

CHAPTER - ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Nepal is a small landlocked country. It is one of the least developed countries of the world. Majority of population depends upon traditional agriculture. Nepal has been incorporating millennium development goals which were committed to achieve by 2015 in its plans and programs of since tenth periodic plan and there has been remarkable progress by the end of this period the number of people living below poverty line has dropped to 21.6 percent in 2016 AD from 42 percent of 1995 AD. However, poverty situation is still miserable in dalit and other backward communities of far-western and Karnali regions and in rural communities as compared to that of urban areas (MoF, 2015/16).

Per capita GDP prices stood at Rs.90,521 in F/Y 2016/17. It was Rs.79,325 in the previous fiscal year. Per capita GDP that had increased by 4.1 percent previous year rise by 14.1 percent in current F/Y. Likewise, per capita GDP that stood at Rs.27,089 at constant prices in previous F/Y 2015/16 is estimated to increase by 6.1 percent to Rs.28,733 in current F/Y 2016/17. Per capita GDP at constant price had declined by 0.9 percent in previous F/Y. Per capita gross disposable income in F/Y 2016/17 has increased by 3.6 percent to Rs.39,142. Per capita GDP in US Dollar terms that stood at USD 746 in 2015/16 has increased to USD 853 in current F/Y. Likewise, per capita gross national income that stood at USD 757 in the previous F/Y 2015/16 rose to USD 862 in the current F/Y. Per capita income has increased due to high economic growth attained in current F/Y 2016/17 (MoF, 2016/17, CBS).

Migrant remittances are a steadily growing external source of capital for developing Countries. The evolution of remittance as a major foundation of the Nepalese economy has raised the concerns over its several aspect including the potential role of macro-economic factors in driving the inflows. In recent years foreign employment and this remittance inflows have drawn attention in the national discourse because it's large magnitude and stability in the positive growth trend. Since 2006, it has dwarfed all other types of resource inflows in Nepal's balance of payments assisting in macro-

economic stability and poverty reduction. As in many developing Countries the importance of workers' remittances as a source of foreign currency earning is increasing and thus, they have become the prime determinants of balance years. Workers' remittances are considered to have contributed in reducing poverty, building up of foreign exchange reserves, registering balance of payments surplus and growth of national saving as well as gross investment. In addition they have contributed to the external sector Sustainability, particularly through the financing of imports and payment of external debt. Its positive impact on the BOP rather than other inflows (aid and investment) arises from the fact that it bears no interest and does not have to be repaid.

Remittance has established as a major source of economic development of the developing countries. The remittance flow is doubled than of foreign aid and foreign direct investment from developed countries to under developed countries. Most of the migrated people are from the rural sector of Nepal but due to the lack of the banking facilities in the rural areas, they are sending their earnings from the informal mediums up to now. In this present condition, most of the migrated people of rural areas are migrated to India for work.

Nowadays remittance is playing very prominent role to reduce poverty level of Nepal especially in rural areas, where there is less opportunities to earn and get employment without agricultural sector. But due to the lack of proper government policy to encourage the remittance income is the productive sector; almost 80 percent of remittance money is used in unproductive sectors. The people are migrated to other countries for work and earn money, which certainly helps to reduce poverty level of rural areas.

In Nepalese context the ratio of population growth rate to employment is very low. Due to traditional farming, low production, unfavorable environment, inefficient growth of industry and other service sector, inefficient government policy, conflict government cannot generate the sufficient employment opportunity. So the foreign employment has played a vital role in the Nepalese economy.

Labor migration and remittance have to come up into view over the last three decade as prominent feature of Nepalese economy. The history of migration is as old as

human civilization labor market is recent phenomenon in Nepal after globalization. Labor migration for overseas from the labor surplus country has rapidly increased. Nowadays causes of migration for foreign employment are unemployment, poverty, low wage rate, price hike, scarcity of food, political instability, etc. Government is unable to provide employment opportunities to the needed people. So labors are migrating to developed countries to avoid unemployment and poverty which brought positive changes in the economy of underdeveloped countries.

Nepalese migration for the purpose of work was initiated from the gulf countries but now even gulf, Korea and Malaysia are the major destination for Nepalese labor. Nowadays officially 110 countries are opened for foreign employment .Bilateral labor agreements have been signed with major labor destination countries namely Qatar, UAE, Bahrain, Japan, Israel and South Korea while reaching an agreement with Saudi-Arabia, Malaysia, Kuwait, Jordan and Lebanon is under way. Safer domestic services are in operation in Saudi-Arabia, Qatar, Kuwait and UAE. Decision on free visa free ticket privilege for foreign employment has been executed (MoF, 2015/2016).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

People are facing various problems due to these problems people migrate from one place to another place for better life. At the present situation the rate of migration for foreign countries is increasing day by day. Every day 1300 people are leaving the country. People are searching for a new destination for various needs.

Due to the inadequate government plans and policies government is unable to create employment opportunities with the ratio of increasing population. Due to lack of employment opportunities in Nepalese labor market, low payment, working environment, price hike, Nepalese culture that does not respect every jobs, increased expectations of youth towards foreign employment, political instability, conflict have forced Nepalese youth towards foreign employment

At present emigration is burning issue of Nepal it is rapidly increasing day by day. Several studies have been conducted in this field by different research institutions and scholars but most of these studies are concentrated with internal migration and do not describe the socio-economic impact to their household, from point of rural

development perspective. The trends of emigration are increasing every day from the Terai too.

Many Nepalese people without technical and vocational training goes to foreign employment so they are less paid. Some people who have gone to foreign country using illegal way and even in restricted countries are taking risks, difficulties etc.

In current context, about 80 percent of remittance is used on repaying the debt, consumption purpose like purchasing land gold, expenditure on social and cultural function like marriage and other ceremonies, purchasing luxurious goods, etc. only remaining 20 percent is used for productive purposes. In rural areas it is difficult to find youth for participating in different fields like agriculture, infrastructure development, security etc.

Remittance income from foreign employment has increase the purchasing power of Nepalese people due to this people are consuming luxurious goods such as smart phone, laptop ornaments, gold, jewelers and other expensive garments is increased. Similarly the consumptions of food items such as rice, meat, junk food is increased luxurious life and high consumption expenditure pattern has increased imports that have reduced foreign currency as earned in the form of foreign remittance. The price of land, building, production daily consumption goods also has increased. The structure of family also has changed to nuclear family and being far from one-another post marriage relation, family violence and crimes are also increasing.

Seddon (1999) stated that remittance has played momentous role in poverty reduction in Nepal from 42 percent to 31 percent in past decades.

Sharma (2006) argued that since most of the remittance has been used for consumption purpose, it has a negative impact on the growth of GDP in Nepal. Some literature stated that remittance earning is used consumption and thus has no significant role to boost domestic investment. Although remittance has emerged as a potentially central economic phenomenon because of its impact on the macro-economic valuables there is lack of literature and analysis based on the real data in assessing the actual status of labor migration and remittance in Nepal.

Attariya town is also located in Terai villages. Many people from the Attariya Municipality had gone abroad for employment. It is seen that the remittance has brought a visible change in economic status of the family and the tendency of emigration for employment is increasing day by day in the town either. The study area of Attariya town as well as most of the R.M of Kailali district is losing their youth day by day in the name of migration. This brings problems in country such as security, loneliness, effect on agricultural production, hamper on children's education; care of old age peoples, etc. the loss of youth in rural areas invites criminal activities. However, there are not any formal researches and studies in this area. The utilization of remittance at the present household level and relationship between remittance and their social status in this area is not known clearly. In such context, remittance as a source of income and its utilization in different purpose is seen as a relevant issue to study. From Above brief discussion this study mainly concerned with the following research questions:

- i. What is the nature and extent of remittance income in the study area?
- ii. What is the socio-economic impact of remittance on study area?
- iii. What is the expenditure pattern of the remittance?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The general objective of the study is to analyze the issue related with foreign employment and remittance in the study area but the specific objectives are as follows:

- i. To analyze the nature and extent of remittance income in the study area,
- ii. To examine the socio-economic impact of foreign employment of Attariya Municipality,
- iii. To find out the expenditure pattern of remittance.

1.4 Significance of the Study

Remittance has become one of the emerging and burning issues in Nepalese economy. To advocate about impact of remittance upon national economy, it is necessary to assess the impact of remittance on domestic investment and domestic consumption level of the Nation and both of which are equally important to enhance the domestic product of the Nation. This study has tried to assess the exact status of the remittance

in Nepal and its contribution in investment and consumption as well as in total GDP of the Country.

In the present context, Nepalese labor can be found in many countries legally or illegally. The trend of travelling to foreign country is increasing rapidly due to different purpose. The main purpose is to earn money. The recent contribution of remittance on GDP is 29.6 percent. The amount of remittance received in fiscal year 2003/04 is Nrs.54.2 billion and that of first eight month of F/Y 2016/2017 is Nrs.450 billion(MoF, 2016/2017). This shows that remittance inflow has increased by huge number.

From the World Bank migrant remittance fact book, Nepal has ranked in third place for remittance receiving countries. So the remittance by foreign migrants has become a back bone of Nepalese economy. Foreign employment has reduced the state of unemployment and poverty to a certain extent. The life style of household who get remittance has been changed. According to CBS 2011, out of total remittance 80

Percent goes to consumption and only 20 percent for capital formation .the large amount of remittance is invested in unproductive sectors like as luxurious goods, real estate, and purchase of ornaments, functions etc. Therefore the remittance is not playing its actual role for the development of the country as well as the reduction of the poverty in national level. The government of Nepal has weak policy and plan to encourage foreign migrant workers to invest their remittance in productive sectors. So it is the major issue in the field of foreign employment .government should make a concrete plan to use remittance in productive sectors.

