect of living in a remittance receiving household on not working and working in an unpaid family activity disappears after controlling for endogeneity. However, the negative effect on working as a wage employee or as an entrepreneur becomes stronger, from -6.5 to -37.5 per cent and from -2.3 to -8.7 per cent respectively. On the other hand, the effect of working as an own account worker becomes positive and significant (+31.6 per cent). A possible explanation for this contrasting effect on the two forms of self-employment is that to start and run an entrepreneurial activity a large and stable source of income is needed. Most of the remittances in Tajikistan reflect the seasonal nature of migration, and given the consistent proportion of population living below the poverty line (see section 2), remittances help the recipient households to achieve a basic level of consumption (Clément, 2011). Therefore, it is likely that the proportion of remittances going into business investments is quite small and not enough to support an entrepreneurial activity, but might be adequate to setup a small own-account business by family members. So, contrary to the findings of Justino and Shemyakina (2012), we find no ‘dependency’ effect of remittances on those left behind. Our results rather show that remittances received by households in Tajikistan, besides being used to cover daily needs, have an important contribution to generate some low scale self-employment activities by the household members left behind.

5.2 Number of hours worked

When looking at the impact of living in a remittance receiving household on the number of job-specific hours worked (see Table 4), our results seem to contradict the findings from previous studies, which showed that remittances lead to a reduction in the labour supply of recipients (Justino and Shemyakina, 2012; Acosta, 2007; Kim, 2007; Funkhouser, 2006). For

instance, even though the effect of living in a remittances receiving household on weekly working hours for unpaid family workers, own account workers, and entrepreneurs was negative, it was not statistically significant at 5 per cent level.

We find, however, that education affects positively the number of hours worked if working as self-employed (on own account or as entrepreneur) and negatively if working in wage employment. It's possible that wages in Tajikistan, like in many other developing countries, are not commensurate with marginal productivity. Therefore, for higher educated the disutility of working more hours might only be properly compensated for if working as self-employed.

5.3 Robustness check

As a robustness check for potential bias due to underreporting of receiving remittances (see Meyer *et al.* 2009 and Section 3), we also run estimations with a dummy for 'living in a migrant household' as alternative to 'living in a remittances receiving household'.¹⁸ In order to deal with the potential endogeneity of the 'living in a migrant household' indicator, we use the same IV strategy as for the models with 'living in a remittances receiving household' as covariate.

The results obtained with 'living in a migrant household' as covariate are very similar to the ones presented above. For brevity, we do not present the full results, but simply summarise them in Table 5.

6. Conclusions

The aim of this paper was to explore the impact of remittances on the occupational outcomes of those left-behind. In particular, the economic activity of non-migrant household members could be positively affected if remittances are seen as an investment opportunity in the presence of credit constraints. However, it could have a detrimental effect as well if the remaining

relatives consider this a simple non-labour income, hence causing them to substitute work for leisure.

We assessed the role of remittances on the labour market outcome in Tajikistan using the Living Standards Survey 2007. We implemented a 3SLS model to estimate a system of equations using an IV approach to address the issue of endogeneity of receiving remittances and found that the remittances received substantially increased the probability for men to work on own account and decreases the probability of working as wage employee. When looking at the effect on the number of job-specific hours worked, we didn't find any statistically significant evidence that remittance recipients reduce their labour supply. These results withstand a robustness check, with remittances being replaced by the (potential) remitters, i.e. living in a migrant household.

Migration and remittances can help the development process of local economies. However, as our findings suggest and as often argued in the literature, they are usually channelled (besides consumption) into small scale family businesses, which are likely to have limited positive effects beyond the household and the local community.

¹ For a review of the related literature, see Antman (2013).

² It is important to note that Justino and Shemyakina (2012) only look at overall labour force participation of left-behind household members. They do not look at the occupation choices/outcomes of family members left-behind. This is an important distinction. Different choice of occupations can impact the economy in a number of different ways, e.g., job creation through entrepreneurship, increase in informal or unpaid work etc. They also use OLS and Tobit models and do not control for endogeneity.

