Microeconomic Impact of Remittances on Household Welfare: Evidences from Bangladesh

Wadood, Syed Naimul and Hossain, Md. Amzad

Department of Economics, University of Dhaka, Department of Economics, University of Dhaka

February 2016

Microeconomic Impact of Remittance on Household Welfare: Evidence from Bangladesh

Syed Naimul Wadood, PhD[1]

Md. Amzad Hossain[2]

Abstract

This paper investigates the effect of both international and domestic remittances and migration on household welfare in Bangladesh. We employ a number of variables such as different types of poverty measures, household consumption expenditure, expenditures on health and education etc to define household welfare. We use the Household Income and Expenditure survey 2010 to estimate the impact of remittance on household welfare. To address the issue of self-selection, we have used Propensity Score Matching (PSM) technique. The results reveal that although both internal and external remittance remittances have significant impact on reducing poverty and increasing consumption expenditure, the degree of impact is much higher for external remittance compared to internal remittance. However we find no impact of remittance on Household expenditure on education and healthcare.

Keywords: remittances, migration, Bangladesh, propensity score matching

1 Introduction

Overseas remittance earnings have become a major source of financial inflow for Bangladesh economy in recent years. Remittance earnings, as equivalent to share of Bangladesh's Gross Domestic Product (GDP), have been consistently on the increase and by 2012 this has reached an equivalent of 12 percent (Bangladesh Bank, 2014). A slightly fluctuating, but overall sustained inflow like this one for the last four decades, has arguably boosted the economy in many different ways. It has been argued that this has helped employment generation, reduction of unemployment, increases in the foreign exchange reserves and also immensely contributed to an acceleration of overall national economic development (Ministry of Finance, 2014). World Bank (2012) argues that remittances contribute to growth of output in the economy by augmenting consumption and investment demand as well as savings.

---

1 Associate Professor, Department of Economics, University of Dhaka. E-mail: snwadood@econdu.ac.bd

2 Lecturer, Department of Economics, University of Dhaka. E-mail: amzadjcc36@gmail.com

Consequently, the economic impact of migration and remittances has received an increasing interest from both researchers and policy makers. Remittances are often the most straightforward link between migration and welfare of the households in the origin country. According to the new economics of labor migration (NELM), migration is part of a household strategy to overcome market failures such as imperfect credit and insurance markets. Remittances that provide households with an income not correlated with farm income can loosen production and investment constraints and finance investments in new production technologies and input. Apart from the direct effects of remittances, there can also be multiplier effects on income, employment and production in the migration sending country (Taylor 1999). When emerged in the 1980"s and 1990"s, NELM contrasted a previously dominating but more pessimistic view on migration and development that argued that remittances often are used for non-productive investments and lead to the development of passive, non-productive and remittance-dependent communities (de Haas, 2007).

One interesting empirical query that follows from this discussion is, *whether remittance earnings enhance household well-being*. As we discuss in detail the methodology, we understand that the three abovementioned empirical questions have not yet been resolved in the context of Bangladesh, and this is the area of research where our study attempts to contribute.

A challenge when estimating the causal impact of migration and remittances on household welfare is self-selection. If migration is not a random decision, and remittances are not randomly assigned, there might be confounding factors that influence both the probability of migration and probability of receiving remittances and the outcome of interest, which would result in biased estimates of the impact of remittances on the outcome. In this study, a matching approach will be applied in order to address the possible self-selection issue. Treatment will in this case be whether the household receives remittances, in order to measure the average treatment effect of the treated. The advantage with this approach is that it allows us to compare households that receive remittances with otherwise similar households that do not receive remittances in order to mitigate the self-selection bias. Since the data contains retrospective information about household assets and subjective wellbeing five years ago, as well as information about when the household started receiving remittances, we are able to look at the change in welfare before and after households start receiving remittances.

The reminder of the papers is structured as follows: Section 2 gives a brief literature review of the impact of remittance on household welfare. Section 3 describes the migration and remittance patterns in Bangladesh; section 4 describes the methodology used; The results are presented in section 5 and section 6 concludes.

2 Literature Review

There has been a growing literature examining how migrant workers' remittances can affect households. Among these studies, some have documented how migrants have contributed to economic and social development in their country of origin. Thus, evidence suggests that remittances from abroad are crucial to the survival of communities in many developing countries as indicated in a World Bank Country Analyses report by Russell et al. (1990). One benefit expected from labor emigration was that migrants would be bringing an impetus to investments, transfer of technology and machinery and new enterprises. Russell et al. (1990) concluded that after satisfying subsistence needs, migrant remittances are used for investment purposes such as education, livestock, farming, and small scale enterprise.

Remittances significantly affect welfare and this was the focus of a study by Koc and Onan (2001). They examined the impact of remittances on the standard of living of left-behind families in Turkey and found that remittances have a positive effect on household welfare. Their study shows that remittances have both direct and indirect income effects, which potentially have important influences on production, income inequality and poverty, at least at the local level. They found that 12percent of households used about 80percent of remittances to improve their standard of living, although it is argued that dependency on the same leaves households vulnerable to changes in migration cycles.

Migrant remittances also serve as a source of income for savings and investment, as confirmed by Taylor (1996), and thereby lead to growth and development of an economy. This is corroborated in a study on Mali by Findley and Sow (1998), who report that remittances not only covered basic food and cash needs but also allowed people to pay for irrigation in agriculture. Adams and Page (2003) using data from 74 low- and middle-income developing countries, found that international migration has a strong statistical impact on reducing poverty.

Whilst some researchers hold the view that remittance flows reduce income inequality between the rich and the poor, others are of the view that the reverse is true because it is the rich that are able to get their family members to migrate. In a study Adams (1991) used income data from households with and without migrants to determine the effects of remittances on poverty, income distribution and rural development and found that although remittances were helpful in alleviating poverty, paradoxically they also contributed to inequality in the distribution of income. By contrast, Gustafson and Makonnen (1993) found that in Lesotho, migrant remittances actually decreased inequality. Chimhowu et al. (2004) support the view that

remittances do increase inequality at the local level, but at the international level they transfer resources from developed to developing countries and so help to reduce inequality.

3 Trends in Migration and Remittance

3.1 Observations from Macro Data

Remittances sent by overseas migrants contribute quite significantly to the economic development of the country through augmenting foreign exchange reserves and income. Workers' remittances flow, as equivalent to percentage of GDP, has been showing increasing trend year by year since the inception of manpower export in 1976 (Figure 1). Remittances sent by the overseas migrants have increased from USD 23.71 million in 1976 to USD 14,338 million in 2012-13, preceded by USD 12,734 million in 2011-12 (Bangladesh Bank, 2014). The contribution of remittance to Gross Domestic Products (GDP) has grown from a meager less than 1 per cent in 1977-78 to around 12 per cent in 2012-13.

