



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

Socio-economic effects of international migration on the families left behind

Nasreen Abbasi and Irfan Mohammad and Javed Akbar Gil
and Zahid Ghulam Mustafa and Arif Ghulam Mohammad

Pakistan Institute of Development Economics, Islamabad, Pakistan

1983

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/39609/>

MPRA Paper No. 39609, posted 26. June 2012 12:52 UTC

COMPLIMENTARY COPY

STUDIES IN POPULATION, LABOUR FORCE AND MIGRATION
PROJECT REPORT NO. 7

SOCIO-ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION
ON THE FAMILIES LEFT BEHIND

NASREEN ABBASI
MOHAMMAD IRFAN

Javed Akbar Gil, Ghulam Mustafa Zahid and Ghulam Mohammad Arif

PAKISTAN INSTITUTE OF DEVELOPMENT ECONOMICS
P.O. Box 1091, Islamabad

Project Director

Professor Syed Nawab Haider Naqvi
Director, PIDE

Project Manager

Dr. Mohammad Irfan
Chief of Research (Economics)

Project Team Members

1. Dr. Iqbal Alam, Chief of Research (Demography)
2. Mr. M. Naseem Iqbal Farooqui, Research Demographer
3. Mrs. Naushin Mahmood Qureshi, Research Demographer
4. Miss Nasreen Abbasi, Research Demographer
5. Mr. Ghulam Yasin Soomro, Research Demographer
6. Miss Zubeda Khan, Research Demographer
7. Miss Talat K. Alauddin, Research Economist
8. Mr. S. Mubashir Ali, Staff Demographer
9. Mr. H.F. Siyal, Staff Demographer
10. Mr. Khalid Hameed Sheikh, Staff Demographer
11. Mr. Ghulam Mohammad Arif, Associate Staff Economist
12. Mr. M. Javed Tariq, Associate Staff Economist
13. Mr. Ghulam Mustafa Zahid, Associate Staff Demographer
14. Miss Rashida Haq, Associate Staff Economist
15. Mr. Zafar Mueen Masir, Associate Staff Economist
16. Mr. Sharif-ul-Haq Grewal, Research Assistant
17. Mr. Mohammad Rafiq, Senior Computer Programmer
18. Mr. Mohammad Khalid, Senior Computer Programmer
19. Mr. Furqan Ahmed Farooqui, Computer Programmer
20. Syed Tariq Ahmed, Computer Programmer
22. Mr. Javed Akbar Gil, Computer Programmer

PREFACE

The need for 'endogenizing' demographic variables in development planning is now widely recognized. The planners have to spread their analytical net wider to capture in one 'go' both the demographic and socio-economic variables. This requires an explicit recognition of the two-way link between changes in fertility on the one hand and those in labour market, wages, income distribution, consumption, savings, investment and other variables on the other. The research work done so far in Pakistan has inadequately addressed itself to this two-way linkage between demographic and socio-economic phenomena. Researchers, constrained by limitations of both data and analytical framework, have tended to study the demographic phenomenon of fertility in isolation from such related matters as labour force participation, rural-urban migration and income and expenditure patterns. These studies have failed to analyse simultaneously the demographic, production and consumption decisions of households. For instance, high fertility rates are generally attributed to biological determinants alone which can be influenced by large supplies of such clinical devices as contraceptives. Such notions about the fertility behaviour of the households have given birth to ineffective government policies. That the many population planning adventures, taking mostly the form of crash programmes, undertaken so far have foundered should not surprise anyone. Fertility, like love that sustains it, is a many-splendoured thing. It must be seen in a broader socio-economic context. The nature of the influences of economic forces, both direct and indirect, on fertility behaviour should therefore constitute a major area of concern for social scientists and policy makers. To make a start in

this direction, the inter-linkages between such variables as fertility, labour force participation and migration and their effects on the household income and expenditure behaviour must be studied. Such a study should permit us to understand better the decision-making process of the household, which is the basic unit in both the demographic and economic analyses. Research studies of this genre have already been carried out in many other developing countries and have provided gainful insights into the determinants of household economic-demographic behaviour. However, in Pakistan the present exercise is the first of its kind.

In order to understand better the economic-demographic interface the project entitled "Studies in Population, Labour Force and Migration" has been undertaken by the Pakistan Institute of Development Economics in collaboration with the ILO and UNFPA. The project is a 'four-in-one' venture based on a national sample, the field-work for which was undertaken by the Statistics Division (formerly called Central Statistical Office, or CSO for short) covering 10,288 households. The survey generated a wealth of data on the household decision-making process concerning the behaviour of the connected foursome - viz. fertility, migration, labour force participation and income and expenditure. Every effort has been made to ensure reliability of the data. This study, which is being brought out in the form of a series of seven 'first' reports, would enhance our understanding of the behaviour of households with respect to the various ways in which they go about fulfilling their 'basic needs'. Even more important, it should lay the foundations of economic demography in Pakistan, opening up new areas of multi-disciplinary research that could not be perceived before. This study should also provide the researcher with a sufficient feel for the real world to permit formal economic-demographic modelling exercises. In this respect the present reports are truly pioneering both in intent and in purpose.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to express their gratitude to Professor Syed Nawab Haider Naqvi for his continued support, advice and encouragement.

They are deeply indebted to Dr. Malik Hussain Mubashir and Dr. Akmal Makhdam for their cooperation in providing the clinical statistics. They express their thanks to Dr. Iqbal Alam for his useful suggestions.

As a manager of the project Mohammad Irfan (one of the authors) is thankful to ILO for the collaboration and UNEPA for the generous funding for the execution of this project.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to express their gratitude to Professor Syed Nawab Haider Naqvi for his continued support, advice and encouragement.

They are deeply indebted to Dr. Malik Hussain Mubashir and Dr. Akmal Makhdam for their cooperation in providing the clinical statistics. They express their thanks to Dr. Iqbal Alam for his useful suggestions.

As a manager of the project Mohammad Irfan (one of the authors) is thankful to ILO for the collaboration and UNEPA for the generous funding for the execution of this project.

List of Tables

	<u>Page</u>
1. Female Labour Force Participation Rates by Household Status, as Receiving or Not Receiving Remittances by Area: Pakistan. 1979.	8
2. Effects of Out-Migration on Household's Out-put, Work and Income by Area. 1979.	12
3. Age Specific Enrollment of Children by Sex and Area. Pakistan. 1979.	15
4. Use of Remittances by Preferences and Area. 1979.	18
 <u>APPENDIX</u>	
I Characteristics of Male Out-Migrants to Middle East by Area 1979.	31
II Labour Force Participation Rates of Females by Household Status as Receiving and Not Receiving Remittances by Income Groups and Area: 1979 (Rural).	32
III Labour Force Participation Rates of Females by Household Status as Receiving and Not Receiving Remittances, by Income Groups and Area: 1979 (Urban).	33
IV Average Hours Worked Per Week by Employed Females 10 ⁺ by Household Status as Receiving and Not Receiving Remittances, by Income Groups and Area: 1979.	34
V Age Specific Labour Force Participation Rates of Females in Households by Number of Out-Migrants and Area: 1979.	34
VI Effects of Out-Migration to Middle East on Work, Out-put, and Income of the Left Behind Household Members by Income groups and area: 1979	35
VII Effects of Out-Migration Within Pakistan on Work, Output and Income of the Left Behind Household Members by Income groups and area: 1979	36
VIII Use of Remittances by Preferences, Area and by Amount Remitted Last Year. 1979 (Rural).	37
IX Use of Remittances by Preferences, Area and by Amount Remitted Last Year. 1979 (Urban).	38
X Ability to Spend by Amount Remitted Last Year by Area: 1979.	39
XI Effects of Out-Migration on the Behaviour of Wives by Length of Husbands Stay Abroad.	40

XII	Effects of Out-Migration on the Behaviour of Children by Length of Fathers Stay Abroad.	40
XIII	Some Demographic Characteristics of Left Behind Wives Suffering from Psychological Diseases. (1st December, 1982 to 30th May 1983).	41
XIV	Drug Prevalence Among Children of Middle East Migrants (1st December, 1982 to 30th May, 1983).	42

XII	Effects of Out-Migration on the Behaviour of Children by Length of Fathers Stay Abroad.	40
XIII	Some Demographic Characteristics of Left Behind Wives Suffering from Psychological Diseases. (1st December, 1982 to 30th May 1983).	41
XIV	Drug Prevalence Among Children of Middle East Migrants (1st December, 1982 to 30th May, 1983).	42

SOCIO-ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF INTERNATIONAL
MIGRATION ON THE FAMILIES LEFT BEHIND

by

Nasreen Abbasi
Mohammad Irfan

INTRODUCTION

Economic boom in the Middle East consequent upon oil price hike in 1973 generated a high pitched demand for labour far outstripping the domestic labour supply of these countries. In order to combat the problem of labour scarcity these countries resorted to labour import which in turn appeared as a unique opportunity for the neighbouring labour rich and capital poor countries. Workers from many countries, notably from South and South East Asia, flocked to Middle East to exploit the better earning opportunities. By 1981, the stock of out-migrants from Pakistan alone was 1.8 million.