Although remittance is a good source of income for developing countries but it is not always a permanent solution of reducing unemployment and poverty .government should create alternative employment in the country and overall policy should be implementing with action plans.

1.5 Limitations of the Study

Almost majority of the studies have their own limitations and this study is not an exception on this fact. The study has following limitations:

- i. The present study is the micro level study of Attariya Municipality of Kailali district so the finding of it may not valid for overall country.
- ii. This study is conducted in only four wards of Attariya Municipality of Kailali district.
- iii. This study is based on the primary data as well as secondary data and any variation on the conclusion from reality is due to the biasness of respondents.

1.6 Organization of the Study

The whole study is divided into six chapters.

The first chapter is the introductory chapter. It consists: general background, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, significance of the study, limitation of the study.

The second chapter deals with review of literature with concept of some terminologies used in the analysis part of the study. The second part of this chapter consist of review of books, previous study, research papers and review of unpublished thesis of various research students.

The third chapter concerned with the research methodology used in this study. It consists of: introduction, research design, sources of data, population and data and method of analysis.

The forth chapter is the analytical chapter. This chapter is devoted to the analysis, interpretation, and scoring the majors finding out of the study. This is an elaborated and main body of the text hence assumed the higher price in significance.

The fifth chapter includes current status of employment and remittance

The sixth chapter includes socio-economic impact of remittance

The seventh chapter includes summary, major findings, and recommendations.

CHAPTER – TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

There are several studies for causes to emigration, its eco-consequences either they are in the form of books or articles. That means study about the matter by finding the books, articles, newspaper and thesis report etc. They are published in past. This chapter helps to take adequate feedback to broaden the information base and inputs to the study, since there not so much adequate study materials related with this topic published in Nepal. This chapter tries to detail the conceptual theoretical concept regarding the definition of remittance as well as the term of poverty.

2.1 Remittance and Employment: A Historical Perspective

In present day Nepalese economy is characterized by “Remittance Economy”. It starts from the beginning of the world war in which Nepalese fought not for the protection of their homeland but in course of fulfilling duty in which they are engaged. At the time of British rule in India, those days when “Nawabs” of Lucknow were watching helplessly the loot of their huge wealth by the Nepalese soldiers. The possession thus received went to the treasury of the rules but the slavery of the foreign employment that has the long experience in Nepal. For the foreign employment Nepalese people are engaged before some centuries. The Nepalese were able to the name “Brave soldier” during the world war. Nepalese people are earned a name for the fighting victory in the war so they are called as “Bir gorkhali”.

The Nepali migrants are called “Lahure” because they employed and earned money in Lahore which is in Pakistan now. Some of the Nepalese earned money in Malaysia so they are called “Malayako Lahure”. According to the study conducted by prof. Seddon, Jagannath Adhikari and Ganesh Gurung entitled “Foreign Labour migration and the Remittance Economy of Nepal” DFID (Department for International Development) in the year 2005, nearly Rs. 69 billion was remitted by the Nepalese working in foreign countries in 1997 . Of this, nearly Rs. 40 billion came from as estimated one billion Nepalese working in India whereas the rest (nearly Rs. 29 billion) come from people working in other parts of the world. According to NRB, the recorded value of money sent back from abroad more than doubled, from 1974/75 (Rs. 216.8million) . Over the next decade, the official value of foreign remittance

increase three fold, to reach Rs. 676.8 million by 1989/90. By the middle of the 1990's the value of officially recorded remittance from abroad accounted for between a quarter and a third (Retrieved from

WWW.nepalnews.com.np/ntimes.issue/169/economy).

International labor migration in Nepal is not a new phenomenon it has been triggering the process of socio-economic transformation in the Country for the decade. Much of early migrations were the upshot of push factors like excessive tax burden exploitative agrarian relations and political instability. The more formal and temporary migration began after people started to work in the British army following the Sugauli treaty that was signed on 2 December 1815. This treaty permitted Britain to recruit Gurkhas for military services. While both the first and second world generated a huge demand for young army personnel from Nepal. In recent times the scope of out-migration for military services has declined and more and more people have migrated for other types of job. Probably, the most positive impacts of labor migration in the local development would be the remittance produced by the migrant worker because it is the most visible product of migration.

The Government of Nepal formally opened its door for citizens to go abroad for work in late 1980s with the approval of the labor act 1985s the Government officially acknowledge the potential value of foreign labor migration beginning from the 1980s Nepalese began to migrate in significant numbers eastwards to South East Asia and Far West and from the Mid 1990s onward westwards to the Gulf Countries. It was only after the 1990s and more so in recent years that policy makers began to fully realize the importance of remittance sent by Nepalese employed abroad for enhancing the livelihood of the households including those in the rural regions. Foreign employment has been regulated in Nepal through the enactment of foreign employment policy act, 2007 and foreign employment rules 2008. In addition, foreign employment policy 2012 aims at promoting safe and inclusive migration coupled with productive use of remittance. In recent years, poverty, poor employment, prospects at home, growing employment opportunities abroad, declining natural resources, and political instability have promoted Nepalese workers to seek employment abroad.

While the total number of workers going for foreign employment was only 3,605 in 1994, it reached 35,543 in 2000 such figure rises by 16.5 percent to 5,28,232 in 2014 from 4,53,543 in 2013. Since, 2000 the annual average growth of workers going overseas for employment was 22 percent. Primarily, the destination of Nepalese migrants is working in more than 70 Countries (The World Bank, 2016).

Because of the geographical proximity historical and socio-cultural ties India is a major destination for Nepalese workers including high seasonal mobility of workers depending on the agricultural harvest. However, the structure of migration is changing with the increase in the number of workers the inflow of remittances has also taken as upswing. Workers' remittances aggregated USD 0.64 billion in 2001 and went up to USD 1.35 billion in 2006. In 2015 remittances stood at USD 6.2 billion arises by 12.2 percent compared to USD 5.53 billion in 2014. Annual average growth of remittance in USD terms has been 18.5 percent since 2001. Likewise, the remittance to GDP ratio increased from 10.7 percent in 2001 to 13.8 percent in 2007 and further 29.1 percent in 2015, putting Nepal among the top five recipients in terms of size of the economy. More ever, the foregoing data demonstrates that remittance have grown dramatically in recent years the result of growing international migration, risen wages in the destination Countries effort to promote the use of formal remittance channels and deprecation of Nepalese rupee visa Us dollar.

The upward movement in remittance has led to a surplus in the current account there by strengthen the overall BOP position. The share of remittance in the total current account recipients for instance soared from 27.4 percent in 2001 to 61.5 percent in 2015. Rising inflows of remittances have also eased foreign exchange constraints of the Country. Gross foreign exchange reserves of the Country reached to USD \$ 8.1 billion in Mid July 2015, which is sufficient to finance more than 11 months of imports of goods and services. These denote that any sharp decline in receipts from remittances could disrupt the structure of the economy from the micro level.

The impact of remittance on national economy can also be exemplified by the fact that it has outstripped exports as the top contributor in the foreign exchange earnings of the Country after 2014. While the share of remittance in total current account receipts has been 27.4 percent, 41.3 percent, and 61.5 percent in 2001, 2007 and 2015

respectively, and the corresponding share of exports stood at 40.5 percent, 25.9 percent and 8.9 percent (World Bank, 2016).

2.2 Theories Regarding International Labor Migration

There is not a single, generally acceptable theory of International migration. In the views of this state of the art and recent growth in transporter population movements the International union of social scientists in population has formed a committee on South-North migration, which is systematically examining International migration theories their assumption, supporting evidence and policy implications.

Among the various models attempting to explain why International migration begins. Five major approaches can be discerned.

- Neo classical Economics: Macro theory (Arguably the body of theory most familiar to World Bank staff) views geographic in the supply and demand of labor. In origin and destination Countries as the major factors driving individual migration decisions. Among the assumptions of this models are that International migration will not occur in the absence of these differentials that their elimination will bring an end to International movements and the labor markets (Not other markets) are the primary mechanisms inducing movements. Government policy, intervention affect migration by regulating or influencing labor markets in origin and destination Countries.
- Neo classical Economics: Micro theory focuses on the level of individual rational actors who make decisions to migrate based upon a cost-benefit calculation that indicates a positive net return to movement. In this approach; human capital characteristics that raise the potential benefits of migration and individual, social or technological factors that lower cost will lead to increased migration. Differences in earning and employment rates are key variables and Governments influence migration through policies that affect these (e.g. through development policies that raise incomes at the point of origin, decrease the profitability of employment at destination, or increase the cost of migration)

- The new economics of migration views migration on as a family (i.e. group) strategy to diversify sources of income, minimizes risks to the household, and overcome barriers to credit and capital. In this model, International migration is a means to compensate for the absence of failure of certain types of markets in developing Countries. For example, crop insurance markets, future markets, unemployment insurance, or capital markets. In contrast to the neoclassical models wage differentials are not seen as a necessary condition for International migration, and economic development in areas of origin or equalization of wage differentials will not necessarily reduce pressure for migration. Governments influence migration through their policies toward insurance, capital, and future markets and through income distribution policies that affect the relative deprivation of certain groups and their by their propensity to migrate.
- Dual labor market theory holds that demand for low level workers in more developed economies is the critical factor shaping International migration. To avoid the structural inflation that would result from raising entry wages of native workers, and to maintain labor as a variable factor of production employees seek low wage migrate workers. In this model International migration is demand based and initiated by recruitment policies of employees or Government in destination areas. Wage differentials between origin and destination areas are their neither necessity nor sufficient condition for migration. The option for Government policy intervention to affect migration is limited short of major changes in economic organization in destination areas.
- World system theory focuses not on labor markets in national economies but on the structure of the world market notably the "penetration of capitalist economic relations into peripheral, no capitalist societies" which takes place to the concerted actions of neo-classical Governments, multinational firms and national elites. International migration is generated as land, raw materials, and labor in areas of origin is drawn into the world market economy and traditional systems are disrupted. The transports, communication, cultural and ideological links that accompany globalization further facilities international

migration in this view, international migration is affected by wage or employment. Differentials between Countries than by policies towards overseas investments and towards the international flow of capital and goods (Russel, 1995).