Figure 1: Share of Remittance as a Percentage of GDP

This rapid growth in overseas remittance earnings has been made possible by a rapid increase in overseas migration (here growth of remittance earnings has been principally propelled by growth in the stock of number of migrant workers, not by growth in remittance per worker (World Bank, 2012)). Overseas migration is essential for a developing country like ours since it not only produces large inflows of valuable foreign currencies but also offers an outlet for frustrated unemployed workers who might otherwise present serious domestic problems, and thereby reduces pressure in the domestic labor market. It is also important in order to reduce unemployment at home and accumulate valuable foreign exchange to stimulate economic growth. Migration also contributes immensely to development through technology transfers and diffusion, since migrant workers while working abroad learn new techniques, deal with latest technologies and once they return home, they are in a position to bring in the new knowledge and technology acquired abroad as well. Even the current migrant workers, whether having the intent to return or not, function as the embodiment of new technologies and ideas that can be easily transferred or diffused home through improved communication channels. Being a hugely labor surplus country Bangladesh participates in the supply side of the global labor market. Each year a large number of people of this country voluntarily migrate overseas for both long- and short-term employment. Figure 2 shows the trends in oversees employment from the period of 1976 to 2012. A total number of around 8.30 million manpower has been exported up till 2012 since the inception of manpower export in 1976. Up till 2006 the number of overseas employment grew

steadily without a few exceptions. There was a sharp rise in overseas employment in 2007 and 2008 followed by a sharp decline in 2009. This sharp decline can be attributed to the ongoing Global Financial Crisis at that time.

3.2 Observations from Micro Household Data

We examine the micro data from the Household Income and Expenditure Survey of 2010 (HIES 2010) in order to understand the issue of migration and remittance in this household-level questionnaire form of nationally representative data. The HIES 2010 contains responses from a total of 12,240 households from all throughout Bangladesh, out of which 7,840 are rural households and 4,400 are urban households (it consists of 620 PSUs (primary sampling units), each comprising of 20 sample survey respondents) (BBS, 2011). The HIES is representative up to the division level, and we find a total of 1,337 observations of foreign remittance observations throughout these 12,240 households (on an average, one remittance receipt observation as against 9.15 number of households) (source: own calculations). We discuss some interesting features of this micro-level migration and remittance data in this sub-section.

The East dominates while the West and the South are mostly absent
We observe overseas remittance receipts are much more prevalent among administrative divisions that are on the eastern part of the country, such as Chittagong, Dhaka and Sylhet and smaller numbers of remittance receipts are observed in the western as well as southern parts of the country, such as in the cases of Barisal, Khulna, Rajshahi and Rangpur divisions. A total of around 72 percent observations are recorded in Dhaka and Chittagong divisions only. This implies that the direct benefits of overseas remittances fall mostly on these two divisions whereas other divisions have been largely bypassed from these benefits. On an average, a Chittagong division remittance-recipient household received around Taka 145 thousand in a year whereas a Barisal division household recipient household received around Taka 94 thousand in a year, even though we do not claim this to be statistically significantly different due to disproportionate number of observations between the two groups and much smaller number of observations in the Barisal group. We do not find statistically significant differences between Chittagong versus non-Chittagong average remittance amount received or Dhaka versus non-Dhaka average remittance amount received.

Table 2. Remittance Amount Received by Division Classification (HIES 2010 Data)

Division	Number of Observations	Percentage Share of total number of Observations	Average Amount of Remittance Sent (TK.)	Standard Error of Mean Remittance (TK.)
Barisal	67	5.01	93,988.06	10,529.15
Chittagong	556	41.59	144,916.7	11,135.49
Dhaka	413	30.89	134,877.4	7,159.11
Khulna	86	6.43	107,857.2	13,917.37
Rajshahi	88	6.58	141,517	16,010.23
Sylhet	127	9.50	135,262.3	17,604.55
Overall National	1,337	100.00	135,738	5,602

Even acknowledging problems of district data within the HIES due to smaller number of observations, if we still examine the district data, we find that Feni, Brahmanbaria and Comilla are the three districts with highest percentages of surveyed households reporting to have received overseas remittance. We find that remittance receipts are more prevalent centering on Dhaka-Chittagong and Dhaka-Sylhet highways. In sharp contrast, the Northern districts such as Kurigram, Lalmonirhat, Netrokona, Nilphamari and Southern district such as Patuakhali reported no observations of remittance receipts among their respective surveyed households.

Table 3. Ranking of Districts in terms of Percentage of Households Receiving Remittance

Ranking of Districts	Name of District	Percentage of Remittance-Receiving HHs	Ranking of Districts	Name of District	Percentage of Remittance-Receiving HHs
1	Feni	39.38	55	Khulna	0.77
2	Brahmanbaria	33.00	56	Narail	0.71
3	Comilla	28.67	57	Panchagarh	0.71
4	Chandpur	25.00	58	Gaibandha	0.63
5	Lakshmipur	23.57	59	Dinajpur	0.50
6	Chittagong	17.50	60	Kurigram	0.00
7	Madaripur	17.14	61	Lalmonirhat	0.00
8	Sylhet	17.08	62	Netrokona	0.00
9	Dhaka	17.00	63	Nilphamari	0.00
10	Noakhali	16.00	64	Patuakhali	0.00
Highest 10 Districts		22.21	Lowest 10 Districts		0.36

If we examine further probe into the data, we find a total of 612 Primary Sampling Units (PSUs) selected throughout the entire country, with each PSU having a total of 20 sample survey respondent households. A total of 265 PSUs (41percent) reported no cases of overseas remittances, likewise 110 PSUs reported only one case each, 80 PSUs reported two cases each,

48 PSUs reported three cases each, 27 PSUs reported four cases each and the remaining 109 PSUs reported 5 up to 14 cases. Whilst a total of 265 PSUs reported zero observations out of twenty households, there are some PSUs which reported 14 out of 20 households to be overseas remittance recipients.

This finding implies direct benefits from overseas remittance does not fall evenly on all sub-national regions-- that the Eastern region dominates the picture whereas the Western regions does not have many cases of overseas remittance. World Bank (2012) opines that perhaps the explanation for this uneven distribution lies in "new economics of migration" (Hanson, 2010). According to the "new economics of migration", household, families or other groups decide collectively to maximize income and minimize risks by sending one or more family members abroad to increase overall family income whereas other family members stay behind earning lower but more stable income. Modeling migration as a form of risk- portfolio diversification in the presence of the "network effects", this implies that migration would tend to be high from regions where the stock of migrants is already high (low from regions where the stock of migrants is low till now). Since Dhaka, Chittagong and Sylhet already have a large stock of migrant workers, it is more likely that new migrant workers would arise from these regions, whereas it is less likely a case for other divisions such as Rajshahi, Rangpur, Khulna and Barisal.