³ See Adams (2011) for a full discussion on remittances, labour supply and participation.

⁴ Banerji and Newman (1993) argue that “there are several ways in which the dynamics of occupational choice influence the process of development. Most obvious among them is the effect on the distribution of income and wealth. Insofar distribution can affect saving, investment, risk bearing, fertility and the composition of demand

and production, there is a clear link with the economy's rate of growth and hence with development in its narrowest sense" (page 275).

⁵ We ran estimations using the women sample as well, but found that remittance receipt has no impact on women's occupational attainment. The results are potentially due to the lower labour force participation of women in Tajikistan, even after the migration of mostly male household members.

⁶ The average monthly per capita income increased in real terms from 119 somoni (about USD 40) in 2003 to 150 somoni (about USD 43) in 2007.

⁷ In 2005, among those who travelled abroad to earn a living for the first time, 88 per cent were younger than 30 (International Organization for Migration, 2006).

⁸ Amounts of internal remittances are not reported in the survey.

⁹ The average amount of annual remittances per household (including receiving and non-receiving households), estimated using TLSS2007, is about USD 139. This average amount is significantly lower compared to a simple estimate based on the total amount of international remittances reported by the National Bank of Tajikistan for 2007 (USD 1.8 billion) and the total number of households reported by the 2010 census (1.2 million), giving an amount of yearly remittances received by the average Tajik household of about USD 1,500. This reveals that the amount of remittances in the TLSS2007 is underreported by a factor of about 10.

¹⁰ This is primarily due to the fact that after the 1990's civil war, a large majority of the population consisted of ethnic Tajiks and hence most of the economic migrants were from that group – those of other ethnicities had fled the country during the civil war, eventually losing all contact with their former homeland.

¹¹ The asset ownership indicators used to construct the wealth index are: separate kitchen; high quality dwelling (if wall, roof and floor are of high quality); type of toilet; gas or electric hob; gas and electric oven; refrigerator; washing machine; sewing machine; television; radio; motorcycle; car; and bicycle.

¹² We use an indicator variable for 'living in a remittances receiving household' instead of the amount of remittances received by the household, as monetary variables in survey data collection are often underreported (see Mayer *et al.* 2009).

¹³ For more information about the *cmp* module see Roodman (2009).

¹⁴ See endnote 11 for more details on the components used to construct the wealth index.

¹⁵ Russia is the main destination of Tajik labour migrants, with over 95% of migrants from the households sampled by the TLSS residing in Russia.

¹⁶ Local economy variables are usually not considered among the determinants of number of hours worked, as they are assumed to affect the number of hours worked only through the occupational choice (see Borias 1980 and Finegan 1962).

¹⁷ We ran estimations for women as well, but did not find any significant effect of remittances on their occupational outcomes. Results are available upon request.

¹⁸ A household sending migrants abroad is more likely to receive remittances.

References

- Acosta, P. (2007). Entrepreneurship, Labour Markets, and International Remittances: Evidence from El Salvador. In: C. Özden and M. Schiff (Eds.), *International Migration, Economic Development & Policy*. World Bank and Palgrave Macmillan, 141-159.
- Adams, R.H. (1998). Remittances, Investment, and Rural Asset Accumulation in Pakistan. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 17(1), 155–173.
- Adams, R. Jr. (2011). Evaluating the Economic Impact of International Remittances On Developing Countries Using Household Surveys: A Literature Review. *The Journal of Development Studies* 47(6), 809-828.
- Antman, F.M. (2013). The Impact of Migration on Family Left Behind. In: A.F. Constant and K.F. Zimmermann (Eds.), *International Handbook on the Economics of Migration*. Edward Elgar Publishing, 293-308.
- Anzoategui, D., Demirguc-Kunt, A., Martinez Peria, M.S. (2014). Remittances and Financial Inclusion: Evidence from El Salvador. *World Development* 54(), 338-349.
- Banerji, A., Newman, A. (1993). Occupational Choice and the Process of Development. *Journal of Political Economy* 101(2), 274-298.
- Borjas, G. J. (1980). The Relationship between Wages and Weekly Hours of Work: The Role of Division Bias. *The Journal of Human Resources* 15(3), 409-423.