2.3 Review on Legal Provision of Foreign Employment in Nepal

The foreign employment act 2064 B.S (2008) is enacted and enforced for promoting the business of foreign employment while safe guarding the rights and interests of workers and foreign employment entrepreneurs by making it a safe, well managed and dignified profession. As per the provision of Act, a separate foreign employment is established on 31 December 2008. Under the ministry of labor and transport management to look after foreign employment related activities, after its establishment the department has adopted number of policies like rigorously curbing foreign employment related funds in collaboration with the private sector, insure that conditions of contrast are enforced through effective monitorizing in coordination with diplomatic mission abroad and see whether employees get the job and wages as stipulated in the contact. In addition, it is also responsible to make the employment agencies by compensations to the persons made to return being stranded in foreign Countries, strictly enforce the system of imparting orientation training before leaving the foreign employment and arranging necessary facilitation to the outgoing and returning workers at the International airport.

2.4 Existing Principles

Remittances undoubtedly left the families of many migrants out of poverty, paying for basic needs and education, enhancing their ability to with stands risks related unemployment or illness, and building their resilience to external events such as climate change or humanitarian crisis. The 2030 agenda for sustainable development sets a specific target (10.C) for SDG goal 10: "By 2030, reduces to less than 3 percent the transaction costs of migration remittances and eliminate remittance corridors with costs higher than 5 percent". Reiterating the targets sets by the Addis Abba Action Agenda. Target 10.C is only one part of the targets that addressed the responsibility of Government to provide all sectors of population with social protection, including public services such as education and universal health care the following principles

should lay out the policies and programs designed to maximizing the development of remittances:

- On their own will not result in development if the condition for those sending and those receiving remittances are not conducive to development and if Government don't provide basic help realize development if those receiving them can spend them on higher education, the creation of self-employment opportunities, and the improvement of local community infrastructure.
- The potential for remittances to contribute to the beneficiaries well-being increases when they are an additional rather than the sole or primary source of income, and
- The development value of remittances depends on the condition under which remittances are earned. Decent work, the possibility for migrants and their families to participate fully in their host societies. As well as the potential opportunities and benefits for gone by migration, must be taken in to account (Para 40, Addis Abba Action Agenda).

2.5 Global and Regional Trends (Migrants and Remittances)

The World Wide Web's of globalization, liberalization, privatization, democratization, marketization and individualization have exercised powerful influences on the life of the third world Countries. The proportion of migrants from Asia, Africa, and Latin America has become increasingly significant for foreign employment. The World Bank suggest that 2-3 million new migrants now leave developing Countries each year legally and illegally, about half of which go to industrial Countries.

Indians working across the globe sent home USD 62.7 billion last year, making India the top remittance receiving Country surpassing China, according to the UN report. The 'one family at a time' study by the UN International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) said to about 200 million migrants globally sent more than USD 445 billion in 2016 as remittances to their families, helping to lift millions out of poverty. Remittance flows have grown over the last decade at a rate averaging 4.2 percent annually, from USD 296 billion in 2007 to USD 445 billion 2016. Migration and remittance flows over the period of 2007-2016 received by 23 Countries led by

India, China the Philippines, Mexico and Pakistan. The study said that India was the top receiving Country for remittance in 2016 at USD 62.7 billion, followed by China (USD 61 billion), the Philippines (USD 30 billion) and Pakistan (USD 20 billion). In the decade between 2007 and 2016 India surpassed China to becoming the top receiving Country for remittance. In 2007, India was on the second spot behind China with USD 37.2 billion in remittance as compared to USD 38.4 billion for China. The study said Asia is the highest originating reason with 77 million migrants, with 48 million remaining within the origin. Over the past decade, remittances to Asia and the specific increased by 87 percent, reaching 244 billion, while migration grew only by 33 percent in comparison Asia remains the main remittance receiving region, with 55 percent of the global flows and 41 percent of total migrants. It is projected that an estimated USD 6.5 trillion in remittances will be sent to low and middle income Countries between 2015 and 2030.

This study added that the amount of money migrants sent to their families in developing Countries has risen by 51 percent over the past decades. Far greater than the 28 percent increase in migration from this Countries.

This dramatic increase in the amount of money migrant sent to their families in developing Countries is helping to lift millions out of poverty and in attending the sustainable goals (SDG), the study said (UN report, 2016)

2.6 Migration

Migration means the movement of people from one place to another place. People migrate from one place to another due to different reasons like employment, productivity of land, wage rate, inflation etc. population census of Nepal 2011, defines migration as "A change of residence for 6 month or more either within the Country or outside the Country". According to the UN report "Migration is a form of geographical mobility of population between one geographical and another" (Shrestha, 2007).

Lewis (1954) distinguished an economy with subsistence sector and developed sector. In the other words, the first is agro – based, unemployment or rural area and second is industrial, developed or urban territory. The prime reason for migration is wage difference. Unlimited supply of labor force prevailing at low wage rate in subsistence

sector. They attracted into industrial sector. It mean migration exists whenever wage differential exists and of such differential cause to end labor mobility.

Todaro (1976) stated that Migration is stimulated primarily by rational economic consideration of relative benefit which is mostly financing earning decision to migrate influenced by the expected incomes between two places. He adds that Probability of getting job in a new area inversely related to unemployment rate in the new area.

Revenstein (1985) clarified that law of migration is also known as push-pull factor of migration, still predominates as framework of migration analysis. Push factor are land tenure system, unfavorable form of trade, wide dispersion of poverty and income and so on. Pull factor are employment opportunity, education and other facilities. These opportunities are known as 'bright light' of the towns. On the other hand push factor migration from their place of origin and on the other hand pull factor migrant to place of destination.

Seddon (2000) observed that 2-3 million migrants now leave developing country each year (legally or illegally). At the beginning of the millennium, Nepalese workers are employed mainly Gulf countries (200,000 plus) and Malaysia (50,000 plus), with least 500,000 (probably 1 million and possibly) working in India. Most of the migrant people used informal channel like *hindi* and from India used hand carriage system. Only few people used formal channel like banking and financial institution. He further suggested that it is necessary to addressed such problem and make appropriate policy towards the benefits of migrant people.

Karna (2017) focused on labor migration and remittance inflows addressing the issue of why the economy is failing and how can prevent further slide and suggest remedies for sustained economic development from a development economics stand point .

Nepal has taken its root of cross border migration from ancient past but it has taken speed up in the recent past when global economy opened up doors of new experiences. Migration and its wider economic and social implications are now said to be a major government priority and the Ministry and more specifically the development of labor is concerned with a range of issues, including the recruitment and developed of Nepali workers internationally, the provision of training in the

context of changing labor markets and the use of remittances. The government is also, of course concerned as is the Nepal Rastra Bank and as are the commercial banks about the flows of remittances and money transfers and also about promotion of savings.

Khatiwada (2017) conducted a study on remittance and its channelization into productive sector in Angkhop VDC of Taplejung district. This study is descriptive and analytical in nature Angkhop VDC of Taplejung district was selected to fulfill the objectives of present day. To obtain the information about remittance primary and secondary data was used. Primary data was collected by household survey through questionnaire during 2016. To make the study comparative secondary data was obtained from various published and unpublished sources. Analysis of data shows that remittance have significant role in the reduction of rural poverty and improve in the standard of living of households by creating employment opportunity and increasing level of income. The data shows that 35.87 percent of remittance is channelized in productive sector by household. Most of the migrants (48.24) percent are going to abroad of age group 15.29 years. Energetic youth are going to abroad so the country is facing the shortage of labor. Most of the migrants (41.18) percent were passed secondary level education. This shows that most of migrants are less educated and because of lack of employment opportunity in country they trends to migrated. Most of the migrants are unskilled which may the main reason for less salary of Nepalese worker in foreign country.

The cause of foreign employment of most migrant is the lack of employment in Nepal on the pull factor is employment opportunity obtained on foreign countries. The data of findings shows that 37.78 percent of remittance is used for regular household, Expenditure including on food items and non-food items.

Government should project/plan for mega project such as hydropower project, roads and highway, railway, etc. by collecting remittance through selling share on bond.

It may be much effective and supportive for nation building when foreign. The main method of transferring remittance is seems informal channel so there is the need to established (MTO) (Money Transfer Organization) like IME in the rural areas also.