Figure 7. Distribution of PSUs in terms of observations of Overseas Remittance Receipts

Low or medium skill service sector jobs dominate while only a few professionals are observed
In terms of occupations of the remittance-sender migrant workers, a total of five job classifications comprise of more than 41 percent observations, and a total of some other 57 job classifications comprise the remaining 59 percent observations (out of a total of 1,337 observations). The five job classifications include firstly, chef, cook, hotel boy and other related categories, secondly, unclassified sales worker, thirdly, unclassified service worker categories, fourthly, house caretaker, cleaner and related categories and fifthly, car driver & conductor, auto and manual works. Only a few professionals are present within the list of remittance-sending migrant workers whereas mostly service worker, commonly unskilled or semi-skilled and rarely skilled, are present within the list of remittance-senders. We do not find statistically significant difference of the average remittance amount sent among these classifications; additionally the number of observations is also small.

Time since the migrant left does not increase remittance amount sent

Out of a total of 1,337 observations, 39 percent migrant workers left within below last two years, 22 percent left in between two to four years ago, 11 percent workers left within four to six years ago, and 29 percent left more than six years ago. We do not find statistically significant differences among average remittance amount sent by these different groups according to time classifications.

Remittances from major host countries lower compared to other, non-major host countries

We find an interesting observation that the major four source country do not necessarily generate higher amount of remittance per migrant worker. On an average, a remittance-sending migrant worker based in Suadi Arabia, U.A.E., Malaysia and Kuwait has sent an yearly amount of TK. 127,500 whereas his/her counterpart based in all other countries has sent an yearly amount of TK. 157,030, and this difference is statistically significant at 5percent (p-value= 0.018). This implies that opportunities for sending larger amount of remittances do not necessarily associate with major host countries for Bangladeshi workers and there is a scope for higher amount of remittance to be sent from other countries (at the same time, variation is also higher as indicated by a higher standard error).

Table 4. Classification of Remittance Observation in terms of Source Country

Country	Number of Observations	Average Remittance Sent (TK.)	Standard Error (TK.)
Major Four Country Group (964 Observations)			
Major Four Countries	964	127,500	4,095
Saudi Arabia	478	143,121	6,877
U.A.E.	262	106,752	5,928
Malaysia	132	112,197	6,654
Kuwait	92	127,391	12,717
Other Countries (373 Observations)			
Other Countries	373	157,030	17,031
t-test of mean differences t = 2.37 (with degrees of freedom 1,335); p-value= 0.018			
Other countries include Qatar, Oman, Singapore, U.K., Italy, South Africa, Libya, U.S.A., Other European countries, Iraq, South Korea, Canada, Iran, Australia, Brunei, Federation of Russia, Japan, Other Countries.			

Remittance amount increases with age of the remittance-senders

We find that Bangladeshi remittance senders are predominantly young since a total of around 75 percent of them are within the age of 40, moreover around 42 percent are within 30 years of age. Whereas on an average, a migrant worker below 30 years of age sent TK. 121 thousand in a year, a migrant worker in the age group of 30 to 40 years sent TK. 16 thousand higher, someone in the age group of 40 to 50 years sent an additional TK. 12 thousand higher, and someone in the age group of 50 years and above sent an additional TK. 47 thousand higher. In terms of standard

error calculations, the age group of within 30 years has exhibited less dispersion, whereas other age groups have exhibited much higher dispersion, implying experiences in terms of earnings bargained and received (and thereby amount sent home) may have been more widespread when the worker enters more senior age categories. We do not find statistically significant differences in terms of average remittance amount sent home within the first three age groups, whereas there is statistically significant differences between the first group and the last group (p=0.00). A simple OLS regression of age on remittance amount sent exhibits a statistically significant estimated coefficient for independent variable "age" (p=0.00).

Table 5. Classification of Remittance Observations in terms of Age Group

Age Group	No. of Observations and Percent of total	Average Remittance Sent (TK.)	Standard Error
Up to 30 years	567 (42.41)	120,900.4	4180.02
Age in between 30 and 40	455 (34.03)	137,053.7	13027.19
Age in between 40 and 50	236 (17.65)	148,540.4	12,890.4
Age above 50 years	79 (5.91)	196,421.5	30,445.8
Total	1,337 (100.00)	135,738.8	5,602

Educational level matters for remittance amount sent, at least at the SSC level

Whereas a total of 65 percent remittance-sender migrant workers have reported to have at least passed class 6 and all above, we can assess that most migrant workers are literate (though only 12 percent have reported to have attained HSC examination-level of education and above). On an average, a migrant worker with HSC examination-level & above educational level has sent TK. 166 thousand which is TK. 52 thousand higher than the average remittance sent home by a migrant worker with educational level of class 1 to 5 and this result is statistically significant (p=0.00). Interestingly we do not find much strong evidence of educational level to have much impact on average remittance amount sent. An OLS regression of educational class achieved on remittance amount sent brings in an estimated coefficient of 3,850 for the educational class which is only statistically significant at 5percent level (p= 0.033), with heteroskedasticity-robust standard error (the estimated constant term is 108, 292). This could be explained in the following way: one additional class obtained by the Bangladeshi migrant worker brings in an additional TK. 3.85 thousand as additional remittance amount sent home whereas with no class obtained the remittance amount sent is estimated at TK. 108 thousand. This remains to be examined whether this constitutes enough incentives among prospective Bangladeshi migrant workers to attain higher educational level.

Table 5. Classification of Remittance Observations in terms of Educational Level

Educational Level Attained	No. of Observations and Percent of total	Average Remittance Sent (TK.)	Standard Error
Illiterate	128 (9.57)	139,236	18,256
Class 1 to 5	343 (26.65)	114,401	5,777
Class 6 to SSC/Equivalent	706 (52.80)	138,505	8,460
HSE/Equivalent and Higher	160 (11.97)	166,480	20,584
Total	1,337 (100.00)	135,738.8	5,602

Woman remittance-sender is only few in numbers

The HIES 2010 data set fails to provide enough information regarding female remittance-senders since only 25 (1.87 percent) out of total 1,337 observations are found to be women. The data which was compiled in bit earlier than 2010 does not have updated information regarding recent upward movements of female migrant workers within the Bangladeshi migrant workers. We find almost same amount of remittance amount that has been reported as for female workers (TK. 137 thousand) as compared to their male counterparts (TK. 136 thousand) and small number of observation does not allow for statistical significance tests.