[Irfan n.d., 7].

For Pakistani workers, Middle East was not a first ever outlet, but this stream of out-migrants was different in many respects from the Pakistani emigrants to West. Unlike the migration to Europe or North America during the Sixties,

Middle East migration comprised mostly of workers unaccompanied by their families and dependents. This was mostly due to the policies of the labour importing countries designed to limit the possibilities of the permanent settlement of workers and to reduce the social and economic cost of their assimilation in the society [Birk and Sinclair 1979]. The recruited workers were discouraged and were not permitted to bring along their families. In addition, the short term nature of the job contracts offered, in conjunction with the heavy initial cost of out-migration, acted as constraints for emigration of the whole family. In Pakistan, according to an estimate, about one million families or about 7.4 million women, children and other dependents are living a 'separated life'.

The skill composition of the out-migrants to the Middle East is another distinct feature. Unlike the Brain Drain to the Industrialized West and North America an overwhelming majority of migrants to the Middle East is either semi-skilled or unskilled. Roughly three-fourths of the workers who left for the Middle East during 1972-79 were production workers. Since most of these workers were belonging to lower income groups prior to emigration, the remittances sent by them may have elevated the socio-economic status of their families. In a short period of a decade or so, about a million families have been added to the Middle class, the level of affluence hardly enjoyed by them prior to

emigration of their family member.¹ Because of the large numbers involved and the fact that most migrants remit money to their families coupled with the prospect of this pattern to continue in the near future,² it becomes imperative to study the socio-economic effects of emigration on the families left behind.

Admittedly, the effects of out-migration transcend beyond the families left behind. Manpower exodus appears to have affected people from every walk of life and every level of society. The outflow of workers, which links the labour market of Pakistan with labour scarce economies of the oil rich Middle East, bears upon broad spectrum of choices ranging from individual's labour participation and human capital investment to sectoral priorities at national level. The reverse flow of remittances has an equally thorough pervading influence on consumption patterns, savings behaviour and ultimately on the volume and composition of aggregate demand. Assessment of the totality of the effects of out-migration can hardly be made in a single research exercise. Whilst studies are underway at

1. This should not be construed as a net effect on society at large, because the families who do not have a member working in Middle East may have experienced a deterioration in their living standards and a down fall in socio-economic status too.

2. According to an estimate of Bureau of Emigration, 0.7 million would emigrate for overseas employment during 1982-85, of which 0.6 million would be towards Middle East.

Middle East, bears upon broad spectrum of choices ranging from

PIDE which focus on the consequences of out-migration at macro as well as sectoral and individual levels, this paper is an attempt to assess the effects of the exodus of a member of household on the remaining members of the same household. Influences wielded by the out-migration of a family member are inferred from the behavioural changes displayed by the rest of the family members. Ideally, one would like to compare the pre-migration to the post-migration situation to arrive at changes attributable to the act of out-migration. This, however, is precluded by lack of longitudinal or retrospective data. The data at our disposal being cross-sectional, yields only a comparison between households having out-migrants or not, and households which received remittances during the year prior to the Survey and those which did not. The implicit assumption underlying this comparison is that the members of the two types of households in question had similar behaviour patterns prior to out-migration.

Influences wielded by the out-migration of a family member
In this paper, behavioural differentials of are inferred from the behavioural changes displayed by the members in the above mentioned two categories of households rest of the family members. Ideally, one would like to pertaining to labour force participation, schooling of compare the pre-migration to the post-migration situation to children and consumption patterns will be studied. In arrive at changes attributable to the act of out-migration, addition, the attitudinal and personality changes of married This, however, is precluded by lack of longitudinal or females and children will be discussed. Furthermore, some retrospective data. The data at our disposal being cross-sectional, yields only a comparison between households having

on wives and children left behind will be provided.

THE DATA

This paper is based largely on the information collected in connection with the "Studies in Population, Labour Force and Migration" (PLM) a PIDE/ILO project. Based on a two-stage stratified random sample, the PLM survey covered 10,288 households wherein each household was administered four different questionnaires — Labour Force, Migration, Fertility and Household Income & Expenditure. The data were collected by Federal Bureau of Statistics during July-December 1979.³ Migration in this Survey refers to mobility after December 1971.⁴ Information from a local hospital on the psychological problems of wives left behind was collected by the authors themselves. A recent study entitled "Left Behind or Left Out" conducted by Pakistan Institute of Public Opinion (PIPO)

THE DATA

constituted a source of information for an understanding of the attitudinal changes of wives and children left behind.

in connection with the "Studies in Population, Labour Force and Migration" (PLM) a PIDE/ILO project. Based on a two-stage

LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPATION AND OUT-MIGRATION.

Exodus of a working hand from the household necessitates

a major readjustment in the organization of production and work, especially in the rural areas where family based enterprises

penditure,

3. For details on this Survey, see Irfan (1981)

4. December 1971 refers to a key event of war with India.

prevail. To the extent the exit of a worker results in higher productivity for the remaining members of the household then one may expect higher labour force participation by the left behind family members in the post-emigration situation. On the other hand, if there is a complementarity between the labour use of those who are left behind and that of the out-migrant, then a decline in their labour utilization may occur. Similarly, remittances sent by the out-migrant bear their influence on the labour force participation specially of females and children whose activity rates are found to vary with the socio-economic status and income of the households.

Statistics on labour force participation in Pakistan

is reflective of the fact that while adult males of working ages prevail. To the extent the exit of a worker results in higher productivity for the remaining members of the household then one may expect higher labour force participation by the left behind family members in the post-emigration situation. On the other hand, if there is a complementarity between the labour use of those who are left behind and that of the out-migrant, then a decline in their labour utilization may occur. Similarly, remittances sent by the out-migrant bear their influence on the labour force participation specially of females and children whose activity rates are found to vary with the socio-economic status and income of the households. An inverse, though non-linear, relationship between family income and female participation is also found by Khan [1979] and Irfan [n.d.]. In the light of the above, one can expect that

addition of remittances to family income would lead to a lower labour force participation of females and children.

Relationship between remittance money and work participation is borne out by Table 1 which suggests that the activity rates of the females belonging to remittance receiving households are lower than their counterparts living in non-recipient households. The determination of the specificity of the relationship between females and children's work participation and remittances to the amount remitted and expectations regarding their future flow is precluded by lack of proper data. A cross tabulation between household income, which presumably includes remittances, and females and children's labour force participation is, however, provided in Appendix Tables II and III. The data are indicative of a non-linear relationship between household income and female activity rates in rural areas in non-remittance receiving households wherein female participation rate rises till the middle income group and thereafter falls. In case of urban females, the participation levels appear to be inversely related to the level of household income.

Controlling for the household income level, the relationship between female work participation and receipt of remittances appears interesting. In the middle and higher income groups of rural areas total as well as the age specific labour force participation rates of females are generally lower in the

Table 1

Female Labour Force Participation Rates by Household Status,
As Receiving or Not Receiving Remittances by Area:
Pakistan 1979.