2.7 Remittance

Remittance means the transferring money from one place to another. Generally remittance refers to that portions of migrants earning sent from the migration destination to the place of origin. Even though they can be sent in kind the term "Remittances" is normally limited to donate monetary and other cash transfers transmitted by migrant workers to their families and communities. Remittance is the amount transferred by workers abroad to support their families' home. Remittances are an important contributing factor to poverty reduction; remittances are voluntary and private international monetary transfer made by the migrants to people with whom they maintain close links. (IOM, 2015) remittance senders and recipients are thus free to decide on the use of these private funds, although policy makers and development partners can facilitated the leveraging of remittance flows to stimulate their use towards sustainable development initiatives.

IMF (1993) stated that the worker remittance covers current transfer income by migrants who are employing in new economy and considered residents there. A migrant is a person who covers to an economy and expected to stay for a year or more. Workers remittance often involves related person, who work for and stay in new economy for less than a year are consider as non-residents. Therefore, their transactions are appropriate mainly to the components for compensation of employees.

Kansakar (1993) found that the origin of Nepalese emigration is after the Anglo-Nepali war in 1914 and was totally for recruitment purpose. The Indian authority was not only open to them but also manage for their permanent settlement. The Prime Minister Bir Samser JBR for the first time relaxed the policy and encouraged the people to join in the British recruitment. So two million people (especially Nepalese male) joined the British regiment ever during the First World War. The Anglo Nepal convention held on 15th may 1815, created alternative labor market to the Nepal and India. The emigration to India accelerated because of opportunities growth and miserable day-to-day life of Nepalese in hill area.

Ale (2004) observed that most used remittance areas are to buy essential food and maintain the house expenses. Only few portion of remittance used in children

education and health. Therefore government should create suitable environment as well as policies that may encourage foreign migrant workers to invest their remittance in productive works.

Karna (2008) stated that human capital is the wealth of nation and its importance has tremendously increased in recent years, as unskilled, semiskilled and skilled people have shown keen inclination towards foreign employment resulting in the substantial growth of remittance inflow.

Englama (2009) stated that more than 80 percent of remittance is used for daily consumption and concluded that remittance could be a stable and predictable source of external finance for development process, when properly used.

Rajkarnikar (2009) explained the impact of remittance with using random sampling method with adopted probability proportional to number of household which sample drawn from 300 *Panchayats* (localities) used mention sample method in fifty households. He found that average age of emigrants 28, average at return 44, life in Gulf 16, unemployment rate before emigration 23 and employment rate after return 29. The study described that most of the Keralian male worker migration in Gulf countries to search the appropriate employment opportunities, and they earned money and sent back their home country. Its impacts particularly 1028 times more than the government revenue recipient, four time more than transfer from central government, 1.5 times more than the government expenditure and 15 to 18 times more than the receipts cashew, marine produce. At last, the study concludes that remittance has impact on poverty, unemployment, standard of living, ownership of houses, consumer durables and social mobility with distribution. On the other hand, affects of migration on women, elderly people and children due to the loneliness.

Nepal has done labor agreement with 107 countries for foreign employment in the world. Nepalese employees have gone more than 75 countries for employment. The total numbers of foreign employee are around 2.5 million. This has become 10% of the total population (Bhattarai, 2010).

Sherpa (2011) stated in Far Western and Mid Western Development Regions of Nepal at two levels: macro and micro (village level) states in his research report that the use of remittances varied from person to person, and with family size and economic

status. There is no real culture of saving and investment and people lacked awareness of the potential benefits. Most people simply spent what they earned and migrated in order to bring back food and money to live on for the next 4 to 6 months. Labor migrants brought new skills like driving, construction, cooking, electrical skills, and house painting when they return to the villages. But opportunities to use these skills, or invest the savings, were very limited. Lack of ideas, of opportunities for entrepreneurship, and of access to markets, all discouraged returned migrants from investing even the small sums that they have.

NRB (2012) conducted a report that remittance income is mostly spent on unproductive conspicuous consumption and a significant chunk of remittance is used for land purchase as well. In addition, it also revealed that hundi has still been one of the channels to remit money from abroad.

Chaudhary (2014) shows that the remittance has both positive and negative impacts onto the family, social, and cultural life of Bangladesh. In case of the family life, remittance increases direct consumptions, increases the ability of buying goods, and helps them improve the standard of living. The families of the transnational migrants can obtain the ability of sending their children to better schools. In addition, families of migrants can avail civic amenities, which contribute to develop their social, economic, and political status. Besides these positive aspects, remittance makes the family members of the migrants more dependent on the remittance. It also provides opportunity of breaking down the extended families and the creation of the nuclear families. In the case of society level, remittance contributes to social development. It provides freedom, enhances philanthropic and social aid activities, helps victims of natural disasters, and contributes to alleviating poverty from the society. In addition, remittance ensures social security of elderly persons and empowers the women of migrants' family. Above all, remittance creates social capital in the society of Bangladesh. In regards to the negative impacts of remittance on the society, remittance flows increase the price of the land of Bangladesh, create social inequality, and foster the rate of inflation. Beyond the family and social level impacts, remittance provides opportunities of developing the material and nonmaterial culture of Bangladeshi families. However, it is also responsible for the creation of cultural lag and cultural conflict in the society of Bangladesh.

Bhatta (2015) stated that the productive use of remittance is the linear and positive function of financial literacy. One percent increase in financial literacy leads to increase in productive use by 6.25 percent. The reason behind unproductive use of remittance is the lack of financial literacy and poor financial behaviors like no financial record keeping, no budget making, no financial goal setting, lack of entrepreneurship and business ideas etc. Finally he recommended that government have to provide financial literacy training to the migrants one month before going to foreign employment so that they can share their knowledge to their family and can set financial goal with them.

Panta and Budha (2016) claimed that the growth of workers seeking employment abroad and, thus, workers' remittance inflows to Nepal have been quite significant in recent years. Domestic economy factors such as unemployment, ongoing demographic transition, lackluster policies formulated by Government of Nepal to promote foreign employment and growth prospects in emerging markets have largely increased the outflow of Nepalese workers. Correspondingly, due to the upsurge in workers' remittance inflows, Nepal has been remaining in the top five positions among the countries in terms of the size of the economy or remittance to GDP ratio for the last few years.

They further stated that an instrumental role of macroeconomic variables in determining the remittance inflows to Nepal. The cyclical component of Nepal's remittance inflows is positively affected by the nominal exchange rate with US Dollar, and economic activity in host countries (India, Gulf countries and advanced economies), indicating the spillovers of business cycles through the remittance channel. In addition, there is an evidence of the co-integration or long-run relationship between the workers' remittance inflows in USD terms and its determinants-nominal NC-US exchange rate, economic activity in host countries and the workers' outflow. The impact of depreciation of NC vis-à-vis USD on the workers' inflows to Nepal is positive. This supports the hypothesis that both the substitution and wealth effect work in the direction to increase the remittance inflows to Nepal in the episode of depreciation. There is also the tendency of Nepalese migrant workers to take advantage of favorable exchange rate by sending back more remittances at the depreciated nominal exchange rate. Likewise, the growing economic activity in India

has positive impact on remittance inflows. Given the high labor mobility and large share of India in Nepal's remittance inflows, this result demonstrates the positive link of Nepalese remittance inflows and the economic cycle of Indian economy. Finally, as expected in theory, the workers' outflow has significant impact on remittance inflows.

Pathak (2016) stated that there are monetary and non monetary cost and benefits of foreign employment. Non monetary benefit and costs cannot be measured in terms of money. But monetary costs and benefits can be measured in terms of money. Monetary cost includes of opportunity cost (OC) and cost paid by migrants for foreign employment (CPMFE). Similarly monetary benefits include remittance in terms of cash and remittance in terms of kind. Net benefit of remittance is the difference between monetary benefits and monetary costs.

2.8 Research Gap

Most of the reviewed literature and other studies are before the work permission to the South Korea. These studies specially focused on Gulf Countries migration. Thirteen thousand Nepalese workers currently worked in South Korea. This study tries to focus on Korean labor migrants, their expenditure pattern and its socio-economic impacts.

CHAPTER –THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This is a comparative study of remittance receiving households (RRHHs) to non remittance receiving households (RNRHHs). This study is a case study of Attariya municipality. It is a micro level study. Descriptive and analytical research designs are used in this research. The data were collected and intercepted to attain the objective of the study. To obtain the various facts about the remittance mainly primary data are collected by using questionnaire similarly secondary data are collected from various sources to fulfill the objective of the study collected data from field study were classified and presented on the table and graph. Similarly, simple statistical tools such as average, percentage, mean difference are used to describe and analyze data. Tables were used to reflex data.

3.2 Nature and Sources of Data

The nature of this study is descriptive as well as analytical. This study is based on both primary and secondary data and information. Interview and questionnaire were the main tools to collect primary data. The secondary data have been collected from published sources i.e. census report, national survey, etc and unpublished sources as record of municipality, police post, etc.

3.3 Sampling Design

The universe of the study is the household of four wards 1, 2, 5 and 7 respectively of Attariya Municipality, Kailali District. These four wards are selected purposively. The reason behind for the selection of these wards is due to the dense population homogeneous population and more number of foreign employees is there, etc. According to the latest data 2074 provided by the Municipality office there are 13,745 households in Attariya municipality. For this study 100 migrant and 100 non migrant households were selected as sample. The sample households were selected from each ward according to proportionate distribution of the total households. The measurement approaches to make the study comparative and to meet the purpose of

the study with and with-out approaches is used. The total number of respondents is 200 including both male and female. The total number of households and their sample size is shown in table 3.1.after determining the sample size. The sample was selected by systematic sampling method.