4 Methodology and Data

Remittance-recipient and non-recipient households are likely to differ from each other in many observable and unobservable characteristics that might be correlated with the outcome variables. Selectivity issues therefore, complicate studies measuring the impact of remittances. Existing studies are mostly non-experimental and do not always use an appropriate method to deal with selection issues. Some authors use instrumental variables to overcome this problem; however, it is difficult to determine and test a correct instrument. So, in order to address potential bias due to unobserved heterogeneity we use propensity matching estimators introduced first by Rosenbaun and Rubin (1983). In this type of method each treated observation (remittance-receiving household) is matched to a fixed number of control observations (non-remittance-receiving household) based on a propensity score. With this approach we are able to calculate robust estimators in order to determine the effects of remittances on households' poverty levels. Basically, this method makes it possible to construct counterfactuals to find out what would happen to a remittance-receiving household's poverty level if the household does not receive remittances.

In matching estimators, two important assumptions are made: conditional independence assumption (CIA) (unconfoundedness) and common support. Let us denote $D = 1$ if a household receives remittances and $D = 0$, otherwise. Then we can define the outcome for the recipients as

Y (1) and the outcome for non-recipients as Y (0). In this study, the outcome variables will be per capita income, consumption per capita and poverty status. We further denote X as a set of socio-demographic variables. Then the two assumptions can be formally expressed as:

The CIA implies that given the set of observables covariates X that are not affected by the treatment (receiving remittances), the potential outcomes P are orthogonal to treatment assignment (Khandker et al. 2010), which allows for selection on observables. The common support assumption sets of each remittance-receiving household can be matched to a corresponding non-remittance-receiving household in order to construct the counterfactual. Once these assumptions are made, the average treatment effect between D=1 and D=0 can be calculated.

Nevertheless, there are some computational problems due to dimensionality. To avoid these problems, Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983) propose constructing a statistical comparison group by estimating a propensity score (the probability of the observations to receive remittances) given the set of covariates X. On the basis of the propensity score, remittance-receiving and non-remittance-receiving groups are matched. Then, the assumptions of conditional independence and common support imply

where is the propensity score or the probability of the observations to receive remittances given X. This method of matching is known as propensity score matching. Basically, what this method implies is that if receiving remittances is independent to the observables covariates X, then it must be independent to . With this, the dimensionality problem is reduced to one dimension. There are no problems in the matching, as Dehejia and Wahba (1999) found, because

observations with the same propensity score have the same distribution of the vector of covariates X.

The propensity score is calculated using a probit model subject to all the observable covariates that may determine receiving remittances. We estimate each observation (T=1 and T=0) probability to receive remittances and then test for the balancing property. As suggested by Heckman et al. (1997), and Becker and Ichino (2002), some observations of the control group with weak common support are dropped in order to make inferences of causality. If the balancing property is not satisfied, then another specification of higher order terms and interactions of covariates are included in the probit model, until the balancing property is satisfied. Once the propensity scores are estimated and the balancing property is satisfied, we estimate a uni-variate nonparametric regression to obtain the average treatment effect on the treated (ATT) between the remittance-receiving households and the non-remittance-receiving households, which can be defined as

We use three types of matching criteria in order to obtain robust ATT. First, we use a nearest-neighbor matching criterion, which matches remittance-receiving households with the closest propensity score of non-remittance-receiving households. Then, we use a kernel matching criterion, which uses a weighted average for non-remittance-receiving households to construct the counterfactual match for each remittance-receiving household (Khandker, et.al. 2010). Finally, we use a stratification criterion in order to match treated observations with control observations. This type of matching criterion separates observations into different strata and then matches similar observations within each stratum.

Finally, it is important to note that the variance for the treatment effect in propensity score matching is estimated incorrectly (Heckman, et al. 1998). Nevertheless, correcting this problem is straightforward by bootstrapping the standard errors (Efron and Tibshirani, 1993; Horowitz, 2003). Therefore, bootstrapped standard errors with 100 replications are estimated for the treatment effect for two matching criteria, kernel and stratification.

4.2 Data

The data used to show the impact of remittance on household welfare has been taken from HIES 2010. HIES 2010 covers data on both domestic and international migration and the socio-demographic characteristics of the migrants and migrant households. Variables which will be used to estimate Propensity score are listed below:

Household Head's sex Household Head's age Household Head's education level Household Head's occupation	No of household members Access to electricity Access to mobile Land size Household Usable Space (Sq. feet)	Source of Drinking Water Wall Material Sanitation type Rural/Urban dummy Division Dummies

5 Results and Discussion

The first step in the empirical exercise is the estimation of the propensity score. For our purposes this is the propensity of being treated i.e. of receiving remittances. The following tables show the results of the logit regressions for each of the model. We see that Household size has a significant impact on the probability of receiving remittance. Household assets such as land size and mobile also increase the likelihood of receiving remittance. However, while electricity connection raises the probability of receiving foreign remittance, it lowers the probability of receiving inward remittance. Other household standard of living proxies such as source of drinking water, type of latrine and material of wall of house also have significant impact. Generally households having brick-built-wall has a higher likelihood of receiving remittance compared to other types of wall materials. Households having access to tube-well water have more likelihood of receiving remittance compared to other sources of drinking water like pond, river and others. Similarly household having access to sanitary latrine has higher probability of receiving remittance compared to other types of latrine. All these indicate that household standard of living positively affects the probability of receiving remittance.

Households with female head are also more likely to receive remittance compared to their male counterpart. This result can be misleading unless we take care of the fact that most of these female headed household had male migrant who used to be the household head and in the absence of them, their wives act as household heads. Age of Household head also positively affects the probability of receiving remittance. Finally, Education of household head has a negative impact on the probability of receiving remittance.

The community level characteristics also influence the probability of receiving remittance. Household locating in the rural areas have higher likelihood of receiving remittance compared to the ones locating in the urban area. Besides the likelihood of receiving remittance also vary according to the region. Households in Chittagong are more likely to receive both types of remittance compared to the baseline region (Barisal). Households residing in Dhaka and Sylhet on the other hand, while have higher probability of receiving foreign remittance; have less likelihood of receiving domestic remittance. Households residing in other division have lower/or not significantly different likelihood of receiving remittance compared to the ones residing in Barisal.