Household Status	Age	FEMALES					MALE CHILDREN	
		All 10+	10-14	15-25	26-44	45+	10-14	15-25
<u>R U R A L</u>								
Households received remittances		10.89	9.83	13.10	11.24	8.35	28.78	67.46
Households did not receive remittances		15.46	12.24	14.88	18.97	14.35	43.94	82.31
<u>U R B A N</u>								
Households received remittances		2.59	-	3.74	-	5.13	5.19	49.95
Households did not receive remittances		4.52	1.81	3.88	7.04	4.81	14.21	64.63

Source: PLM Survey 1979.

remittance receiving households. For the lower income groups (0-280 and 281-420), activity rates of females belonging to the recipient households are higher than the females of non-recipient households. These findings tend to suggest that if the remittance income is meagre and the household still lies at the lower rung of income distribution ladder, females have to work more. It must be noted that majority of the remittance receiving households fall under upper middle or higher income groups and very few observations pertain to lower income groups. The validity of the conclusion, cited above, is therefore impaired to some extent despite its plausibility in certain cases. Furthermore, the nexus between female work participation and household income can satisfactorily be examined in a multivariate regression framework where variables like age and education of females are also reckoned with.⁵

A similar comparison between households having out-migrants and those who do not, irrespective of the remittances, tends to corroborate the earlier findings. Female age specific labour force participation rates are higher in the non-migrant households than the households having an out-migrant. Besides participation, two other labour supply measures were also taken into consideration. Average number of hours worked per week by

5. A companion paper by Mohammad Irfan presents the results of such an exercise.

females does not vary across the two sets of households distinguished on the basis of receipt of remittances or out-migration from the household. Another indicator, which can be regarded as a measure of potential labour supply is the proportion of workers who want more work. Desire for additional work is relatively higher in females of the non-receiving than the remittance receiving households. In rural areas, 29 percent of the females in the labour force from non-recipient household desired more work, compared to 21 percent of females from the recipient households. In case of urban areas, the corresponding figures are 27 percent and 25 percent. Not only that the labour force participation rates of females of recipient households are substantially lower than that of the females of non-recipient households but a higher percentage of the former also wants lesser work. This leads to the question whether remittance money further enhances the seclusion of females or withdrawal from labour force occurs only from arduous and low paid jobs. A comparison between recipient and non-recipient households indicates that proportion of the unpaid family helpers among the working females is smaller in the former households than that of the latter in rural areas. Opposite pattern holds in urban areas (See Appendix Tables II and III). Assuming that the females of the two categories of households had roughly the same employment structure prior to emigration, the remittance flow appears to have reduced unpaid family work in rural areas substantially lower than that of the females of recipient households.

and wage employment in urban areas amongst the females of recipient households. Whilst unpaid family work performed by females in rural areas consists mostly of farming and live-stock related activities which carry a high effort price of labour, in urban areas female wage employment ranges from maid servants to professionals like doctors and teachers. Though there is no evidence to offer but it can be conjectured that in case of urban females the reduction in their participation due to remittance flow has taken place in the low paid jobs, because female family members of skilled and ~~semi-skilled workers~~ (the major proportion of out-migrants) could have hardly been employed as professionals prior to the latter's emigration to Middle East.

Exit of a member alongwith the lower participation of those left behind may have either reduced the output of family based enterprise or led to hiring of the additional labour. Effects of outmigration on output, work and income of the households are presented in Table 2 wherein effects of out-migration to Middle East are also compared with effects of out-migration within Pakistan. Responses to the question, "what are the effects of out-migrant's absence on family" are detailed in the table by rural/urban and by income classification (appendix Tables VI and VII).

Table 2

Table 2

HOUSEHOLD'S OUTPUT, WORK AND INCOME BY AREA: 1979.

EFFECTS OF OUTMIGRATION ON HOUSEHOLD'S OUTPUT, WORK AND INCOME BY AREA: 1979.

(Percentages)

(Percentages)*

Area	EFFECT ON OUTPUT			EFFECT ON INCOME			EFFECT ON WORK			EFFECT ON OUTPUT			EFFECT ON INCOME		
	Household of:			EFFECT ON INCOME			EFFECT ON WORK			EFFECT ON OUTPUT			EFFECT ON INCOME		
	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>RURAL AREAS</u>															
15	a.	51	13	11	27	5	45	2	15	51	13	11	27	5	45
8	b.	70	6	3	33	5	44	1	8	70	6	3	33	5	44
<u>URBAN AREAS</u>															
1	a.	70	6	3	18	5	55	-	1	70	-	6	18	5	55
4	b.	65	5	2	35	8	24	-	4	65	5	2	35	8	24

Source: PLM Survey 1979

*: Percentages will not total to 100 because others and few additional minor categories are not reported in the table.

Note:- 1,4, 7 = No effect.

2 = Had to hire labour

3 = Additional work for the family

5 = Loss of labour and decline in agricultural/non-agricultural output

6 = Remittance money helpful in increasing output

8 = Remittance money helpful in increasing income

9 = Additional money for use.

Table 2 reflects that three fifths of the rural households having an out-migrant in Middle East report no effect on work, this fraction is higher for households with out-migrants working in Pakistan. While a minor fraction of households (2 percent) of Middle East migrants reported hiring labour in rural areas, a substantial proportion (15 percent) admitted additional work owing to migration of a member. Compared to this when the out-migrant member was working within Pakistan a significantly lower proportion (8 percent) reported additional work for the family. A plausible explanation of lesser additional work in latter case could be that out-migrants within Pakistan synchronise their visits home with the peak harvesting and sowing periods in rural areas, whereas overseas workers are unable to do so. Relative to the rural households their urban counterparts are less affected by the departure of a working hand simply because the family based enterprise, like farming, is less common in urban areas.

Effects of out-migration pertaining to output are interesting. In rural areas, approximately half of the households with out-migrant member in Middle East reported that their output is insensitive to the exit of a member. Whilst 13 percent of the households reported a decline due to loss of labour, 11 percent reported an increase in output because of the remittance money that added to the investment funds. The corresponding percentages for households with out-migrant member working within Pakistan are 6 and 3. Compared to effects on work and output, the percentage of

households reporting a positive influence on income were respectably high in both the rural and the urban areas. Remittances are regarded as an addition to money available for use by most of the households. A minor fraction of the households reported addition to income through the use of remittances, presumably from investment funded by the remittances.

Overall output and work load proved to be less sensitive to out-migration compared to household income, which rose due to the inflow of remittances. However, in rural areas fractions of households reporting an increase in work load for the family (15 percent) and decline in output due to loss of labour (13 percent) are not insignificant. Thus suggesting that labour force participation of some members of some households having out-migrants in Middle East must have increased, though the group displays an overall decline in activity rates of females and children.

CHILD SCHOOLING:

As already mentioned, work participation of children in remittance receiving households (having out-migrant) is significantly lower than that of their counterparts in non-remittance receiving households. However, in rural areas of households reporting an increase in work load for the family (15 percent) and decline in output due to loss of labour (13 percent) are not insignificant. Thus suggesting that labour

Table 3

Table 3

AGE SPECIFIC ENROLLMENT OF CHILDREN BY
SEX AND AREA: PAKISTAN 1979

AGE SPECIFIC ENROLLMENT OF CHILDREN BY
SEX AND AREA: PAKISTAN 1979

Household Status	Age	MALE			FEMALE		
		5-9	10-14	15-25	5-9	10-14	15-25
<u>RURAL AREAS</u>							
1. Households receiving remittances	2.9	45.2	65.5	27.1	22.3	21.1	2.9
2. Households not receiving remittances	3.0	35.4	51.0	13.6	11.7	12.6	1.2
<u>URBAN AREAS</u>							
1. Households receiving remittances	14.0	77.0	84.0	39.0	61.1	69.4	14.0
2. Households not receiving remittances	7.0	58.3	75.0	29.0	47.1	55.1	17.0

Source: PLM Survey 1979.