Table 3.1 Sample Distribution

| Ward No. | No of Migrant Households | Sample Size | No of Non - migrant Households | Sample Size |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | 250 | 25 | 550 | 19 |
| 2 | 300 | 29 | 600 | 20 |
| 5 | 200 | 20 | 900 | 30 |
| 7 | 270 | 26 | 920 | 31 |
| Total | 1,020 | 100 | 2,970 | 100 |

Source: Attariya Municipality, 2017.

3.4 Methods of Data Collection

3.4.1 Primary Data Collection

Primary data collection was collected through direct interview with the help of questionnaire. Two separate questionnaire were designed, one for migrants households and another one for non-migrants households. The questionnaires are presented in appendix. The questionnaire contains socio-economic and other current issues to meet the required information related to this study. Primary data is required for the proposed study are information regarding the impact of remittance on consumption behavior of their family, expenditure on their children's education, purchases of luxurious goods and land, bank balance, health condition and treatment, Income of the households from various sources like farm income and non-farm income, remittance income etc. The questionnaire also contained the age, sex, family structure, causes to join foreign employment, economic condition before joining foreign employment, condition of housing facility etc. The questionnaire contained expenditure on durable goods, children's education, Ownership of the assets and social activities. The access of respondent's family in information and technology and

ownership of the assets like television, solar energy, refrigerator, etc are also included in questionnaire.

3.4.2 Secondary Data Collection

Besides Primary data some required data related to the study are collected from Secondary sources available from official and unofficial sources. Among them Census report, annual publication of NRB, published and unpublished research work, unpublished thesis, Journals, newspapers, website of department of foreign employment, books, reports, etc. are the major resources central bureau of statistics.

3.5 Data Analysis and Presentation

After the data collected from questionnaire, it was regrouped and reclassified to analyze. The available data from various sources was classified and tabulated to meet the need of the study after completing the field work. All information of the filled up questionnaire was presented in master table after editing the cross checking. After collection, classification and editing of the data analysis and presentation of the data is another important work for the fulfillment of the objective of study. Different statistical tools were used for data analysis like average, percentage, frequency and ratio. Descriptive method was used for qualitative data. The data was presented using tables. The income from different sources expenditure on different headings and their average was presented in the table to attain the objectives of study about Socio-economic impact and economic behavior between the migrant household and non migrant household due to remittance. The mean difference test was applied.

CHAPTER: FOUR

SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC FEATURES OF RESPONDENTS

This chapter includes the information required for the study area. This chapter also deals with the socio economic and demographic features of respondents found in the study area along with educational status, age, sex, caste, family size, occupation and access of housing facility along with condition of house, types of toilet, sources of drinking water and land holding size.

4.1 Profile of the Study Area

Attariya is a municipality situated in Kailali District in the Seti Zone of Far Westren Development Region of Nepal. The municipality was established in 18 may 2014 merging the existing Malakheti, Sripur, Beladevipur, Geta VDCs. Attariya is gateway of Far West Nepal. The Mahendra highway meet at the Attariya making a transport hub in the region. Attariya is about 600 km far from Kathmandu, 15 km far from Dhangadhi, 40 km far from Mahendranagar and 120 km far from Dadeldhura. Buses are the main mode of transport. Magic vans, tempo, rikshaw, taxi serve as a means of local transportation. Nepal's second largest airport i.e. Dhangadhi Airport lies in the Attariya municipality ward no. 11. Buddha Air, Yeti Air and Nepal Airlines provide regular flight service from Kathmandu. Total population of Attariya municipality is 72,521 among 34,634 are male and 37,887 are female. Chhetri is the dominant caste with 22,682 individual followed by tharu ethnic group with 22,077. Bhramin ranked third with 12,315. Dalits account significant number with population size 10,972 and 3,775 are considered as other caste ethnic groups residing in the municipality. The male to female sex-ratio is 94.41. Total 13,745 households are there with household size 5.27. Most number of households of this municipality received remittance. Attariya municipality is the study area of this research because this place is highly affected by foreign employment. There is some impact of remittance like as education, health, access in information and communication is increased, insurance and use of other assets like as solar energy, motor bike, and refrigerator etc. is increased. Their children are sent to private school. Houses are being made of RCC. Consumption expenditure was also increased in the study area (Source: Attariya Municipality).

4.2 Age and Sex of Respondents

In the study area for research work, the respondents were found between 20 to above years of age. Some of the respondents are head of household and other respondents are head of household and other respondents are responsible members of their household. The age group and their sex distribution is represented in table 4.1

Table 4.1 Composition of Respondents on the Basis of Age and Sex

| S.N. | Age Group | No. of Respondents on Migrant Households | | | No. of Respondents on Non-migrant Households | | |
|--------------|-----------|--|--------|-------|--|--------|-------|
| | | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| 1 | 20-29 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 7 |
| 2 | 30-39 | 6 | 20 | 26 | 12 | 15 | 27 |
| 3 | 40-49 | 10 | 25 | 35 | 24 | 21 | 45 |
| 4 | 50-59 | 19 | 13 | 32 | 6 | 2 | 8 |
| 5 | 60-69 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 10 |
| 6 | Above 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Total | | 40 | 60 | 100 | 57 | 43 | 100 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table no. 4.1 shows that most of the respondents are of age 40-50. There are 40 male and 60 female respondents found in migrant households similarly, in non-migrant households there are 57 male and 43 female respondents were found. Most of the male are joined in foreign employment due to this reason there are more female respondents were found in foreign employed group. In non migrant household, most of the male respondent and other some are father, mother, grandfather, brother and sister were the respondent.

4.3 Educational Status of Respondents

Education plays the vital role for the development of the people. Education makes people able to fulfill their demands. Without education no healthy life can be

imagined. Education provides much job opportunity to the people. The educational status of this study area is shown in table 4.2.

Table 4.2 Distribution of Respondents by Educational Status

| S.N. | Level | No. of Respondents on Migrant Households | No. of Respondents on Non-migrant Households |
|--------------|-----------------|--|--|
| 1 | Primary | 5 | 10 |
| 2 | Lower secondary | 40 | 38 |
| 3 | Secondary | 30 | 25 |
| 4 | +2 | 13 | 17 |
| 5 | Higher level | 12 | 10 |
| Total | | 100 | 100 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 4.2 shows that the number of respondents having only primary level education was 5 in migrant household and 10 in non-migrant households. The number of respondents who had completed lower secondary level education was 40 in migrant household and 38 in non-migrant household. The number of respondents who passed S.L.C. was 30 and 25 respectively in migrant and non-migrant household. Similarly, the number of respondent who had completed +2 was 15 and 17 respectively in migrant and non-migrant household. Similarly, the respondent having higher education was 12 in migrant household and 10 in non-migrant household. The table shows that the majority of respondent have only lower secondary level education.

4.4 Caste and Ethnicity of Respondents

In the study area the respondents are from various ethnic groups. The majority of respondents are from janajati and other are from Bhramin, Chhetri, and Dalits. The caste and ethnicity of respondents are presented in table 4.3.

Table 4.3 Distribution of Respondents by Caste and Ethnicity

| S.N. | Ethnic Group | No. of Respondents on Migrant Households | No. of Respondents on Non-migrant Households |
|--------------|--------------|--|--|
| 1 | Bhramin | 24 | 22 |
| 2 | Chhetri | 27 | 31 |
| 3 | Janajati | 39 | 38 |
| 4 | Dalit | 10 | 9 |
| Total | | 100 | 100 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 4.3 shows that the number of Brahmin respondents was 24 in migrant households and 22 in non-migrant households. Similarly, the number of Chhetri respondents was 27 and 31 respectively in migrant and non-migrant households. The number of Janajati respondents was 39 in migrant households and 38 in non-migrant households. Similarly, the Dalit respondents were 10 and 9 respectively in migrant households and non-migrant households. In this study Janajati includes Tharu, Magar, Tamang, Gurung, etc. In comparison the Janajati respondents were found more than other ethnic groups.

4.5 Household Size of Respondents

In this study area Family with different sizes were found majority of extended family was seen here since, the study area is municipality most number of family are living in rural areas where the family lives with poverty and they lived in joint family. Most of the Janajati people have extended family members. The practice of nuclear family and family planning activities are increasing in recent year due to quality education and awareness programs. The distribution of respondents according to their household size is shown in table 4.4.

Table 4.4 Distribution of Respondents by Household Size

| S.N. | Household Size | No. of Respondents on Migrant Households | No. of Respondents on Non-migrant Households |
|--------------|-----------------------|---|---|
| 1 | 3 | 7 | 12 |
| 2 | 4 | 31 | 27 |
| 3 | 5 | 24 | 31 |
| 4 | 6 | 13 | 11 |
| 5 | 7 | 5 | 6 |
| 6 | 8 and above | 10 | 13 |
| Total | | 100 | 100 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 4.4 shows that 7 migrant and 12 non-migrant household have family size 3. The household having household size 4 were 31 from migrant and 27 from non-migrant group. This study shows that majority of household in migrant household have household size 4. The majority of household in non-migrant household have household size of 5. 24 migrant and 31 non migrant household have family size of 5. Some household were seen having household size 6, 7 and 8 or more it is because they born more child or live in joint family. Household with four members was found dominant in migrant group and household with 5 members was found dominant in non-migrant group.