Bruze, G. (2011). Marriage Choices of Movie Stars: Does Spouse's Education Matter? *Journal of Human Capital* 5(1), 1-28.

Chami, R., Fullenkamp, C., Jahjah, S. (2005). Are Immigrant Remittance Flows a Source of Capital for Development? *IMF Staff Papers* 52(1), 55-81.

Clément, M. (2011). Remittances and Expenditure Patterns in Tajikistan: A Propensity Score Matching Analysis. *Asian Development Review* 28(2), 58-87.

Cox-Edwards, A., Rodriguez-Oreggia, E. (2009). Remittances and Labor Force Participation in Mexico: an Analysis Using Propensity Score Matching. *World Development*, 37(5), 1004–1014.

Demurger, S, Xu, H. (2011). Return Migrants: The Rise of New Entrepreneurs in Rural China. *World Development* 39(10), 351-372.

Dubin, J.A., McFadden, D.L. (1984). An econometric Analysis of Residential Electric Appliance Holdings and Consumption. *Econometrica* 52(2), 345-362.

Dustmann, C., Kirchkamp, O. (2002). The Optimal Migration Duration and Activity Choice after Re-Migration. *Journal of Development Economics* 67, 351-372.

Erlach, A. (2006). Tajikistan: From Refugee Sender to Labor Exporter, Migration Policy Institute, Washington DC.

European Training Foundation (2010). Labour Market Review: Tajikistan. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Filmer, D., Pritchett, L. H. (2001). Estimating Wealth Effects without Expenditure Data-or Tears: An Application to Educational Enrolments in States of India. *Demography* 38(1), 115-132.

Finegan, A. (1962). Hours of Work in the United States: A Cross-Sectional Analysis. *Journal of Political Economy* 70(5), 452-470.

Funkhouser, E. (2006). The Effect of Emigration on the Labour Market Outcomes of the Sender Household: A Longitudinal Approach Using Data from Nicaragua. *Well-Being and Social Policy* 2(2), 5-25.

Giulietti, C., Wahba, J., Zimmermann, K.F. (2013). Entrepreneurship of the Left-Behind. *Research in Labor Economics* 37, 65-92.

Holmlund, H., Lindahl, M., and Plug, E. (2011). The Causal Effect of Parents' Schooling on Children's Schooling: A Comparison of Estimation Methods. *Journal of Economic Literature* 49(3), 615-51.

Ilahi, N. (2002). Return Migration and Occupational Change. *Review of Development Economics* 3(2), 170-186.

International Labour Organization (2010). Migration and Development in Tajikistan –

Emigration, Return and Diaspora. ILO: Moscow.

International Organization for Migration (2006). Remittances and Their Impact to Social Life in Khtalon Oblast, Republic of Tajikistan. Analytical report. IOM: Dushanbe.

Justino, P., Shemyakina, O.N. (2012). Remittances and Labour Supply in Post-Conflict Tajikistan. *IZA Journal of Labour and Development* 1:8.

Kim, N. (2007). The Impact of Remittances on Labour Supply: The Case of Jamaica. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 4120, Washington, DC, USA.

Lee L.F. (1983). Generalized Econometric Models with Selectivity. *Econometrica* 51, 507-512.

Meyer, B.D, Wallace, K.C., Sullivan, J.C. (2009). The Under-Reporting of Transfers in Household Surveys: Its Nature and Consequences. NBER Working Paper 15181. National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, USA.

Mendola, M., Carletto, G. (2012). Migration and Gender Differences in the Home Labour Market: Evidence from Albania. *Labour Economics* 19(6), 870-880.

Mesnard, A. (2004). Temporary Migration and Capital Market Imperfections. *Oxford Economic Papers* 56(2), 242-262.

Olimova, S., Bosc, I. (2003). Labour Migration from Tajikistan. IOM: Dushanbe.