The Table reflects that the percentage of children enrolled in schools is higher for the households receiving remittances than that of the non-recipient/non-migrant ^{households.} / This is true for both the sexes for all age groups except for urban females 15-25 . Relative differences in the school enrollment are larger in rural areas specially for females. Overall high enrollment of children particularly in older age groups is not consistent with the findings of earlier case studies which suggest that there is a dis-interest in education among male children after class III [Bilquees and Hamid 1931] and decline in the number of male students pursuing higher education because of the incentives associated with emigration [Shaheed 1981]. The data at our disposal provides enrollment in the schools only, with no information regarding drop-outs or completion of grades. Behaviour towards investment in human capital by families of out-migrants merits further investigation, as it is reflective of the importance accorded to education in maintaining or upgrading their newly acquired socio-economic status in society. To the extent a rise in socio-economic status was achieved without a major contribution from formal education, there may not be sufficient incentive to get the children highly educated though some schooling might be preferred. A closer look at the remittance use pattern, discussed below, is reflective of a very low priority accorded to education. It can, therefore, be argued that while

school enrollment of children belonging to the out-migrants' households is higher than their counterparts, this hardly constitutes a guarantee that they would end up being more educated than the group under comparison, though data at our disposal suggest otherwise.

REMITTANCES AND CONSUMPTION

Household consumption, both its level and pattern, are sensitive to the level of disposable income. To the extent remittances lead to a rise in the household income, a higher level of household consumption expenditure is an obvious result. The PLM Survey provides information on the use of remittances and its effects on consumption etc. by seeking responses on the spending preferences of the households and their ability to spend on different items. These two sets of information are utilized to study the influence of remittances on household consumption and investment behaviour. A summary of the preferences of the households is reproduced in Table 4.

The foremost preference of the households to be satisfied out of remittance income, reflects that two items: to buy food/clothing and to buy household goods or to make improvements in the house, exhaust 80 percent of the responses in rural and 70 percent in urban areas. Preference to spend on these two items is almost equal in rural areas while in urban areas the latter

Table 4

USE OF REMITTANCES BY PREFERENCES AND AREA, 1979.

	REMITTANCE USE													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
(RURAL)														
First Preference	100	6.69	-	-	40.18	42.99	-	3.76	-	-	1.79	2.52	-	2.08
Second Preference	100	2.73	10.70	1.27	15.66	25.21	-	4.59	-	-	0.40	10.40	0.66	28.73
Third Preference	100	2.45	4.52	1.61	3.51	8.69	2.57	6.04	1.09	-	-	8.08	-	61.43
(URBAN)														
First Preference	100	1.05	0.92	-	26.44	43.53	1.09	8.28	-	-	2.12	7.64	-	8.93
Second Preference	100	3.97	0.85	1.81	11.97	20.60	-	9.35	1.72	1.80	3.62	8.80	-	35.50
Third Preference	100	3.74	0.84	1.67	5.58	3.90	-	8.28	1.54	-	-	7.53	2.82	64.09

Source: /PLM Survey, 1979/.

Column

1. Total
2. To pay for weddings
3. To pay for school fee
4. To pay medical expenses.
5. To buy food/clothing
6. To buy household goods or make improvements to house
7. To pay for luxuries such as ornaments
8. To pay off debts
9. To buy farm/non-farm equipment
10. To purchase seeds/pesticides, fertilizers
11. To buy land/business
12. Others
13. Savings
14. No response.

item is preferred (43 percent compared to the former 26 percent). These two items are followed by the preferences to spend on weddings, to pay debts etc. An insignificant fraction (1.8 percent in rural and 2.1 percent in urban areas) of the preferences fall under the category "to buy land/business". A similar distribution at second and third preference level further indicates high priority accorded to food/clothing or household goods and improvements in the house. Expenditure on schooling and health acquires some weightage at the second and third preference levels specially for rural households.

It is a bit surprising that spending on the education of the children does not come as a matter deserving any special priority even at the third preference level. Compared to urban areas, there is a higher proportion stating expenditure on the school fee of children in rural areas and this percentage shows a slight increasing trend with the amount remitted [Appendix Table VIII]. The emerging educational preference for children is, however, hardly encouraging. This could be, firstly, because the average age of a migrant from the PLM Survey is only 29 years, hence many of emigrants' children might be of pre-school age. Secondly, primary education was made free during the Fifth Five Year Plan throughout the country so children going to government schools do not incur much of an expenditure. However, it is distressing to note that a higher priority is attached to pay for weddings in the rural areas ^{compared} to education (7 percent have given this as the first preference on which money was used compared to nil for education).

This should not be surprising because marriage is an important social occasion which provides an opportunity to exhibit the wealth of the family through extravagant indulgence.

Substantiating the question on remittances use, ability to spend on a variety of items [Appendix Table X] was enquired through a precoded question in the PLM Survey. It varies widely across different items, but there is an overall reported improvement in the ability to spend both in the rural and the urban areas. Respondents have reported a high improvement on the consumption of food/clothing, household goods, improvements to house, marriages etc. The reported ability to spend in business, farm, non-farm implements, purchase of land or other property, and improvements to land are quite low. In essence both the data on preference ordering and ability to spend suggest that a significant proportion of ^{the} remittances is being consumed and the investments made by families are predominantly in the form of renovation or construction of houses.

The purchase of household goods/or making improvements in the house is accorded high priority by recipient families even at the second and third preference level. High investment priority on housing and improvement to house is not unusual and is in line with the observations of the small scale sample studies by Shaheed [1981], Bilquees and Hamid [1981] and the larger enquiry conducted by PIPO [1983], all of which reported a preferential

investment in construction. Studies on international migration elsewhere also have shown that a visible form of investment resulting out of remittances is in the housing sector. This pattern is quite widely exhibited whether it is migration from Maghreb (Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia) to France [OECD: 1979] or of the temporary Mexican rural migrants to U.S. [Cornelius: 1979] or of Yemeni migrant workers to Middle East [Birk and Sinclair:1979].

A number of reasons can be offered for investment in housing. At the macro level, investment in housing may have been induced by the facilities offered by the government through housing schemes for the Pakistani's working abroad. At the micro level, individuals and families regard ownership of a house as adding to the status of the family, an indication of the success of the migrant and a desirable form of investment. In rural areas converting ^a'katcha' (made of mud and straw etc.) house, or part of it to 'pucca' (brick or cement structure) is perceived as a significant change in the status of the family and a display of the newly acquired wealth. It affects the family both in tangible as well as non-tangible ways. Non-tangible benefits derived by the family are status in the community and relatives whereas, tangible benefits add to the physical comfort of the family.

EFFECTS ON ATTITUDES AND VALUES

The foregoing sections evidence that families of Middle East workers enjoy a higher level of consumption, experience a relief in work load and reside in new or renovated houses as compared to non-migrant households. However, there are other gains and adjustments which the family of an out-migrant has to contend with but which are not quantifiable. As emigration of an adult male entails family separation, it may call for a variety of adjustments and assumption of additional responsibilities by those who are left behind (especially the wives and children). It must be noted that according to PLM Survey, two thirds of the emigrants to the Middle East were married [Appendix Table I]. In other words, roughly 0.9 million wives are living a separated life. In addition to psychological, emotional and sexual problems associated with prolonged absence of the husband, his out-migration also imposes upon the wife the role of decision maker in household matters besides supervision of the children. Whether the wife successfully performs her new role, is important to know, as consolidation of gains made through a job in Middle East depend to a large extent on her performance in bringing up the children and managing the household affairs. Information pertaining to these aspects of females and children is woefully inadequate. There is a distinct lack of systematic studies on the adjustment problems and effects of out-migration on the values and attitudes of those left behind.

A recent study conducted by PIPO entitled "Left Behind or Left Out" attempts to ascertain behavioural changes of the wives and children left behind. Admittedly, the treatment of the subject can hardly be regarded as adequate, findings of the study pertaining to attitudinal and behavioural changes are reproduced in the Appendix Tables XI and XII. Overall, the data suggest an increase in the independence, disobedience, extravagance and unhappiness of the wives. Length of the husband's stay abroad strengthened these attitudes.

These findings should not be accepted prima facie as they embody many biases on the part of the respondents. The question was asked to the defacto household head as, "in the light of your observations in your locality, would you agree that the overseas Pakistanis' wives have become caring for the family, spendthrift, disobedient, domineering etc.?" Any information so obtained would obviously be highly sensitive to the respondents' perception and might not be the depiction of reality. Also, while analysing such data, it should be borne in mind that a number of changes that are labelled as negative really do not mean that. For instance, obedience and passivity expected from daughter-in-laws, in joint families, may not be feasible in a situation when husband is not present, and the wife's direct participation and expression of opinion in the absence of her husband could be taken as her becoming independent and disobedient.