4.6 Occupation of Migrant Workers before Foreign Employment

The questionnaire contains a question that whether the Foreign employed person had occupation or not when they were in home land Nepal before joining in foreign employment. Many of the respondents replied that, they were jobless in Nepal before joining in the foreign employment. During the research it was found that majority of the persons were seasonally employed in agriculture and part time job. The job of migrant worker before foreign employment is presented in the Table 4.5.

Table 4.5 Distribution of Respondents by Jobs

| S.N. | Occupation | No of Respondents |
|--------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | Yes | 37 |
| 2 | No | 63 |
| Total | | 100 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 4.5 shows that 63 migrant workers were jobless before joining the foreign employment when they were in Nepal and 37 migrant workers were employed before joining the foreign employment when they were in Nepal. The worker who was employed in Nepal before joining the foreign employment chooses to joining foreign employment is due to low income in Nepal. From the study most of the respondents replied that they were unemployed in Nepal.

4.7 Access of Housing Facility

In this section of access of housing facility condition of houses, Types of toilet, Sources of drinking water, Land holding size, Destination of foreign employment, Reason for foreign employment, Economic condition of household before foreign employment and sources of money to go for foreign employment, etc are included.

4.7.1 Condition of Houses

In the study area people who lives in urban areas they have house made with RCC in large numbers and in rural areas most people have house made with stone, mud, with roof of tin and slate and some people have made their house by using stone, mud and timber with thatched roof. The condition of houses of migrant and non-migrant household is shown in table 4.6.

Table 4.6 Condition of Houses

| S.N. | Condition of Houses | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|--------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | Made with RCC | 66 | 35 |
| 2 | Made with stone, mud with roof of tin and slate | 30 | 55 |
| 3 | Made with stone, mud and timber with thatched roof | 4 | 10 |
| Total | | 100 | 100 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 4.6 shows that 66 migrant and 35 non-migrant household have house made with RCC. 30 migrant and 55 non-migrant household have house made with stone, mud with roof of tin and slate. Similarly, 4 migrant and 10 non-migrant household have made house with stone, mud and timber with thatched roof. This study shows that most of the migrant household is willing to make their house with RCC. Remittance income has created positive effect on RCC house.

4.7.2 Types of Toilet

Another access of housing facility is toilet. In this section types of toilet like toilet with flush, toilet without flush, communal toilet and no toilet facility were included. Types of toilet in the study area are listed in the table 4.7.

Table 4.7 Types of Toilet

| S.N. | Types of Toilet | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|--------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | Toilet with flush | 27 | 20 |
| 2 | Toilet without flush | 70 | 72 |
| 3 | Communal toilet | 3 | 8 |
| 4 | No toilet facility | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | 100 | 100 |

Sources: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 4.7 shows that out of 100 households all households from migrant and non-migrant have access to toilet. 27 migrant households and 20 non-migrants households have toilet with flush. 70 migrant households and 72 non-migrant households have toilet without flush. Similarly, 3 migrant households and 8 non-migrant households uses communal toilet.

4.7.3 Sources of Drinking Water

Another access of housing facility is sources of drinking water. In the study area most number of people is still behind from pure drinking water only few people from urban areas are getting pure drinking water. In the study area sources of drinking water like well, hand pump, tap, and tube well were included. The sources of drinking water of migrant and non-migrant household were listed in the table 4.8.

Table 4.8 Sources of Drinking Water

| S.N. | Sources | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|--------------|----------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | Well | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Hand pump | 43 | 56 |
| 3 | Tap | 52 | 30 |
| 4 | Tube well | 5 | 14 |
| Total | | 100 | 100 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 4.8 shows that out of 100 households none of the migrant household as well as non-migrant households use well for drinking water. 43 migrant households used hand pump for drinking water and 56 non-migrant households used hand pump for drinking water. 52 migrant households use tap and 30 non-migrant households used tap for drinking water. Similarly, 5 migrant households used tube well and 14 non-migrant households used tube well for drinking water. In migrant households more number of households lives in urban areas. Similarly, most number of non-migrant household used hand pump for drinking water because more number of non-migrant households lives in rural areas.

4.7.4 Food Sufficiency from Own Land

In this study food sufficiency from own land of migrant and non-migrant households in last year was included. From study it was known that non-migrant households had more food for consumption than migrant households. Food sufficiency from own land of both migrant and non-migrant households during last year was shown in table 4.9.

Table 4.9 Food Sufficiencies' from Own Land

| S.N. | Food Sufficiency | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|--------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | Less than 3 month | 7 | 2 |
| 2 | 3-6 month | 20 | 12 |
| 3 | 6-9 month | 37 | 24 |
| 4 | 9-12 month | 38 | 42 |
| 5 | Left for sale | 8 | 20 |
| Total | | 100 | 100 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 4.9 shows that 7 migrant households has food sufficiency from own land was less than 3 month and 2 non-migrant households had food sufficiency from own land was less than 3 month. 20 migrant households had food sufficiency from own land between 3 to 6 month and 12 non-migrant households had food sufficiency from own land was between 3 to 6 month. 37 migrant households had food sufficiency from own land was between 6 to 9 month and 24 non-migrant households had food sufficiency from own land was between 6 to 9 month. 38 migrant households has food sufficiency from own land was between 9 to 12 month and 42 non-migrant households had food sufficiency from own land was between 9 to 12 month. Similarly, 8 migrant households had food sufficiency from own land was left for sale and 20 non-migrant households had food sufficiency from own land was left for sale. From this study it is seen that migrant households had less numbers of workers to work in the field. Some migrant households had given their land to rent so they only get half of the food production. Some migrant households were able to sell the food because they had more land and they use modern technology, seeds, fertilizers, etc.

4.8 Economic Status of Respondents before Foreign Employment

In this study respondents were asked one question about their economic status before joining in foreign employment whether it is lower, middle or upper level. The distribution of respondents by economic status is shown in table 4.10.

Table 4.10 Distribution of Respondents by Economic Status

| S.N. | Economic Status | No of Respondents |
|--------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Lower | 49 |
| 2 | Middle | 40 |
| 3 | Upper | 11 |
| Total | | 100 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Economic status of migrant workers plays a vital role for the people to join foreign employment. Only lower economic level people doesn't go to foreign employment people from upper economic level also join foreign employment. Most Nepalese youth join to foreign employment to overcome from their poor economic condition and prosperity.

Table 4.10 shows that 49 households were found lower economic status. Majority of household were from lower economic level which is 49 no. of respondents. Similarly, 11 household were found from upper level economic status. Similarly, 40 households were found in middle level economic status. From this study it is found that mostly lower economic level people are joining foreign employment because they are facing more problems than middle and upper economic level.

4.9 Destination of Foreign Employment

In this study respondents were asked from migrant household where their family members were in abroad for work from 100 households 73 households has one member who joined in foreign employment. In 18 household two members were involved in foreign employment and in 9 rests household there were 3 members were involved in foreign employment. There were all total 141 foreign employees in 100

households. The name of the employed country and number of migrant workers are presented in table 4.11.

Table 4.11 Destination of Foreign Employment

| S.N. | Destination Countries | No of Respondents |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Saudi Arabia | 35 |
| 2 | UAE | 30 |
| 3 | Qatar | 15 |
| 4 | Malaysia | 40 |
| 5 | South Korea | 10 |
| 6 | USA | 4 |
| 7 | Japan | 7 |
| Total | | 141 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 4.11 shows that 35 persons were working in Saudi Arab, 30 were working in UAE, 15 were working in Qatar, and 40 persons were working in Malaysia. Similarly, 10 persons were working in South Korea 4 persons were working in USA through DV programmed. 7 persons were working in Japan through language test and many persons were working in India which is not included in this study. USA, Korea and Japan had taken less number in this table because a lottery system called DV is only way to go USA and for Korea and Japan Nepalese worker should pass the language test which is quite difficult for the less educated people and it is costly also. In UAE, Malaysia, Qatar had taken more number in this table because this are familiar destination and affordable for the migrant workers.

4.10 Reasons for Foreign Employment

Many individuals are interested to go for foreign employment is increasing day to day all over the country. In the study area also foreign employment is the subject of attraction for the people. Many Nepalese people mostly youngster are compelled to go for foreign employment due to the lack of employment opportunities, less payment, conflict, political instability, Natural disasters etc. The causes to go for foreign employment is presented in table 4.12.

Table 4.12 Reasons for Foreign Employment

| S.N. | Reasons for Foreign Employment | No. of Respondents |
|--------------|---|--------------------|
| 1 | Due to low income in homeland | 35 |
| 2 | Due to attractive salary | 30 |
| 3 | Influenced by returnees from foreign employee | 25 |
| 4 | For repaying the debt | 7 |
| 5 | Conflict | 3 |
| Total | | 100 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 4.12 shows that out of 100 respondents 35 persons had joined foreign employment due to low income in homeland. 30 persons joined in foreign employment due to attractive salary. 25 persons joined in foreign employment due to influenced by returnees from foreign employment. 7 persons joined in foreign employment for repaying the debt. Similarly, 3 persons joined in foreign employment due to conflict. The main reason behind to go for foreign employment was low income in homeland.

4.11 Sources of Money for Foreign Employment

In the study area it is known that many of the people go for foreign employment by their own sources. The sources of money and number of respondents are presented in table 4.13.