Paulson, A. and Townsend, R. (2004). Entrepreneurship and Financial Constraints in Thailand. *Journal of Corporate Finance* 10(2), 229-262.

Piracha, M., Vadean, F. (2010). Return Migration and Occupational Choice: Evidence from Albania. *World Development* 38(8), 1141-1155.

Riester, A. (2012). Resilience of Remittances during the Global Financial Crisis and the Entrenchment of Migration. In: I. Sirkeci, J. H. Cohen, & D. Ratha (Eds.), *Migration and remittances during the global financial crisis and beyond*, Washington: World Bank, 141-147.

Roodman, D. (2009). Estimating Fully Observed Recursive Mixed-Process Models with cmp. Working Paper 168, Centre for Global Development.

Woodruff, C., Zenteno (2007). Migration Networks and Microenterprises in Mexico. *Journal of Development Economics* 82(2), 509-528.

World Bank (2009). Republic of Tajikistan. Poverty Assessment. Report N. 51341-TJ.

Yang, D. (2008). International Migration, Remittances and Household Investment: Evidence from Philippine Migrants' Exchange Rate Shocks. *The Economic Journal* 118(April), 591-630.

Zellner, A., Theil, H. (1962). Three-Stage Least Squares: Simultaneous Estimation of Simultaneous Equations. *Econometrica* 30(1), 54-78.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics – men, aged 15 to 62

	All		
Living in a remittance receiving household	0.150		
Living in a migrant household	0.134		
Amount of mean yearly HH remittances – TJS	428.48 (USD 123.66) ¹		
Amount of mean yearly HH remittances (if>0) – TJS	2,835.24 (USD 819.27) ¹		
	Living in remittance receiving household	Living in non-remittance receiving household	P-value
Occupation: not working	0.245	0.160	0.000
Occupation: unpaid family worker	0.159	0.093	0.000
Occupation: wage employment	0.451	0.572	0.000
Occupation: own account worker w/ income ²	0.058	0.071	0.157
Occupation: own account worker w/o income ²	0.055	0.041	0.069
Occupation: entrepreneur	0.031	0.062	0.000
No. of average hours per week worked if unpaid family worker	34.029	38.874	0.004
No. of average hours per week worked if wage employed	47.074	47.129	0.944
No. of average hours per week worked if own account worker with pay	42.700	46.573	0.147
No. of average hours per week worked if own account worker without pay	60.745	52.819	0.003
No. of average hours per week worked if entrepreneur	46.481	43.302	0.339
Age	36.200	35.480	0.108
Marital Status	0.712	0.763	0.001
Education: primary or less	0.158	0.139	0.129
Education: secondary	0.712	0.672	0.023
Education: tertiary	0.130	0.189	0.000
Ethnicity: Tajik	0.865	0.776	0.000
Household size	7.490	7.412	0.494
Share of children in the household	0.267	0.301	0.000
Share of women in the household	0.358	0.315	0.000
Share of elderly in the household	0.027	0.035	0.004
Wealth index ³	-0.149	-0.030	0.000
Rural	0.784	0.697	0.000
Unemployment rate	0.173	0.155	0.000
Region: Dushambe	0.100	0.151	0.000
Region: Sughd	0.102	0.184	0.000
Region: Khatlon	0.263	0.319	0.000
Region: Reg. of Republican Subordination	0.288	0.231	0.000
Region: Gorno-Badakhshan	0.247	0.113	0.000
Living in migrant household	0.772	0.021	0.000
Two or more men in the household (i.e. at home or abroad)	0.924	0.716	0.000
Average wage in Russian region of residence for migrants living abroad – average at Tajik community level (RUB)	5057.18	4907.08	0.000
Observations	860	4,857	

Notes: 1) Exchange rate as at 30 Dec 2007: 1 USD = 3.4649 TJP. 2) 'Own account workers' are self-employed individuals who have no paid employees, while 'entrepreneurs' are self-employed individuals with paid employees. 3) The wealth index is a composite measure of a household's cumulative living standard and it is constructed using the following assets: separate kitchen, high quality dwelling (if wall, roof and floor are of high quality), type of toilet, gas or electric hob, gas and electric oven, refrigerator, washing machine, sewing machine, television, radio, motorcycle, car, and bicycle.