Interestingly, the study reports no change in the assumption of additional responsibilities by the wife. The indicators used to gauge the reorganization and assumption of new responsibilities are: dealings with banks; children's admissions to schools; day to day shopping of the household; purchases/construction of property/house; arranging children's marriages; looking after the farm/livestock. Since most of the above dealings require some minimal level of literacy, the above responsibilities would not be taken up by the females, the majority of whom are illiterate.

The behaviour of children is also ascertained on the basis of responses of the defacto household head based on his observations in his locality. Biases of the respondent can be very important in this case too, as usually older people are wary of the behaviour of the younger generation. The table shows an increase in the keenness for education amongst male children with the length of father's stay abroad. However, at the same time high truancy is reported. Together these two are contradictory. The reported behaviour of male children is also reflective of some regressive tendencies, like becoming spendthrift, indulgent and disobedient. Amongst female children, keenness for education somewhat declines with the length of father's stay abroad. Their incidence of disobedience is higher in the earlier years of father's absence. This should be a reaction to relaxation in the stronger paternal control and authority over young girls.

The 'negative' behavioural changes in wife and children are reflective of various types of psychological strains that each individual undergoes. At times the psychological pressures can contribute to problems of physical and mental health. Some clinical evidence on this aspect is provided in the following section.

CLINICAL EVIDENCE OF PSYCHOLOGICAL DISEASES/DISORDERS

Because of societal values, women do not express their distress verbally, hence the psychological aberrations born out of husband's absence find expression through psychosomatic diseases. Women in our sample suffered from various anxiety symptoms, fainting attacks, epileptic fits, tetany, aphonia, hemiplegia, headaches, back aches and other body aches. Sexual frustration among the younger women was high.⁶ According to the specialist who heads the Department of Psychological Diseases in a local hospital, every day he deals with ten to fifteen patients afflicted with what is described as the 'Dubai Syndrome'. According to the official records of the six months period for which the data were provided (December 1st, 1982 to May 30, 1983) 1443 females patients afflicted with 'Dubai Syndrome' were treated. Of these, 97 were in-patients, and 1346 were out-patients. These clinical records indicate that 37 percent (Appendix Table XIII) of the female out-door patients were those whose duration of

6. Some evidence of increase in sexual involvement among females of migrant households is provided by Bilquees and Hameed[1981].

marriage was less than two years, and in 71 percent of the total cases duration of husband's migration was also less than 2 years. Thus most of the wives were young and 34 percent have had either one or no child. Majority of them (78 percent) was living in the joint/extended families.

Most of these women came to the hospital loaded with jewellery, wearing expensive clothes as described by doctors. These women might have had material satisfaction but this did not recompense the physical companionship of the husband, that resulted in various types of psychological problems. Among the younger wives, of age less than 25 years, hysteria, hyperventilation and anxiety were common whereas wives in age group 26-35, reported headaches, other pains and weeping attacks. An increase in drug abuse was discovered amongst the children belonging to the migrant households. (Appendix Table XIV). Amongst the younger boys, 12-14 years, smoking and hashish was on the rise, but in older age groups, heroin was being used. The hospital records for the six months period (December 1st, 1982 to May 30, 1983) showed admission of 67 in-patients who were heroin addicts. Of these, 43 had their fathers working in Middle East.

Keeping in view the small number of observations nothing conclusive can be offered on the use of drugs by the emigrant's children. It could, however, be symptomatic of the related problem, as during the therapeutic process, it was linked with the father's absence. Left behind children have had suddenly more access

to money and less of parental control, hence they are more easily tempted to such evils. This needs to be investigated further. However, it should be cautioned that on the basis of the clinical evidence provided, it is difficult to generalize about the effects on the left behind females and children. Firstly, because these persons might have been suffering from various types of psychological illness prior to the emigration of the husband/father, but because of affluence seek medical treatment now. Secondly, the small sample size and the absence of any control group for comparison precludes generalization.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

This paper represents an attempt to ascertain the effects of migration of a family member (out-migrant) on the remaining household members. A comparison between households having an out-migrant and receiving or not receiving remittances is suggestive of a lower female work participation, a higher schooling of children in the former than in the latter households. While some households reportedly had additional work for the family, overall the remittance money appears to have reduced the female unpaid family work in rural areas and low paid wage employment in the urban areas. Therefore, a reduced work burden, higher level of consumption and increase in schooling of children can be regarded as the effects of out-migration on the left behind family members.

This paper represents an attempt to ascertain the effects

In contrast to these quantifiable gains, certain changes hardly amenable to measurement have taken place too. Admittedly, there is no way to impute a shadow cost for husband's separation, some evidence from other studies and clinical data reflect certain unhealthy developments. While some females have fallen victim to psychological disorders/diseases the children of the out-migrants may turn into delinquents because of the absence of paternal control. It must be noted that this study, by making a comparison of the two types of households, is in fact capturing their differential behaviour which may not represent inter-temporal changes in the behaviour patterns of members of the out-migrant's households. In addition, a bivariate classification is used as a major expositional device which carries its own limitations.

1. ARTEP-ILO (1983), "Employment and Structural Change in Pakistan - Issues for the Eighties". A Report For the Pakistan Planning Commission for the Sixth Five Year Plan. (1983-88) The Asian Employment Programme (ILO-ARTEP) January, 1983.
2. Bilquees, Faiz and Shahnaz Hanid (1981), "Impact of International Migration on Women and Children Left Behind", A Case of a Punjabi Village. Research Report Series No.115, January 1981 Pakistan Institute of Development Economics, Islamabad.
3. Birks, Stace and Clive Sinclair (1979), "Migration for Employment Among the Arab Countries". Development Digest Vol. XVII, No.4, October, 1979.
4. Cornelius, Wayne A (1979), "Migration to the United States: A View From Rural Mexican Communities". Development Digest Vol. XVII= No.4 October 1979.
5. Frittelli, Anna Teresa, (1981), "Report on Migrant Women in their country of Origin". International Migration, Vol. XIX No.1/2 1981.
6. Gilani, Ijaz, M. Fahim Khan and Munawar Iqbal. (1981), "Labour Migration from Pakistan to the Middle East and Its Impact on the Domestic Economy. Part I, II, III. Research Report Series Nos. 126, 127, 128. Pakistan Institute of Development Economics. of the Sixth Five Year Plan. (1983-88) of the Asian Employment Programme (ILO-ARTEP)
7. Hodge, Emily J. (1977) "The Role of Village Women in Village-Level and Family - Level Decision Making and Agriculture; A Pakistani Punjab Case Study". Prepared for USAID/Islamabad. Contract No.77-01, June, 1977. "A Case of a Punjabi Village. Research Report Series No.115, Pakistan Institute of Development Economics, Islamabad.
8. Irfan, Mohammad (1981). "An Introduction to Studies in Economics, Population, Labour Force and Migration". A PIDE/ILO - UNFPA Project. Research Report Series No.118. Pakistan Institute of Development Economics, February, 1981.
9. Irfan, Mohammad (n.d.), "The Determinants of Married Female Labour Force Participation in Pakistan", (forthcoming)
10. Irfan, Mohammad, Lionel Demery and Ghulam Mohammad Arif (n.d.) "Migration Patterns in Pakistan: Preliminary Results from the PLM Survey, 1979. (Forthcoming).
11. Khan, Mohammad Ali and Ismail Sirageldin (1979) "Education, Income and Fertility in Pakistan". Economic Development and Cultural Change. Vol.27 No.3 April, 1979.

12. Khan, Seemin Anwar and Faiz Bilquees (1976) "The Environment, Attitudes and Activities of Rural Women; A Case Study of a Village in Punjab", Pakistan Development Review; Vol.X No.3.
13. Pakistan Institute of Public Opinion. (1983), "Left Behind or Left Out? A Study of the Left Behind Families of Overseas Pakistanis.
14. Rahat, Naveed, "Male Out-migration, Matri-weighted Families and the Changing Role of Women; A Case Study of a Punjab Village in Pakistan", Paper prepared for "Action-Oriented Study of the Role of Women in Rural Development, Colombo Workshop Conference, (Colombo).
15. Shah, Nasra M, (1975), Work Participation of Currently Married Women in Pakistan: Influence of Socio-Economic and Demographic Factors". The Pakistan Development Review, Vol.XIV. Winter 1975 No.4.
16. Shaheed, Farida (1981), "Migration and its Effects on Women in the Villages of Provenance". Paper prepared for the International Labour Office Tripartite Asian Regional Seminar, Rural Development and Women, Mahabeleshwar, India, April 1981.
17. Staff of OECD Development Center (1979), "Economic Consequences of Migration From North Africa to France Development Digest Vol. XVII. No.4 October 1979.