Table 4.13 Sources of Money for Foreign Employment

| S.N. | Sources of Money | No. of Respondents |
|--------------|--|--------------------|
| 1 | From own source | 55 |
| 2 | From bank | 20 |
| 3 | From merchant /Money lender | 7 |
| 4 | From selling various things including land | 18 |
| Total | | 100 |

Source: *Field survey, 2017.*

Table 4.13 shows that 55 persons has gone in foreign employment by their own source. 20 persons has gone in foreign countries by taking loan from bank. 7 persons has gone in foreign countries by taking loan from merchant/money lender. Similarly, 18 persons has gone in foreign countries by selling various things like gold, animals like cow, buffalo, goat, etc including land.

CHAPTER FIVE

CURRENT STATUS OF EMPLOYMENT AND REMITTANCE

5.1 Country- wise Foreign Employment Situation

A total number of 36,19,981 individuals have gone for foreign employment until F/Y 2015/16 and of this 34,64,868 were male and 1,55,113 were female. Likewise, the total numbers of out bound Nepalese for foreign employment with work permit has stood at 1,86,166 by the first eight months of current F/Y 2015/16 out of this 1,76,831 were male and the rest 9,335 were female. As per above statistics the number of Laborers leaving the Country with work permit for foreign employment is declining as compared to that of proceeding years.

Table 5.1 Country- wise Foreign Employment Situation

| S.N. | Country | Total | Male | Female |
|------|--------------|----------|----------|--------|
| 1 | Qatar | 62,269 | 61,255 | 1,014 |
| 2 | Malaysia | 38,464 | 37,847 | 617 |
| 3 | Saudi Arab | 41,183 | 42,423 | 760 |
| 4 | UAE | 26,251 | 22,459 | 3,792 |
| 5 | Kuwait | 5,648 | 5,317 | 331 |
| 6 | Bahrain | 1,924 | 1,780 | 144 |
| 7 | Oman | 1,412 | 1,078 | 334 |
| 8 | South Korea | 47 | 47 | - |
| 9 | Lebanon | 76 | 32 | 44 |
| 10 | Israel | 72 | 36 | 36 |
| 11 | Afghanistan | 541 | 538 | 3 |
| 13 | Japan | 1,620 | 1,567 | 53 |
| 14 | Others | 4,659 | 2,452 | 2,207 |
| 15 | Total | 1,86,166 | 1,76,831 | 9,335 |

Source: MOLE, *Economic Survey, 2016/17*.

Table 5.1 shows that most number of Nepalese workers is working in Gulf Countries like Qatar 62,269, Malaysia 38,464, Saudi Arab 43,183, and so on. This is due to the Labor agreement between the Government of Nepal and Government of Gulf

Countries, This is due to the cheap destination and most Nepalese have access to go and work there. Accordingly, in comparison to Gulf Countries like European Countries these numbers are less because of the difficult process, Government policies and Costly destination. Similarly, the ratio of women to men in Foreign Employment is vast difference due to the safety of women, family support, etc.

5.2 Number of Nepalese Migrating Abroad

The trend of Nepalese workers migrating to Foreign Countries is very old and this trend is increasing day by day. Mostly youth Nepalese people are leaving Country and they inspired other people also. In comparison to other Countries Nepal is becoming the Country having more number of peoples working in Foreign Countries this numbers can be increased if the numbers of workers in India is also added. But due to the open border between Nepal and India there is a free flow of labor and there is no official and reliable data of the Nepalese migrant in India. In the year 1997/98 the numbers of workers going abroad as Job seekers was just 7,745 and it increased to 1,04,739 in 2001/02. The number of migrant workers had reached up to 2,04,533 in the year 2006/07. Accordingly, to Ministry of Finance, number of Persons issued permits for Foreign Employment up to 2016/17 had reached 1,86,166. Number of workers migrating abroad per year is shown in table 5.2.

Table 5.2 Total Number of Migrants per Year

| Year | Total Number of Migrants |
|-------------|---------------------------------|
| 1997/98 | 7,745 |
| 1998/99 | 27,796 |
| 1999/00 | 35,543 |
| 2000/01 | 55,025 |
| 2001/02 | 1,04,739 |
| 2002/03 | 1,05,055 |
| 2003/04 | 1,21,769 |
| 2004/05 | 1,39,696 |
| 2005/06 | 1,82,043 |
| 2006/07 | 2,14,094 |
| 2007/08 | 2,15,268 |

| | |
|---------|----------|
| 2008/09 | 2,19,965 |
| 2009/10 | 1,73,239 |
| 2010/11 | 2,10,663 |
| 2011/12 | 2,50,172 |
| 2012/13 | 2,76,787 |
| 2013/14 | 2,91,449 |
| 2014/15 | 3,64,740 |
| 2015/16 | 2,66,491 |
| 2016/17 | 1,86,166 |

Source: MOF, *Economic Survey from 1997/98 to 2016/17*.

Table 5.2 shows that the total number of migrating workers has been increasing continuously and the trend of Nepalese workers going to abroad and the increment has been seen higher after 2000/01. There are two responsible factors for such a growing trend of Nepalese workers going abroad for employment are push factors and pull factors. High demand of labor in industrialized and developed Nation like East Asian Countries, Middle East Nations and Gulf Countries are Pull Factors and lack of employment opportunity in the Nation, Distorted peace and security, Low wage level, Lack of Agricultural development in rural areas, Scarcity of basis services needed for survival, Liberal policies of Government and demonstration effect are main push factors.

5.3 Remittance and its Growth in Nepal

Remittance is an important source of Foreign exchange for most of the developing and under developed Nations. But, actual data of remittance cannot be obtained as remittance as remittance obtained through informal channel is significant in those Nations. So, it is the obligations of researcher to accept official data of remittance and the remittance entered through informal channel only can be guessed. Nepalese official's records have shown that the total amount of remittance entered in the Nation was Rs.47.54 billion in the year 2002/03. The figure has highly risen particularly after 2007/08 and has been reached to Rs.142.68 billion. In the first eight months of 2016/17 remittance earned and sent by migrant workers has been recorded to Rs.450 billion. Table 5.3 illustrates the growth of remittance in Nepal.

Table 5.3 Remittance and its Growth in Nepal

| Year | Remittance (in billion Rs.) |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2002/03 | 47.54 |
| 2003/04 | 54.20 |
| 2004/05 | 58.59 |
| 2005/06 | 65.54 |
| 2006/07 | 97.69 |
| 2007/08 | 142.68 |
| 2008/09 | 209.70 |
| 2009/10 | 231.73 |
| 2010/11 | 253.6 |
| 2011/12 | 359.6 |
| 2012/13 | 343.6 |
| 2013/14 | 543.3 |
| 2014/15 | 617.3 |
| 2015/16 | 655.3 |
| 2016/17 | 450 |

Source: MOF, *Economic Survey from 2002/03 to 2016/17*.

Total number of remittance inflow has been increasing year by year as shown in table 5.3 because of such a high increase in labor migration from Nation growth of remittance inflow is also in increasing trend.

5.4 Ratio of Remittance to GDP in Nepal

The responsible factors that enhance GDP and its growth in the Nation are various elements like domestic consumption, domestic investment, saving, Government expenditure, net exports etc. Now a day's share of remittance to GDP is increasing per year. Since income earned through remittance are spent by recipients in the form of consumption purpose or investment purpose. Investment is not only included on physical capital but also on human capital like education, health, skill development, etc. Ratio of remittance to GDP was just 10.69 percent in 2000/01 and this figure is in increasing trend and the ration of remittance is 26.9 percent in first eight months of 2016/17. Table 5.4 shows that the ratio of GDP in Nepal.

Table 5.4 Ratio of Remittance to GDP

| Year | Ratio of Remittance to GDP (in percent) |
|-------------|--|
| 2000/01 | 10.69 |
| 2001/02 | 10.35 |
| 2002/03 | 11.01 |
| 2003/04 | 10.91 |
| 2004/05 | 11.12 |
| 2005/06 | 14.94 |
| 2006/07 | 13.76 |
| 2007/08 | 17.49 |
| 2008/09 | 21.15 |
| 2009/10 | 19.19 |
| 2010/11 | 18.5 |
| 2011/12 | 23.5 |
| 2012/13 | 25.6 |
| 2013/14 | 27.7 |
| 2014/15 | 29.1 |
| 2015/16 | 29.6 |
| 2016/17 | 26.9 |

Source: MOF, *Economic Survey from 2000/01 to 2016/17*.

Table 5.4 shows that not only volume of the remittance has increased but also its ratio to GDP has increased. In 2005/06 the ratio of remittance to GDP has increased up to 14.94 percent from 10.69 percent in the year 2000/01 but in comparison of 2005/06, in 2006/07. Similarly, in comparison of 2008/09 in 2009/10 and in comparison of 2009/10 in 2010/11 the ratio has declined. In the first eight month of 2016/17 ratio of remittance to GDP has reached 26.9 percent. The ratio of remittance to GDP has highly increased in the Nation because the increasing rate of remittance inflow is more than the increasing rate of GDP.

5.5 Foreign Labor Employment Trend and Composition

Restoration of democracy in 1990's opened the door of an international labor market. Near about eight million non-residential Nepalese are spread over forty Countries

(Department of Labor 2003). The supply of Nepalese youth in foreign Countries in search of work is increasing day by day at a high rate that is unstoppable in this trend of migration. The distribution of Nepalese about foreign labor employment as shown by the population censuses of 2011 is shown in following table 5.5.