Table 9: Logit model for Propensity score Matching

VARIABLES	(1) Household received any type of remittance	(2) Household received inward remittance	(3) Household received foreign remittance
Household size	0.000235***	0.000130***	0.000160***
	(5.79e-05)	(3.85e-05)	(4.81e-05)
mobile	0.662***	0.153**	1.017***
	(0.0512)	(0.0598)	(0.0776)
telephone	-0.0745	-0.000646	-0.0671
	(0.132)	(0.169)	(0.149)
electricity	0.120***	-0.0962*	0.255***
	(0.0421)	(0.0547)	(0.0523)
Sex of HH head	-1.381***	-0.785***	-1.312***
	(0.0441)	(0.0541)	(0.0490)
Age of HH Head	0.0107***	0.0164***	0.00398**
	(0.00134)	(0.00159)	(0.00166)
Education of HH Head	-0.0151***	0.00870	-0.0252***
	(0.00484)	(0.00624)	(0.00569)
Land	0.136***	0.0833***	0.139***
	(0.0150)	(0.0185)	(0.0175)
Wall Materials (Base: Brick)			
Wood	-0.0974*	0.0919	-0.150**
	(0.0520)	(0.0734)	(0.0585)
Mud Brick	-0.188***	0.115	-0.305***
	(0.0690)	(0.0921)	(0.0790)
Bamboo	-0.144**	0.181**	-0.290***
	(0.0668)	(0.0892)	(0.0801)
Others	-0.291	-0.182	-0.275
	(0.326)	(0.477)	(0.312)
Type of Latrine (Base: Sanitary)			
Pacca Latrine (water seal)	-0.0536	0.0250	-0.0704
	(0.0590)	(0.0791)	(0.0687)

Pacca Latrine (pit)	0.137**	0.264***	0.00203
	(0.0582)	(0.0745)	(0.0693)
Kacha Latrine	0.0414	0.0717	0.0322
	(0.0574)	(0.0758)	(0.0662)
Kacha Latrine (pit)	-0.166**	-0.0273	-0.206***
	(0.0667)	(0.0875)	(0.0798)
Others	-0.262*	-0.113	-0.357*
	(0.153)	(0.167)	(0.190)
Source of drinking Water (Base: Supplied Water)			
Tube well	0.402***	0.197	0.413***
	(0.0891)	(0.127)	(0.0977)
Pond	-0.205	-0.132	-0.356
	(0.266)	(0.316)	(0.355)
Well	0.0204	0.361	-0.562
	(0.227)	(0.236)	(0.390)
Others	0.0997	0.329	-0.0478
	(0.156)	(0.227)	(0.196)
Rural (dummy: 0 urban, 1 Rural)	0.331***	0.331***	0.251***
	(0.0502)	(0.0680)	(0.0578)
Division Dummies (Base: Barisal)			
Chittagong	0.211***	-0.458***	0.775***
	(0.0671)	(0.0822)	(0.0934)
Dhaka	-0.191***	-0.564***	0.344***
	(0.0636)	(0.0732)	(0.0908)
Khulna	-0.522***	-0.663***	-0.0433
	(0.0796)	(0.0926)	(0.110)
Rajshahi	-0.497***	-0.727***	0.0257
	(0.0846)	(0.104)	(0.113)
Rangpur	-0.636***	-0.536***	-0.685***
	(0.0982)	(0.100)	(0.168)
Sylhet	-0.226***	-0.933***	0.431***
	(0.0870)	(0.133)	(0.110)
Constant	-1.885***	-2.417***	-2.606***
	(0.141)	(0.182)	(0.172)
Observations	12,240	12,240	12,240

Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

5.1 Remittance (all types)

Tables 10 through 15 reports the results of the PSM matches under the various outcome variables and model specifications discussed above. Table 10 reports the impact of all type of remittance on per capita consumption. The result suggests that for every matching algorithm, the *ATET* is positive and significant, which means that remittances account for a positive and statistically significant difference between the matched treated (remittance receiving) and control groups in

terms of per capita consumption (measured in Taka). Similarly for every type of matching algorithm, the ATET of remittance on per capita food expenditure is positive and significant. Besides, remittance recipient household suffer less from poverty compared to the control groups and this results hold true for all types of matching algorithm. Further the treatment groups spend more on health expenses compared to the non-recipients one. However we do not see any significant difference between the treatment and control group in terms of education expenditure. On the other hand the impact of remittance on calorie intake is ambiguous- while stratification matching and Kernel matching suggest the impact is positive and significant the Nearest-neighbor matching suggest that the impact while positive is not significant.

Table 10: Per capita Consumption

	N (treatment)	N (Control)	ATT	Standard Error	t
Nearest Neighbor Matching	1688	1115	483.79	123.903	3.905
Stratification Matching	1688	10488	606.555	81.459	7.446
Radius Matching	1518	10440	734.534	61.236	11.995
Kernel Matching	1688	10488	558.781	74.123	7.539

Table 11: Per capita food expenditure

	N (treatment)	N (Control)	ATT	Standard Error	t
Nearest Neighbor Matching	1688	1115	207.703	38.955	5.332
Stratification Matching	1688	10488	246.244	30.238	8.144
Radius Matching	1518	10440	303.877	25.95	11.71
Kernel Matching	1688	10488	228.961	28.712	7.974

Table 12: Poverty rate (Upper Poverty Line)

	N (treatment)	N (Control)	ATT	Standard Error	t
Nearest Neighbor Matching	1688	1115	-0.06	0.018	-3.386
Stratification Matching	1688	10488	-0.101	0.012	-8.601
Radius Matching	1518	10440	-0.159	0.01	-15.415
Kernel Matching	1688	10488	-0.088	0.013	-7.042

Table 13: Health Expenditure

	N (treatment)	N (Control)	ATT	Standard Error	t
Nearest Neighbor Matching	1688	1115	2210.875	640.296	3.453
Stratification Matching	1688	10488	2137.834	585.574	3.651
Radius Matching	1518	10440	2754.623	581.467	4.737
Kernel Matching	1688	10488	2012.866	.	.

Table 14: Education Expenditure

	N (treatment)	N (Control)	ATT	Standard Error	t
Nearest Neighbor Matching	1688	1115	-2275.08	1648.534	-1.38
Stratification Matching	1688	10488	-285.951	618.441	-0.462
Radius Matching	1518	10440	614.322	420.752	1.46
Kernel Matching	1688	10488	-635.288	.	.

Table 15: Calorie Intake

	N (treatment)	N (Control)	ATT	Standard Error	t
Nearest Neighbor Matching	1688	1115	10.879	27.536	0.395
Stratification Matching	1688	10488	51.861	21.319	2.433
Radius Matching	1518	10440	110.578	17.201	6.428
Kernel Matching	1688	10488	45.307	.	.