APPENDIX TABLE I

CHARACTERISTICS OF MALE OUT-MIGRANTS TO
MIDDLE EAST BY AREA:1979

Characteristics	Total	Rural	Urban
Total Migrants (B.S)	100	100	100
% Males	95.8(100)	97.22(100)	93.54(100)
% Single	33.96	33.10	35.44
% Married	65.16	65.51	64.56
Mean Current Age	29.58	29.64	29.47

SOURCE: PLM Survey 1979.

APPENDIX TABLE II

LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATES OF FEMALES BY HOUSEHOLD STATUS
AS RECEIVING AND NOT RECEIVING REMITTANCES, BY INCOME GROUPS &
AREA:1979

RURAL

Females	INCOME GROUPS					
	Total	0-280	281-420	421-700	701-1120	1120+
<u>HOUSEHOLDS RECEIVING REMITTANCES</u>						
Total Population 10+	100	100	100	100	100	100
% 10+ in Labour Force	10.89	32.08	29.92	11.04	8.73	10.55
Age Specific LFPR 10-14	9.83	0	19.45	4.15	12.89	10.32
Age Specific LFPR 15-25	13.10	0	41.49	21.83	4.46	12.60
Age Specific LFPR 26-44	11.24	0	26.83	6.80	11.65	11.55
Age Specific LFPR 45+	8.53	100	27.10	7.90	7.08	6.99
Unpaid Family Helpers as % of total L.F.	70.53	100	49.52	66.90	82.56	69.13
% of L.F. Wanting more work	21.05	0	18.40	23.52	10.74	28.11
% of L.F. Wanting less work	12.07	100	24.82	0	8.39	15.14
<u>HOUSEHOLDS NOT RECEIVING REMITTANCES</u>						
Total Population 10+	100	100	100	100	100	100
% 10+ in Labour force	15.46	10.95	17.00	18.00	17.65	9.41
Age Specific LFPR 10-14	12.24	14.59	7.88	12.87	13.95	10.05
Age Specific LFPR 15-25	14.88	7.40	12.93	18.03	17.05	9.03
Age Specific LFPR 26-44	18.97	5.44	22.46	18.10	23.47	12.53
Age Specific LFPR 45+	14.35	19.25	19.75	19.00	14.16	6.31
Unpaid Family Helpers as % of total L.F.	75.64	59.10	72.47	78.63	70.74	84.48
% of L.F. wanting more work	29.51	11.56	25.03	33.09	26.95	31.55
% of L.F. wanting less work	11.42	37.07	15.24	11.69	10.78	7.40

Source: PLM Survey 1979.

APPENDIX TABLE III

LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATES OF FEMALES BY HOUSEHOLD STATUS
AS RECEIVING AND NOT RECEIVING REMITTANCES, BY INCOME GROUPS & AREA: 1979.

(URBAN)

Females	INCOME GROUPS					
	Total	0-280	281-420	421-700	701-1120	1120+
<u>HOUSEHOLDS RECEIVING REMITTANCES</u>						
Total population 10+	100	100	100	100	100	100
% 10+ in Labour Force	2.59	100	0	0	1.87	1.91
Age specific LFPR 10-14	0	0	0	0	0	0
Age specific LFPR 15-25	3.74	0	0	0	0	5.22
Age specific LFPR 26-44	0	0	0	0	0	0
Age specific LFPR 45+	5.13	100	0	0	9.39	0
Unpaid Family Helpers as % of total L.F.	69.96	100	0	0	0	51.26
% of L.F. wanting more work	25.20	0	0	0	0	51.26
% of L.F. wanting less work	15.06	0	0	0	100	0
<u>HOUSEHOLDS NOT RECEIVING REMITTANCES</u>						
Total population 10+	100	100	100	100	100	100
% 10+ in Labour Force	4.52	13.57	3.69	4.83	4.64	4.23
Age specific LFPR 10-14	1.81	0	2.05	2.31	2.51	1.20
Age specific LFPR 15-25	3.88	2.99	1.91	4.90	3.30	3.93
Age specific LFPR 26-44	7.04	4.17	6.08	5.49	7.39	7.68
Age specific LFPR 45+	4.81	35.82	5.16	5.61	4.94	3.46
Unpaid Family Helpers as % of total L.F.	21.03	0	0	20.84	34.16	14.68
% of L.F. wanting more work	27.40	27.61	24.84	40.77	25.19	22.88
% of L.F. wanting less work	9.36	0	35.74	6.45	8.47	10.44

Source: PLM Survey 1979.

APPENDIX TABLE IV

AVERAGE HOURS WORKED PER WEEK BY EMPLOYED FEMALES 10+ BY HOUSEHOLD STATUS AS RECEIVING AND NOT RECEIVING REMITTANCES, BY INCOME GROUPS AND AREA : 1979

Employed Females 10+ in HH's	INCOME GROUP					
	Total	0-280	281-420	421-720	721-1120	1120+
	<u>RURAL</u>					
No Out-Migrant	30.95	35.84	30.87	30.13	32.17	29.48
Households with out migrants						
a) Not receiving remittances	30.95	36.10	30.80	30.09	32.21	29.40
b) Receiving remittances	30.82	35.00	29.34	31.62	25.86	34.02
	<u>URBAN</u>					
No Out-Migrant	40.19	36.53	41.39	34.82	38.96	45.55
Households with out migrants						
a) Not receiving remittances	40.98	37.18	41.39	44.92	38.96	45.27
b) Receiving remittances	41.09	35.00	-	-	42.00	45.24

Source: PLM Survey 1979.

APPENDIX TABLE V

AGE SPECIFIC LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATES OF FEMALES IN HOUSEHOLDS BY NUMBER OF OUT-MIGRANTS BY AREA; 1979

Household	AGE GROUP				
	Total 10+	10-14	15-25	26-44	45+
	<u>RURAL</u>				
No out migrant	16.77	13.71	16.79	20.10	15.11
One out-migrant	12.07	9.93	13.37	14.35	9.85
	<u>URBAN</u>				
No out-migrant	5.01	1.98	4.52	7.12	5.90
One out-migrant	2.65	4.66	2.39	2.74	2.89

Source: PLM Survey 1979.

APPENDIX TABLE VI

EFFECTS OF OUT-MIGRATION TO MIDDLE EAST ON WORK, OUTPUT AND INCOME OF THE LEFT BEHIND HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS BY INCOME AND AREA : 1979.