Table 2: Multinomial logit estimation of occupational outcomes (marginal effects) – living in remittance receiving HH

	Not Working	Unpaid Family Worker	Wage Employee	Own Account Worker w/ pay	Own Account Worker w/o pay	Entrepreneur
Remittances receiving HH	0.053*** (0.013)	0.036*** (0.011)	-0.067*** (0.023)	0.003 (0.011)	-0.002 (0.005)	-0.023* (0.013)
Age	-0.015*** (0.004)	-0.005* (0.003)	0.019*** (0.006)	0.001 (0.003)	0.001 (0.001)	-0.001 (0.003)
Age squared x 100	0.017*** (0.005)	0.005 (0.003)	-0.018*** (0.007)	-0.003 (0.004)	-0.001 (0.002)	-0.000 (0.003)
Head of the household	-0.082*** (0.018)	0.014 (0.013)	0.007 (0.026)	0.042*** (0.012)	0.006 (0.006)	0.014 (0.012)
Married	-0.065*** (0.016)	0.016 (0.011)	-0.011 (0.024)	0.045*** (0.014)	0.002 (0.006)	0.013 (0.010)
Educ level: secondary	-0.006 (0.014)	-0.040*** (0.008)	0.055*** (0.020)	-0.006 (0.011)	-0.006 (0.005)	0.002 (0.009)
Educ level: tertiary	-0.079*** (0.020)	-0.099*** (0.016)	0.281*** (0.028)	-0.048*** (0.015)	-0.029*** (0.008)	-0.025** (0.012)
Ethnicity: Tajik	-0.005 (0.015)	0.021 (0.016)	-0.037 (0.027)	-0.004 (0.010)	0.021** (0.009)	0.005 (0.012)
Household size	0.003 (0.002)	0.002 (0.002)	-0.009*** (0.003)	0.002 (0.002)	0.001* (0.001)	0.000 (0.002)
Share of women	0.056 (0.048)	-0.041 (0.040)	0.095 (0.077)	-0.022 (0.036)	-0.022 (0.017)	-0.066** (0.033)
Share of children (<15)	-0.000 (0.043)	0.021 (0.031)	0.026 (0.061)	-0.018 (0.025)	0.000 (0.013)	-0.028 (0.023)
Share of elderly (>62)	0.002 (0.067)	0.086 (0.059)	0.001 (0.113)	0.021 (0.058)	0.029 (0.023)	-0.139** (0.054)
Wealth index	-0.019*** (0.007)	0.005 (0.006)	-0.006 (0.011)	0.017*** (0.005)	-0.005* (0.003)	0.008 (0.005)
Rural location	-0.058*** (0.020)	0.020 (0.019)	0.019 (0.031)	-0.012 (0.015)	0.026*** (0.010)	0.005 (0.012)
Unemployment rate	0.963*** (0.066)	-0.484*** (0.095)	-0.496*** (0.149)	0.015 (0.068)	-0.147*** (0.045)	0.149** (0.065)
Regional controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	5,717					
Wald chi-sq	1,475.96					
Pseudo R-sq	0.145					

Robust standard errors in parentheses adjusted for 267 clusters (i.e. panel sampling units)

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 3: 3SLS estimation of occupational outcomes – living in remittance receiving HH