5.2 Inward Remittance

Tables 16 through 20 shows the impact of inward remittance on various outcome variables under different matching algorithm discussed in the methodology part. Table 16 reports the impact of inward remittance on per capita consumption. The result suggests that for *Stratification Matching* and *Radius Matching*, the *ATET* is positive and significant, which means that remittances account for a positive and statistically significant difference between the matched treated (remittance receiving) and control groups in terms of per capita consumption (measured in Taka). However, the impact while positive is not significant for *Nearest-neighbor Matching*. However for every type of matching algorithm, the ATET of remittance on per capita food expenditure is positive and significant. Besides, remittance recipient household suffer less from poverty compared to the control groups but this results hold true only for *Stratification Matching* and *Radius Matching*. Further there was not any significant difference between the treatment groups and control groups in terms of health expenses for all matching algorithm other than Nearest Neighbor Matching. On the other hand the impact of remittance on calorie intake is found to be positive and significant regardless of the matching algorithm.

Table 16: Per capita Consumption

	N (treatment)	N (Control)	ATT	Standard Error	t
Nearest Neighbor Matching	540	498	95.357	145.409	0.656
Stratification Matching	539	11695	244.483	87.583	2.791
Radius Matching	517	11609	327.426	84.628	3.869

Table 17: Per capita food expenditure

	N (treatment)	N (Control)	ATT	Standard Error	t

Nearest Neighbor Matching	540	498	119.089	55.172	2.158
Stratification Matching	539	11695	140.245	40.449	3.467
Radius Matching	517	11609	179.054	38.275	4.678

Table 18: Poverty rate

	N (treatment)	N (Control)	ATT	Standard Error	t
Nearest Neighbor Matching	540	498	-0.052	0.027	-1.956
Stratification Matching	539	11695	-0.073	0.018	-4.078
Radius Matching	517	11609	-0.09	0.018	-4.896

Table 19: Health Expenditure

	N (treatment)	N (Control)	ATT	Standard Error	t
Nearest Neighbor Matching	540	498	1435.387	624.053	2.3
Stratification Matching	539	11695	802.655	528.129	1.52
Radius Matching	539	11695	802.655	528.129	1.52
Kernel Matching	540	11694	627.076	.	.

Table 20: Calorie Intake

	N (treatment)	N (Control)	ATT	Standard Error	t
Nearest Neighbor Matching	540	498	108.126	38.766	2.789
Stratification Matching	539	11695	119.501	29.807	4.009
Radius Matching	517	11609	118.35	28.756	4.116
Kernel Matching	540	11694	104.188	.	.

5.3 Outward Remittance

Tables 21 through 25 report the results of outward remittance various outcome variables. Table 21 reports the impact of outward of remittance on per capita consumption. The result suggests that for every matching algorithm, the *ATET* is positive and significant, which means that remittances account for a positive and statistically significant difference between the matched treated (remittance receiving) and control groups in terms of per capita consumption (measured in Taka). Similarly for every type of matching algorithm, the ATET of remittance on per capita food expenditure is positive and significant. Besides, remittance recipient household suffer less from poverty compared to the control groups and this results hold true for all types of matching algorithm. Further the treatment groups spend more on health expenses compared to the non-recipients one. However we do not see any significant difference between the treatment and

control group in terms of education expenditure except for the *Radius Matching*. On the other hand the impact of remittance on calorie intake is ambiguous- while stratification matching and Kernel matching suggest the impact is positive and significant the Nearest-neighbor matching suggest that the impact although negative is not significant.

Table 21: Per capita Consumption

	N (treatment)	N (Control)	ATT	Standard Error	t
Nearest Neighbor Matching	1104	785	500.285	126.883	3.943
Stratification Matching	1104	10611	701.182	100.455	6.98
Radius Matching	995	10421	909.239	86.42	10.521

Table 22: Poverty rate

	N (treatment)	N (Control)	ATT	Standard Error	t
Nearest Neighbor Matching	1104	785	-0.075	0.019	-4.056
Stratification Matching	1104	10611	-0.115	0.012	-9.583
Radius Matching	995	10421	-0.172	0.011	-15.9

Table 23: Per capita food expenditure

	N (treatment)	N (Control)	ATT	Standard Error	t
Nearest Neighbor Matching	1104	785	191.381	45.954	4.165
Stratification Matching	1104	10611	256.75	37.36	6.872
Radius Matching	995	10421	333.424	34.489	9.667

Table 24: Health Expenditure

	N (treatment)	N (Control)	ATT	Standard Error	t
Nearest Neighbor Matching	**1104**	785	1919.215	1156.627	1.659
Stratification Matching	1104	10611	2714.036	800.543	3.39
Radius Matching	995	10421	3086.422	817.285	3.776
Kernel Matching	1104	10611	2579.194	.	.

Table 25: Education Expenditure

	N (treatment)	N (Control)	ATT	Standard Error	t
Nearest Neighbor Matching	1104	785	-197.263	995.171	-0.198
Stratification Matching	1104	10611	935.05	663.47	1.4
Radius Matching	995	10421	1612.945	530.201	3.042
Kernel Matching	1104	10611	201.847	.	.

Table 26 : Calorie Intake

	N (treatment)	N (Control)	ATT	Standard Error	t
Nearest Neighbor Matching	1104	785	-7.395	31.294	-0.236
Stratification Matching	1104	10611	40.916	24.123	1.696
Radius Matching	995	10421	84.11	20.423	4.11

Kernel Matching	1104	10611	30.284	.	.

6 Conclusion and Policy Implications

In this paper we have investigated the causal relationship between remittances and household welfare using household data. For this investigation we employed Propensity score matching technique. The results of the empirical exercise tend to support the conclusion that remittances have a positive impact on per capita incomes and, crucially, contribute to a decline in poverty status. By establishing such a quantified microeconomic result on the effect of foreign remittances in Bangladesh, we strengthen the case for remittances as a poverty alleviating policy tool.

Our empirical results reveal therefore that appropriate policy to explore more foreign employment and more proficient use of remittances would help the well-being of the households. In essence, the beneficial consequences of foreign remittances may lead us towards the path of adopting a "foreign employment" policy so as to "bring in" more of the same. In this regard, some policy considerations under different objective headings are offered below.

First, high fees charged by financial institutions, coupled with insufficient ATM facilities are still pushing some workers into remitting money home through the Hundi system (D8 2008). While the Bangladesh Ministry of Finance made headway in curtailing Hundi transfer when they introduced strict time limits on official transfers and promoted electronic banking, competition within the banking sector needs to be encouraged to mitigate fees and harness a greater number of formal remittances.

Second, there are also significant gender issues that must be addressed if migration and remittance payments are to be effectively utilized. Women are of particular concern in the workforce. Currently, women migrants are an immensely unutilized asset. This is largely due to government restrictions on the number of unskilled and semi-skilled women who can migrate. However, problems are also faced by those women who manage to migrate (whether legally or not), with many reported cases of exploitation. Therefore, in order to capitalize on this untraditional market effectively the government must promote and empower women in the workforce.