EFFECTS	INCOME GROUP					
	Total	0-280	281-420	421-720	721-1120	1120+
<u>RURAL</u>						
<u>ON WORK</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
1. No effect	63.1	64.7	57.1	62.5	57.9	66.2
2. Had to hire labour	2.0	-	-	-	5.3	1.4
3. Additional work for family	15.4	29.4	28.6	18.8	7.9	14.1
4. Loss of labour & decline in agri./non-agri. output.	0.7	-	-	-	2.6	-
5. Others	18.8	5.9	14.3	18.8	26.3	18.3
<u>ON OUTPUT</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
1. No effect	51.7	70.6	42.9	56.3	52.6	46.5
2. Loss of labour & decline in agri./non-agri. output	13.4	17.6	28.6	18.8	7.9	12.7
3. Money helpful in increasing agri./non-agri. output	10.7	-	-	6.3	7.9	16.9
4. Additional output available for use	0.7	5.9	-	-	-	-
5. Provided information to improve output	2.0	-	-	-	-	4.2
6. Others	21.4	5.9	28.6	18.8	31.6	19.7
<u>ON INCOME</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
1. No effect	26.8	17.6	14.3	37.5	28.9	26.8
2. Money helpful in increasing agri./non-agri. output	4.7	5.9	-	12.5	5.3	2.8
3. Additional output available for use	44.3	70.6	42.9	31.3	26.3	50.7
4. Provided information to improve output	1.3	-	-	-	-	2.8
5. Others	22.8	5.9	42.9	18.8	39.5	16.9
<u>URBAN</u>						
<u>ON WORK</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
1. No effect	82.1	100.0	100.0	60.0	76.2	84.4
2. Had to hire labour	-	-	-	-	-	-
3. Additional work for family	0.9	-	-	20.0	-	-
4. Loss of labour & decline in agri./non-agri. output	-	-	-	-	-	-
5. Others	16.9	-	-	20.0	23.8	15.6
<u>ON OUTPUT</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
1. No effect	68.9	100.0	-	40.0	61.9	72.7
2. Loss of labour & decline in agri./non-agri. output	-	-	-	-	-	-
3. Money helpful in increasing agri./non-agri. output	5.7	-	-	20.0	4.8	5.2
4. Additional output available for use	3.8	-	-	-	-	5.2
5. Provided information to improve output	-	-	-	-	-	-
6. Others	21.7	-	100.0	40.0	33.3	16.9
<u>NON INCOME</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
1. No effect	17.9	50.0	-	-	9.5	20.8
2. Money helpful in increasing agri./non-agri. output	4.7	-	-	-	-	6.5
3. Addi. output available for use	53.8	50.0	100	60.0	52.4	53.2
4. Provided information to improve output	-	-	-	-	-	-
5. Others	23.6	-	-	40.0	38.1	19.5

Source: FOM Survey 1979.

APPENDIX TABLE VII

EFFECTS OF OUT-MIGRATION WITHIN PAKISTAN ON WORK, OUTPUT AND INCOME OF THE LEFT BEHIND HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS BY INCOME AND AREA : 1979.

EFFECTS	INCOME GROUP					
	Total	0-280	281-420	421-720	721-1120	1120+
	<u>RURAL</u>					
<u>ON WORK</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
1. No effect	77.9	86.7	87.0	78.9	74.3	70.9
2. Had to hire labour	1.4	1.0	4.3	-	1.8	1.9
3. Additional work for family	8.4	6.1	4.3	6.6	11.5	8.5
4. Loss of labour & decline in agri./non-agri. output	0.7	-	-	1.3	-	1.9
5. Others	11.7	6.1	4.3	13.1	12.4	16.9
<u>ON OUTPUT</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
1. No effect	70.2	80.6	78.3	69.7	68.1	61.3
2. Loss of labour & decline in agri./non-agri. output	6.0	5.1	8.7	2.6	10.6	3.8
3. Money helpful in increasing agri./non-agri. output	2.9	2.0	-	-	2.7	6.6
4. Additional output available for use	5.3	2.0	4.3	10.5	5.3	4.7
5. Provided information to improve output	0.5	-	-	-	-	1.9
6. Others	15.1	10.2	8.7	17.1	13.3	21.7
<u>ON INCOME</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
1. No effect	32.5	26.5	26.1	35.5	37.2	32.1
2. Money helpful in increasing agri./non-agri. output	5.3	5.1	4.3	7.9	8.0	0.9
3. Additional output available for use	43.7	57.1	52.2	43.4	38.9	34.9
4. Provided information to improve output	0.2	-	-	-	-	0.9
5. Others	18.2	11.2	17.3	13.2	16.0	31.0
	<u>URBAN</u>					
<u>ON WORK</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
1. No effect	72.4	83.3	40.0	88.9	65.6	75.5
2. Had to hire labour	-	-	-	-	-	-
3. Additional work for family	3.8	-	-	-	3.1	5.7
4. Loss of labour & decline in agri./non-agri. output	-	-	-	-	-	-
5. Others	23.9	16.7	60.0	11.1	31.3	18.9
<u>ON OUTPUT</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
1. No effect	64.8	83.3	40.0	77.8	59.4	66.0
2. Loss of labour & decline in agri./non-agri. output	5.7	-	-	-	9.4	5.7
3. Money helpful in increasing agri./non-agri. output	1.9	-	-	-	-	3.8
4. Additional output available for use	1.9	-	-	-	-	3.8
5. Provided information to improve output	25.7	16.7	60.0	22.2	31.3	20.8
6. Others	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>ON INCOME</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
1. No effect	35.2	-	20.0	55.6	34.4	37.7
2. Money helpful in increasing agri./non-agri. output	7.6	-	-	11.1	-	13.2
3. Additional output available for use	23.8	83.3	20.0	11.1	25.0	18.9
4. Provided information to improve output	-	-	-	-	-	-
5. Others	33.3	16.7	60.0	22.2	40.6	30.2

Source: PLM Survey, 1979.

APPENDIX TABLE VIII

-37-

USE OF REMITTANCES BY PREFERENCES, AREA, AND BY AMOUNT REMITTED LAST YEAR, 1979.
(RURAL AREAS)

Amount remitted last year	Total	To pay for weddings	To pay for School fee's	To pay for medical expenses	To buy food/clothing	To buy HH goods or make improvements to home	To pay for luxuries such as ornaments	To pay off debts	To pay farm/non-farm equipment	To Purchase seeds/pesticides fertilizers	To buy land/business	Others	Savings	No response
<u>FIRST PREFERENCE</u>														
Total	100	5.59	-	-	40.18	42.99	-	3.76	-	-	1.79	2.52	-	2.08
< 6000	100	2.39	-	-	36.98	38.67	-	6.85	-	-	3.36	7.98	-	3.77
6001-12,000	100	2.11	-	-	51.13	43.53	-	3.22	-	-	-	-	-	-
12001-24,000	100	3.21	-	-	30.28	56.65	-	-	-	-	3.85	-	-	-
24001-48,000	100	15.30	-	-	48.14	29.12	-	7.44	-	-	-	-	-	-
48,000+	100	26.03	-	-	11.99	54.0	-	-	-	-	-	7.97	-	-
No Information	100	-	-	-	50.43	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	49.5
<u>SECOND PREFERENCE</u>														
Total	100	2.73	10.70	1.27	15.66	25.21	-	4.59	-	-	0.40	10.04	0.66	28.73
< 6000	100	2.39	6.39	0	17.71	31.28	-	3.56	-	-	-	2.55	-	36.12
6,001-12,000	100	3.71	21.53	1.48	9.16	21.74	-	-	-	-	-	12.34	-	30.04
12001-24,000	100	-	10.92	3.56	14.97	20.99	-	7.37	-	-	-	19.07	-	23.11
24001-48,000	100	7.58	-	-	21.54	30.67	-	7.24	-	-	-	9.42	-	23.55
48,000+	100	-	-	-	38.62	7.98	-	19.21	-	-	7.48	-	13.51	11.99
No Information	100	-	-	-	-	50.43	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	49.57
<u>THIRD PREFERENCE</u>														
Total	100	2.45	4.52	1.61	3.51	8.69	2.57	6.04	1.09	-	-	8.08	-	61.43
< 6000	100	-	-	-	8.78	4.94	2.39	3.36	-	-	-	3.53	-	77.00
6,001-12,000	100	3.73	-	3.47	-	16.02	2.11	4.79	-	-	-	15.94	-	53.94
12001-24,000	100	3.07	5.08	2.44	5.06	5.79	2.73	7.69	4.70	-	-	10.13	-	53.31
24,001-48,000	100	-	22.61	-	-	9.42	-	11.75	-	-	-	-	-	56.22
48000+	100	12.59	7.98	-	-	-	13.51	7.98	-	-	-	-	-	57.94
No Information	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.00

Source: PLM Survey 1979.