	Not Working	Unpaid Family Worker	Wage Employee	Own Account Worker w/ pay	Own Account Worker w/o pay	Entrepreneur
Remittances receiving HH	0.066 (0.074)	0.064 (0.067)	-0.308*** (0.106)	0.017 (0.052)	0.193*** (0.042)	-0.033 (0.047)
Age	-0.017*** (0.004)	-0.006 (0.004)	0.018*** (0.005)	0.001 (0.002)	0.004 (0.002)	-0.000 (0.003)
Age squared x 100	0.018*** (0.005)	0.006 (0.004)	-0.014** (0.007)	-0.004 (0.003)	-0.005* (0.003)	-0.001 (0.003)
Head of the household	-0.052*** (0.017)	0.016 (0.016)	-0.042 (0.027)	0.046*** (0.013)	0.024* (0.013)	0.009 (0.012)
Married	-0.101*** (0.020)	0.025* (0.013)	0.006 (0.024)	0.040*** (0.011)	0.015 (0.009)	0.015 (0.010)
Educ level: secondary	-0.003 (0.017)	-0.060*** (0.016)	0.064*** (0.020)	-0.002 (0.010)	-0.005 (0.010)	0.007 (0.009)
Educ level: tertiary	-0.061*** (0.020)	-0.103*** (0.019)	0.260*** (0.027)	-0.049*** (0.014)	-0.026** (0.012)	-0.021** (0.010)
Ethnicity: Tajik	-0.012 (0.014)	0.026 (0.018)	-0.028 (0.027)	-0.006 (0.011)	0.012 (0.008)	0.007 (0.015)
Household size	0.003 (0.002)	0.003 (0.002)	-0.009*** (0.003)	0.001 (0.002)	0.002 (0.001)	0.000 (0.002)
Share of women	0.082 (0.051)	-0.055 (0.043)	0.152* (0.081)	-0.024 (0.037)	-0.093*** (0.035)	-0.062 (0.038)
Share of children (<15)	0.016 (0.039)	0.014 (0.033)	0.043 (0.059)	-0.014 (0.027)	-0.027 (0.024)	-0.031 (0.025)
Share of elderly (>62)	0.008 (0.077)	0.093 (0.079)	-0.091 (0.113)	0.024 (0.054)	0.089* (0.052)	-0.124*** (0.041)
Wealth index	-0.018** (0.007)	0.002 (0.007)	-0.003 (0.011)	0.018*** (0.005)	-0.008 (0.005)	0.009 (0.005)
Rural location	-0.065*** (0.021)	0.027 (0.021)	0.021 (0.029)	-0.012 (0.015)	0.024* (0.015)	0.006 (0.013)
Unemployment rate	1.081*** (0.079)	-0.546*** (0.119)	-0.558*** (0.147)	0.008 (0.059)	-0.131** (0.065)	0.147* (0.080)
Regional controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Constant	0.431*** (0.076)	0.239*** (0.080)	0.195* (0.106)	0.113** (0.046)	-0.018 (0.038)	0.041 (0.068)
Observations	5,717					
F-test 1st stage	212.50					
P-value joint	0.000					
Over-identification Sargan test	6.187					
P-value	0.289					
Endog test	29.60					
P-value	0.000					

Robust standard errors in parentheses adjusted for 267 clusters (i.e. panel sampling units)

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 4: 3SLS estimation of log of hours worked with multivariate selection into occupation