Third, our study finding echoes the findings of World Bank (2012) such that direct benefits of remittance earning fall disproportionately on the Eastern part of the country, whereas the Western and the Southern part of the country have been largely bypassed. The districts within Dhaka, Chittagong and Sylhet divisions are the one where there have been long traditions of overseas migration and remittance earning. The economic theory predicts that, if not controlled, new migration would occur, where the stock of migrant population is already higher. This implies that

the government of Bangladesh should proactive measures to increase the number of migrant workers from the Southern and western belt in order to reduce this regional disparity.

Fourth, the overseas migration in Bangladesh traditionally have been limited to mostly Middle East and only recently in some South-East Asian countries. But as the macroeconomic data suggests remittance received from countries like the USA, the UK and Italy has been significant despite smaller migration trends to these countries. This may imply higher remittance earning per migrant worker in these countries compared to the traditional ones in the Middle East. Therefore GOB should take steps to explore new market opportunities not only limited to these ones, but also include other European countries like Federation of Russia, Sweden, Norway, Germany, the Netherlands as well as some South East Asian countries like Brunei, Malaysia, Singapore and Hong Kong.

Fifth, the amount of illegal migration that still occurs in Bangladesh warrants further attention. With the creation of the Ministry of Expatriates' Welfare and Overseas Employment (MoEWOE) in 2001, the Government of Bangladesh attempted to curtail the amount of undocumented migration. Due to a number of loopholes and disjointed efforts among different anti-trafficking groups there is still insufficient regulation of recruitment agencies and human traffickers (Islam 2009). While promotion of formal remittances would likely help, the governments must show persistent vigilance against human trafficking through coherent and strictly enforced law. There should also be increased cooperation between origin countries and countries of destination so that there is a more coordinated and uniform effort in regulation of migration and enforcement of ethical practices and laws.

Sixth, It is also important that institutions introduce new savings instruments as well as further opportunities whereby migrants can channel their remittance funds into productive sectors of the economy (World Bank 2005). Education in financial planning and business development/management would be effective in harnessing the development impact of remittances. As mentioned earlier, remittance income is used primarily for consumption purposes. While this is valuable to the economy via the multiplier effect, further economic progress would be expected if there was broader development. Migrant workers investing their remittances in business opportunities within their local towns would create employment and growth opportunities; however, for this to happen incentives need to be offered by the government. These incentives could include public infrastructure and development in region centers to encourage remittances investment in these areas, as well as tax incentives for certain projects deemed suitable for development.

Finally, while it is clear that remittances improves welfare, it is the households that are better able to afford the initial cost of the overseas migration that benefit the most (World Bank 2007). Policy initiatives such as the expansion of social programs in microfinance and skills development, and the lowering of interest rates on pre-departure loan schemes (World Bank 2005) could provide the necessary help for struggling households not yet meeting the initial cost of migration. Currently, there are only a few training centers in Bangladesh to provide prospective migrant workers with the skills needed to successfully migrate and remain employed. Expanding these training institutions, especially beyond city boundaries would increase the skill base of prospective migrants as well as provide access to training for the more disadvantaged households on city outskirts.

References

Bangladesh Bank (2014), "Annual Report 2012-2013", Bangladesh Bank.

BBS (2014), "Statistical Pocketbook of Bangladesh 2013", Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics, Statistics and Information Division, Ministry of Planning, Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh.

BBS (2011), "Preliminary Report on Household Income & Expenditure Survey- 2010", Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics, Statistics and Information Division, Ministry of Planning, Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh.

BMET (2014). Bureau of Manpower Employment and Training, Government of the Peoples' Republic of Bangladesh, Dhaka. (From http://www.bmet.org.bd)

Aggarwal, Reena, Demirguc-Kunt, Asli and Martinez Peria, Maria Soledad (2006). "Do Workers' Remittances Promote Financial Development?", World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 3957.

Adams, R. H.Jr. (1989). "Workers' Remittances and Inequality in Rural Egypt". Economic Development and Cultural Change, 38, 45-71.

Adams, R.H. and J. Page. (2003). "Impact of International Migration and Remittances on Poverty". Paper presented at the Department for International Development/World Bank Conference on Migrant Remittances. London, 9-10 October.

Adenutsi, D. (2011). "Financial Development, International Migrant Remittances and Endogenous Growth in Ghana", Studies in Economics and Finance, 28(1), 68-89.

Banerjee, A., Dolado, J., Galbraith, J. W. and Hendry, D. F. (1993), "Co-integration, Error Correction, and the Econometric Analysis of Non-Stationary Data", Oxford University Press, New York.

Barham, B. & Boucher, S. (1998). "Migration, Remittances and Inequality: Estimating the Net Effects of Migration on Income Distribution". Journal of Development Economics, 55, 307-331.

Bohra, A. K. & Krieg, R. G.(1998), "A Simultaneous Multinomial Logit Model of Indirect Internal Migration and Earnings",JRAP (1998) 28, 1, 60-71.

Bryson, A., R. Dorsett, and S. Purdon, (2002) "The Use of Propensity Score Matching in the Evaluation of Active Labour Market Policies," Policy Studies Institute and National Centre for Social Research, UK.

Chami, R., Barajas, A., Cosimano, T., Fullenkamp, C., Gapen, M. &Montiel, P. (2003)."Macroeconomic Consequesces of Remittances".Occational Paper No.259, Internationl Monetary Fund.

Chimhowu. A., J. Picsse and C. Pinder. (2004), "The Impact of Remittances". Enterprise Development Impact Assessment Information Service EDIAIS, Issue 29, April 2004.

Craigwell, R., Jackman, M. & Moore, W. (2010). "Economic Volatility and Remittances".International Journal of Development, 9(1), 25-42.

D8 Secretariat. (2008). "High Fees Drive Bangladesh Remittance Into Informal Channels", Developing 8 Organisation for Economic Cooperation.

Davies, P.S., Greenwood, J.M. & Li, h. (2001), "A Conditional Logit Approach to US State-to-State Migration", Journal of Regional Science, Vol. 41, No.2, 2001, pp 337-360.

Docquier, F.&Rapoport, H. (2003). "Remittances and Inequality: A Dynamic Migration Model". Bonn, Germany: IZA discussion paper 808.

Durand, J., Kandel, W., Parrado, E.A. & Massey, D.S. (1996). "International migration and development in Mexican communities". Demography, 33, 249-269.

Giuliano, P. & Ruiz-Arranz, M. (2009)."Remittances, financial development and growth"Journal of Development Economics, 90, 144-152.

Glytsos, N. P. (2005). "The contribution of remittances to growth: A dynamic approach and empirical analysis". Journal of Economic Studies, 32 (6), 468-496.