APPENDIX TABLE IX

-38-

USE OF REMITTANCES BY PREFERENCES, AREA, AND BY AMOUNT REMITTED LAST YEAR, 1979.
(URBAN AREAS)

Amount remitted last year	Total	To pay for weddings	To pay for school fees	To pay medical expenses	To buy food/clothing	To buy HH goods or make improvements to home	To pay for luxuries such as ornaments	To pay off debts	To buy farm/non-farm equipment	To purchase seeds/pesticide's fertilizer's	To buy land/business	Others	Savings	No response
<u>FIRST REFERENCE</u>														
Total	100	1.05	0.92	-	26.44	43.53	1.09	8.28	-	-	2.12	7.64	-	8.93
< 6,000	100	-	-	-	36.31	46.02	-	6.80	-	-	-	-	-	10.87
6,001-12,000	100	4.18	-	-	34.19	41.73	4.28	-	-	-	4.40	7.40	-	3.81
12,001	100	-	-	-	11.86	55.89	-	19.61	-	-	4.31	8.23	-	-
24001-48,000	100	-	6.77	-	36.65	27.86	-	-	-	-	-	28.72	-	-
48,000+	100	-	-	-	-	38.11	-	38.11	-	-	-	-	-	23.77
No information	100	-	-	-	-	30.91	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	69.09
<u>SECOND REFERENCE</u>														
Total	100	3.97	0.85	1.81	11.97	20.60	-	9.35	1.72	1.80	3.62	8.80	-	35.50
< 6,000	100	4.01	3.05	3.40	6.03	13.66	-	13.48	-	3.23	-	3.40	-	49.74
6,001-12,000	100	3.74	-	-	10.41	29.33	-	10.51	-	3.59	-	3.38	-	39.04
12,001-24,000	100	8.29	-	-	29.32	16.41	-	8.19	7.48	-	-	21.26	-	9.04
24,001-48,000	100	-	-	6.34	-	27.73	-	7.79	-	-	21.20	15.68	-	21.25
48,000+	100	-	-	-	-	38.11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	61.89
No information	100	-	-	-	17.06	-	-	-	-	-	13.85	-	-	69.09
<u>THIRD REFERENCE</u>														
Total	100	3.74	0.84	1.67	5.58	3.90	-	8.28	1.54	-	-	7.53	2.82	64.09
< 6,000	100	3.39	3.02	-	-	3.61	-	-	2.74	-	-	6.87	-	80.36
6,001-12,000	100	6.96	-	2.58	3.82	4.18	-	4.68	3.05	-	-	7.46	-	66.27
12,001-24,000	100	4.52	-	3.34	16.40	4.05	-	22.78	-	-	-	4.09	8.11	36.70
24001-48,000	100	-	-	-	6.34	6.77	-	13.87	-	-	-	13.73	7.10	52.20
48,000+	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.00
No information	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17.06	-	82.94

Source: PLM Survey 1979.

APPENDIX TABLE X

-39-

ABILITY TO SPEND BY AMOUNT REMITTED LAST YEAR BY AREA, 1979

Amount Remitted	Total	Purchase of land or other property	Farm non-farm improvements & machinery	Expansion of business	Improvement to land	Pesticides fertilizers seeds raw-material etc.	Household goods and improvements to building	Food/clothing	Marriage	Luxury items such as ornaments
<u>RURAL AREAS</u>										
Total	24.00	4.94	3.76	3.35	2.78	6.85	61.88	86.72	29.27	16.75
6,000	21.82	3.36	3.36	2.39	3.36	12.61	61.27	78.99	20.24	10.95
6,001-12,000	24.46	3.66	-	5.45	-	-	69.17	89.66	34.74	17.44
12,001-24,000	26.78	8.53	8.10	-	8.10	10.83	64.89	87.06	32.85	20.66
24,001-48,000	18.71	7.44	-	-	-	-	30.58	100.00	16.64	14.74
48000+	29.61	-	19.94	-	-	19.94	88.13	68.19	54.58	15.96
No information	33.33	-	-	49.57	-	-	50.43	100.00	49.57	50.43
<u>URBAN AREAS</u>										
Total	25.07	6.92	1.86	3.71	15.49	5.2	68.89	87.00	28.56	8.01
6,000	23.70	-	-	3.21	5.97	6.02	69.49	94.07	24.64	7.24
6,001-12,000	27.46	4.40	3.57	7.38	21.71	3.73	75.92	87.32	35.53	7.62
12,001-24,000	27.91	13.05	4.18	4.14	22.26	7.27	78.09	88.14	26.26	5.83
24,001-48,000	22.23	15.26	-	-	13.73	6.77	57.78	72.26	27.97	6.34
48000+	23.87	-	-	-	-	-	38.11	100.00	38.11	38.11
No information	18.74	13.85	-	-	17.06	-	49.91	68.81	19.00	-

Source: PLM Survey, 1979.

APPENDIX TABLE XI

EFFECTS OF OUT-MIGRATION ON THE BEHAVIOUR OF WIVES BY LENGTH OF HUSBANDS STAY ABROAD

Length of stay abroad	More responsible about family	Better informed and mature	Spend-thrift	Very Independent	Disobedient	Undomestic	Fond of displaying prosperity	Unhappy and concerned
Upto 2 years	91	82	52	50	42	50	63	64
2-4 years	87	83	57	57	49	50	61	57
4-6 years	88	80	74	69	47	61	66	48
Above 6 years	83	92	65	64	47	56	59	46

Source: Reproduced from PIPO. 1983.

APPENDIX TABLE XII

EFFECTS OF OUT-MIGRATION ON THE BEHAVIOUR OF CHILDREN BY LENGTH OF FATHERS STAY ABROAD

Length of stay abroad	Keenness for education	Responsible towards parents	Spend-thrift	Indulgent	Disobedient	Absent from school
<u>MALES</u>						
Upto 2 years	74	83	63	56	51	56
2-4 years	77	81	64	63	59	55
4-6 years	77	82	80	55	59	58
Above 6 years	77	78	79	64	63	61
<u>FEMALES</u>						
Upto 2 years	71	88	38	44	45	35
2-4 years	75	84	43	50	47	33
4-6 years	67	83	56	51	38	22
Above 6 years	68	80	36	31	34	25

Source: Reproduced from PIPO. 1983.

APPENDIX TABLE XIII

SOME DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF LEFT BEHIND WIVES
SUFFERING FROM PSYCHOLOGICAL DISEASES
(DECEMBER 1ST, 1982 TO 30TH MAY 1983)

Characteristics	Out-patients	In-patients
Total female patients	1346 (100)	97 (100)
Age of wife	<u>100.00</u>	<u>100.00</u>
15-25	2.6 } 26-35 } 36-44 } 45+ } No-information	75.26 24.74 -
Duration of marriage	<u>100.00</u>	<u>100.00</u>
Less than one year	24.22 } 1 to 2 years } 2 to 5 years } 5+ years }	87.63 12.37
Duration of husband's migration	<u>100.00</u>	<u>100.00</u>
Less than one year } 1 to 2 years } 2 to 5 years } 5+ years }	70.73 29.27	93.81 6.19
Frequency of husband's visit	<u>100.00</u>	<u>100.00</u>
Once in 6 months	nil	nil
Once in a year	nil	nil
Once in 2 years	100.00	100.00
Number of children	<u>100.00</u>	<u>100.00</u>
None	14.63	73.20
one child	69.69 } two children } 3+children }	26.80
Number of children born [*] before husbands migration	Majority either with no child or one child	Majority either with no child or one child
Area of current residence	<u>100.00</u>	<u>100.00</u>
Rural	10.47	6.19
Urban	78.08	83.81
No-information	11.45	-
Type of family in which living	<u>100.00</u>	<u>100.00</u>
Nuclear	7.06	89.69
Joint/extended	78.08	-
No-information	14.86	10.31

Source: Department of Psychological Medicine and Neuro Psychiatry, Rawalpindi General Hospital.

*This information was not available for all patients, and is a rough indication.

APPENDIX TABLE XIV

DRUG PREVELANCE AMONG CHILDREN OF MIDDLE EAST MIGRANTS
(DECEMBER 1ST 1982 TO MAY 30, 1983)

<u>Patients</u>	<u>Drugs and Diseases</u>
Common disease among school going children	Truancy, (running away from school) Aggressive and voilent behaviour
<u>Out-patients</u>	
age group 12-14	Cigarette and hashish (5 percent)
age group 25-26	Herion (46 percent)
<u>In-patients</u>	
Total in-patients who were Herion addicts	67 (100)
Number of in-patient herion addicts whose fathers were abroad	43 (64 percent)

Source: Department of Psychological Medicine and Neuro Psychiatry,
Rawalpindi General Hospital.