	Unpaid Family Worker	Wage Employee	Own Account Worker w/ pay	Own Account Worker w/o pay	Entrepreneur
Remittance receiving HH	-0.323 (0.633)	-0.013 (0.176)	0.407 (0.623)	-0.542 (0.830)	-0.951 (0.672)
Age	0.023 (0.037)	-0.016* (0.009)	-0.012 (0.037)	0.029 (0.060)	-0.037 (0.034)
Age squared x 100	-0.018 (0.037)	0.016 (0.010)	0.022 (0.040)	-0.009 (0.062)	0.030 (0.037)
Head of the household	-0.309 (0.219)	-0.044 (0.060)	-0.194 (0.208)	-0.476 (0.311)	0.124 (0.215)
Married	-0.317 (0.215)	-0.030 (0.057)	-0.369* (0.206)	-0.196 (0.311)	0.200 (0.219)
Educ level: secondary	-0.005 (0.131)	-0.043 (0.042)	0.229* (0.133)	0.158 (0.195)	0.147 (0.162)
Educ level: tertiary	0.526 (0.475)	-0.253** (0.119)	0.699 (0.434)	0.921 (0.766)	-0.129 (0.477)
Ethnicity: Tajik	-0.280** (0.124)	0.056 (0.035)	-0.249** (0.109)	-0.098 (0.201)	0.130 (0.127)
Household size	-0.007 (0.018)	0.006 (0.005)	0.019 (0.017)	-0.029 (0.028)	0.014 (0.022)
Share of women	0.615 (0.592)	-0.098 (0.148)	0.459 (0.554)	1.247 (0.889)	-0.115 (0.546)
Share of children (<15)	0.266 (0.301)	-0.019 (0.083)	-0.039 (0.291)	0.473 (0.422)	0.064 (0.312)
Share of elderly (>62)	0.463 (0.608)	-0.255 (0.187)	0.626 (0.645)	-0.223 (0.846)	-1.246* (0.675)
Wealth index	-0.074 (0.102)	-0.005 (0.029)	-0.096 (0.093)	-0.155 (0.154)	0.163 (0.104)
Constant	3.027*** (0.682)	4.482*** (0.322)	8.716*** (1.855)	5.808** (2.733)	-0.911 (2.849)
$\rho_{hours,UFW}$	0.053 (0.209)	0.457*** (0.098)	-0.125 (0.128)	-0.171 (0.149)	0.088 (0.168)
$\rho_{hours,WE}$	0.562* (0.300)	-0.552 (0.353)	0.545** (0.254)	0.950*** (0.235)	-0.575** (0.254)
$\rho_{hours,OAWwp}$	-0.744** (0.295)	-0.185 (0.331)	-0.908*** (0.284)	-0.388** (0.184)	0.547** (0.266)
$\rho_{hours,OAWwop}$	-0.201 (0.162)	-0.103 (0.162)	-0.036 (0.137)	-0.251 (0.217)	-0.292 (0.235)
$\rho_{hours,ENT}$	-0.743** (0.315)	0.451 (0.361)	-0.574** (0.286)	-1.008*** (0.226)	0.897*** (0.298)
Observations	5,717	5,717	5,717	5,717	5,717
Wald chi-sq	3,583.84	3,018.88	3,690.02	3,099.52	3,05.79

Robust standard errors in parentheses adjusted for 267 clusters (i.e. panel sampling units)

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 5: Impact of remittances/migration on occupational outcomes and job-specific hours worked of household members left behind – men

Model	Model specification	Not Working	Unpaid Family Worker	Wage Employment	Own Account Worker w/ pay	Own Account Worker w/o pay	Entrepreneur
Occupational outcomes							
Mlogit	Living in a rem. receiving HH	0.053*** (0.013)	0.036*** (0.011)	-0.067*** (0.023)	0.003 (0.011)	-0.002 (0.005)	-0.023* (0.013)
	Living in migrant HH	0.043*** (0.014)	0.034*** (0.012)	-0.044* (0.026)	-0.013 (0.013)	-0.001 (0.005)	-0.018 (0.014)
	Living in a rem. receiving HH	0.066 (0.074)	0.064 (0.067)	-0.308*** (0.106)	0.017 (0.052)	0.193*** (0.042)	-0.033 (0.047)
	Living in migrant HH	0.062 (0.060)	0.046 (0.057)	-0.248*** (0.088)	0.013 (0.044)	0.157*** (0.034)	-0.030 (0.041)
Hours worked							
3SLS	Living in a rem. receiving HH		-0.323 (0.633)	-0.013 (0.176)	0.407 (0.623)	-0.542 (0.830)	-0.951 (0.672)
	Living in migrant HH		-0.269 (0.579)	-0.019 (0.152)	0.433 (0.498)	-0.344 (0.756)	-0.754 (0.531)

Robust standard errors in parentheses adjusted for 267 clusters (i.e. panel sampling units)

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Notes: The table summarizes the estimation results presented in Tables 2 to 4 for the impact of 'living in a remittances receiving household' on occupational outcome and job-related hours worked. For comparison, it also presents the results using 'living in a migrant household' as alternative covariate to 'living in a remittances receiving household'. For brevity, only the coefficients and standard errors of the covariates of interest are presented.