Glytsos, N.P. (1993). "Measuring the income effects of migrant remittances: a methodology approach applied to Greece".Economic Development and Culture Change, 42, 131-168.

Esquivel, G., and A. Huerta-Pineda, (2006) "Remittances and Poverty in Mexico: A Propensity Score Matching Approach," Inter-American Development Bank.

Enders, W., (2004), "Applied Econometric Time Series", John Wiley & Sons, New\ York.

Engle, R. E. and Granger, (1987) C. W. J., "Cointegration and Error-Correction: Representation, Estimation, and Testing", Econometrica, Vol. 55, pp.251 – 276.

Faini, R. (2001). "Development, Trade, and Migration". Washington D.C.: IMF.

Findley, S. and S. Sow. (1998). "From season to season: Agriculture, poverty, and migration in the Senegal River Valley, Mali". In R. Appleyard, ed.. Emigration Dynamics in Developing Countries: Sub-Saliaran Africa, pp. 69-144. London: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

Hanson, G.H. (2010). "International Migration and the Developing World", Chapter 66, in Dani rodrik and Mark Rosenzweig, editors: Handbook of Development Economics, Vol. 5, The Netherlands: North Holland, 2010, pages 4363-4414.

Jackman, M., Craigwell, R. & Moore, W. (2009). "Economic volatility and remittances: evidence from SIDS". Journal of Economic Studies, 36(2), 135-146.

Jayaraman, T. K., Choong, C-K.& Kumar, R. (2011). "Role of remittances in small Pacific Island economies: an empirical study of Fiji". International Journal of Economics and Business Research, 3(5), 526-542.

Johansen, S.,(1988) "Statistical Analysis of Cointegration Vectors", Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, Vol. 12, pp.231 – 254.

Johansen, S.,(1991) "Estimation and Hypothesis Testing of Cointegrating Vectors in Gaussian Vector Autoregressive Models", Econometrica, Vol. 59, pp. 1551 – 1580.

Katz, E. (2000), "Individual, Household and Community-level determinants of Migration in Ecuador: Are there Gender Differences", Prepared for the annual meeting of the population association of America, Los Angeles, CA, March 23-25, 2000.

Khan, M W R, (2008) "The Micro Level Impact of Foreign Remittances on Incomes in Bangladesh A Measurement Approach Using the Propensity Score" Centre for policy Dialogue, Paper no:73

Koc, I. and I. Onan. (2001) "The impact of remittances of international migrants on the standard of Living of the Left-Behind Families in Turkey"."Conference Proceedings, XXIV International Union for the Scientific Study of Population (IUSSP) General Conference, Salvador, Brazil, 18-24 April.

Ministry of Finance (2014), "Bangladesh Economic Review 2014", Economic Advisors' Cell, Finance Division, Ministry of Finance, Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh.

Mundaca, B.G. (2009). "Remittances, financial market development, and economic growth: the case of Latin America and the Caribbean". Review of Development Economics, 13 (2), 288-303.

Poveda, A.R, (2007), " Determinants and consequences of internal and international migration: The case of rural populations in the South of Veracruz, Mexico", Demographic Research, Vol.16, pp 287-314, 24 April, 2007.

Prakash, A.B., (1999), "The Transmission of Signals in a Decentralized Commodity Marketing System". The case of the UK Pork Market, PhD. Thesis, Wye College, University of London.

Quartey, P., &Blanson, T. (2004). "Do migrant remittances minimize the impact of macro-volatility on the Poor in Ghana?" Global Development Network.

Rao, B.B.& Hassan, G.M. (2011). "A panel data analysis of the growth effects of remittances". Economic Modelling, 28 (1-2), 701-709

Rahman, Matiur, Mustafa, Muhammad, Islam, Anisul, Guru-Gharana, and Kishor Kumar (2006). "Growth and Employment Empirics of Bangladesh", The Journal of Developing Areas, Fall.

Ratha, D. (2005). 'Remittances: A Lifeline for Development'. Finance and Development, vol. 42.

Rosenbaum, P., and D. Rubin, (1985) "The Central Role of the Propensity Score in Observational Studies for Causal Effects," Biometrika, 70, 41-55.

Rosenbaum, P., and D. Rubin, (1983) "Constructing a Control Group Using Multivariate Matched Sampling Methods that Incorporate the Propensity", American Statistician, 39, 33-38.

Russell S.S., K. Jacobsen and W.D. Stanley. (1990), " International Migration and Development in Sub-Saharan Africa", Volume 2, Country Analyses. World Bank Discussion Papers No. 102. The World Bank, Washington, D.C.

Siddiqui, T. (2005). International Labour Migration from Bangladesh: A descent work perspective. Working Paper No.66, Policy Integration Department, National Policy Group, International Labour Office, Geneva.

Stahl, C., & Arnold, F. (1986). "Overseas Workers' Remittances in Asian Development". International Migration Review, vol. 20, no. 4, 899-925.

Stahl, C.W. &Habib, A. (1989). "The impact of overseas workers' remittances on indigenous industries: evidence from Bangladesh". The Developing Economies, 27, 269-285.

Stock, J. and Watson, M.,(1988) "Testing for Common Trends", Journal of American Statistical Association, Vol. 83, pp.1097 – 1107.

Spatafora, N. (2005). 'Two current issues facing developing countries', World Economic Outlook, International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC.

Taylor, J.E. (1992). 'Remittances and Inequality Reconsidered: Direct, Indirect and Intertemporal Effects.' Journal of Policy Modelling, vol. 14, no. 2. 187-208.

Taylor, J.E. 1996. "International migration and national development". Population Index, 62(2):181-212.

Taylor, J.E. (1999). "The New Economics of Labour Migration and the Role of Remittances in the Migration Process" International Migration, 37 (1): 63- 88.

Thadani, Veena N. and Michael P. Todaro. (1984) "Female Migration: A Conceptual Framework", In Women in the Cities of Asia: Migration and Urban Adaptation", James T. Fawcett, Siew-Ean Khoo and Peter C. Smith, eds. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

The Daily Star (29th December, 2014), "Manpower Export Goes Up 1 pc, Remittance 5 pc: Reveals Refugee and Migratory Movements Research Unit based on BMET statistics", Staff Correspondent.

World Bank (2005). "Migrant Labour Remittances in the South Asia Region." Report No. 31577

World Bank (2007). "Sri Lanka Poverty Assessment: Engendering Growth with Equity, Opportunities and Challenges", Report No. 36568-LK.

World Bank (2012). "Bangladesh: Towards Accelerated, Inclusive and Sustainable Growth Opportunities and Challenges", Report No. 67991, Volume II: Main Report, June, 2012, Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Sector Unit South Asia Region, World Bank