Table 5.5 Number of Migrant Nepalese Working in Different Countries in 2011

| S.N. | Countries | Number of People | In Percent |
|--------------|--------------------------|------------------|------------|
| 1 | India | 5,96,065 | 77.74 |
| 2 | Saudi Arabia | 66,880 | 8.72 |
| 3 | UAE | 13,549 | 1.76 |
| 4 | Malaysia | 6,520 | 0.85 |
| 5 | Qatar | 25,520 | 3.32 |
| 6 | Hong Kong | 11,255 | 1.46 |
| 7 | Korea | 2,880 | 0.37 |
| 8 | Singapore | 3,075 | 0.40 |
| 9 | Kuwait | 4,201 | 0.54 |
| 10 | Bahrain | 2,808 | 0.36 |
| 11 | Japan | 3,540 | 0.46 |
| 12 | China | 1,280 | 0.16 |
| 13 | Russia and others | 845 | 0.11 |
| 14 | Other Asian Countries | 3,980 | 0.51 |
| 15 | Australia | 2,345 | 0.30 |
| 16 | The United Kingdom | 7,580 | 0.98 |
| 17 | Germany | 1,875 | 0.24 |
| 18 | France | 230 | 0.02 |
| 19 | Other European Countries | 2,025 | 0.26 |
| 20 | USA, Canada and Mexico | 8,578 | 1.11 |
| 21 | Other Countries | 1,678 | 0.21 |
| Total | | 7,66,709 | 100 |

Source: *Population Census 2011, National Report CBS*

Table 5.5 shows that total absentees of the Country reported by the Population Censuses report 2011, are 7, 66,709. Out of this number 5,96,065 people i.e. 77.74 percent of total absentees have gone to India which implies that migration in Nepal is still

associated with India, major destination of Nepalese emigrants except India are Hong Kong, Malaysia, Saudi Arab, Qatar, UAE, UK and the USA, etc. More especially, only three Gulf Countries Saudi Arab, Qatar and UAE have contained more than 60 percent of Nepalese absentees except India. This brings the fact that Nepalese emigrated are mainly in this three Countries.

CHAPTER: SIX

SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACT OF REMITTANCE

6.1 Household Income

The income of each individual household from different agricultural sources such as food crops, cash crops, fruits and animal product were included in this section. The income from these different sources was separately compared and finds the conclusion of it the comparative study of farm income from different sources was listed below in the following table. The income from farm of agriculture land in last one year is included in this section. In this section the total remittance income last year of both individual as well as joint income of household were included.

6.1.1 Distribution of Agriculture Land

In this study area land includes total ownership of land i.e. Kattha, Bigah, Khet, Bhari. Most of the migrant household has Kattha (Ghaderi) in facilitated area. The distribution of agriculture land in Kattha is shown in the table 6.1.

Table 6.1 Distribution of Agriculture Land

| S.N. | Land in Kattha | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | <15 | 13 | 8 |
| 2 | 15-24 | 17 | 10 |
| 3 | 25-34 | 22 | 35 |
| 4 | 35-44 | 35 | 37 |
| 5 | 45 & above | 13 | 10 |
| 6 | Average Land holding | 34.3 | 38.8 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.1 shows that the average land holding of migrant household was 34.3 Kattha and that of 38.8 Kattha in non-migrant household both migrant and non-migrant households had similar pattern of land distribution. Migrant household had more land below 10 Kattha it is because of most migrant household are using their remittance income for housing.

6.1.2 Purchase of Land

The purchasing of land is determined by income during the study it is shown that most of the migrant household had purchased land in comparison it non-migrant household. Purchasing of land in both household during last year was presented in table 6.2.

Table 6.2 Purchasing of Land

| S.N. | Purchasing of Land | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|--------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | Yes | 39 | 18 |
| 2 | No | 61 | 82 |
| Total | | 100 | 100 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.2 shows that 39 migrant household and 18 non-migrant households had purchased the land in previous year. This research shows that for residential purpose near the facilitated area some part of remittance income is used. Most household are purchasing their land for residential purpose and business purpose not for agricultural purpose. Purchasing of land is using in unproductive sector.

6.1.3 Farm Income

In this section different income sources of farm income like income from food crops, income from cash crops, income from vegetables, income from fruits and income from animal products are included.

a. Income from Food Crops

In this study area food crops is the supporting source of income for the household source of income for the household. All the respondents were asked the income from the food crops. The result is presented in table 6.3.

Table 6.3 Income from Food Crops

| S.N. | Income (in NRs.) | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | <10,000 | 7 | 1 |
| 2 | 10,000-19,999 | 11 | 8 |
| 3 | 20,000-29,999 | 25 | 24 |
| 4 | 30,000-39,999 | 27 | 31 |
| 5 | 40,000 & above | 30 | 36 |
| 6 | Average Income | 33,720 | 39,730 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.3 shows that the average annual income of last year from food income was Rs.33,720 in migrant household and Rs.39,730 in non-migrant household, there was no more difference on food income between these two groups. This study shows the effect of remittance income on farming food crops is not contributing significantly for both groups agriculture farm is not playing its effective role because of land holding size, traditional farming, urbanization, lack of good policy, etc.

b. Income from Cash Crops

Cash crops like mustard, potato, sugarcane and other seed oil plants, etc. were important source of income in migrant as well as non-migrant households. In this study Cash crops were cultivated for both business purpose as well as domestic purpose. The household income from Cash crops of respondents in last year is shown in table 6.4.

Table 6.4 Income from Cash Crops

| S.N. | Income (in NRs.) | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | <10,000 | 6 | 12 |
| 2 | 10,000-19,999 | 27 | 23 |
| 3 | 20,000-29,999 | 32 | 31 |
| 4 | 30,000 & above | 35 | 34 |
| 5 | Average Income | 31,010 | 23,980 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.4 shows that the average income from Cash crops of last year of migrant household was Rs.31,010 and Rs.23,980 in non-migrant household. There is some difference between income from Cash crops between migrant and non-migrant household. The cultivation system of migrant household is modern. The remittance income is playing significant role in Cash crops.

c. Income from Vegetables

The income of respondent's household vegetables was included in this section. In the study area vegetable is also a good sources of income for non-migrant households vegetables like cauliflower, green chili, lady finger, tomato, radish, etc. were cultivated. The income from migrant households as well as non-migrant households is presented in table 6.5.

Table 6.5 Income from Vegetables

| S.N. | Income (in NRs.) | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|-------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | <15,000 | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | 15,000-19,999 | 5 | 7 |
| 3 | 20,000-24,999 | 11 | 16 |
| 4 | 25,000-29,999 | 15 | 20 |
| 5 | 30,000 & above | 7 | 25 |
| 6 | Average Income | 26,550 | 27,542 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.5 shows that the average income from vegetable of migrant household was Rs. 26,550 and that of non-migrant household was Rs. 27,542 in last year. Out of 100 household 40 migrant household and 75 non-migrant household get income from vegetables. The average income of non-migrant household is more than migrant household is because of the more workers available and the land holding size and most household lives in rural areas. This shows that there was a little role of remittance for getting income from vegetables.

d. Income from Fruits

In the study area fruits like litchi, papaya, mango, banana, lemon, etc. were produced in large scale as well as small scale. Few household are engaged in fruit business and most of the household members are producing fruits for self consumption. Most people sell their fruit in local market. The household income from fruit produced in last year was shown in table 6.6.

Table 6.6 Income from Fruits

| S.N. | Income (in NRs.) | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|-------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | <10,000 | 3 | 5 |
| 2 | 10,000-19,999 | 7 | 9 |
| 3 | 20,000-29,999 | 11 | 13 |
| 4 | 30,000 & above | 19 | 18 |
| 5 | Average Income | 29,275 | 27,555 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.6 shows that the average household income from fruits of migrant household was Rs. 29,275 and that of non-migrant household was Rs. 27,555 there was significant difference between average fruit income of migrant and non-migrant households. Remittance income has played significance role in fruit farming. Out of 100 households 40 migrant households and 45 non-migrant households had earned income from fruits. Most of the households did not get income from fruit because most household farm fruit for self consumption.

e. Income from Animal Products

In the study area the main source of income was animal product. The farming of cow, goat, buffalo, chicken, fish, etc. is the main sources of income for both migrant and non-migrant households. Chicken were produced in large scale for business purpose where as cow, buffalo were used for milk, ghee and sell of dairy product in local market. Many families were depending upon animal product for livelihood. The total income of animal product of respondent's household in last year is presented in table 6.7.

Table 6.7 Income from Animal Product

| S.N. | Income (in NRs.) | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|-------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | <30,000 | 10 | 15 |
| 2 | 30,000-49,999 | 21 | 36 |
| 3 | 50,000-69,999 | 24 | 33 |
| 4 | 70,000 & above | 35 | 16 |
| 5 | Average Income | 57,870 | 48,930 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.7 shows that the average household income of migrant household in last year was Rs. 57,870 and that of non-migrant household was Rs. 48,930. The average income of migrant household is more than that of non-migrant household. Remittance income has played significant role in animal product. The reason behind positive impact of remittance on animal product in the study area was due to increase in investment of migrant household and the market of animal product in the study area. Animal farming is increasing day by day is due to skilled they earned in foreign Country they are using in animal farming is increasing.

6.1.4 Wage Income.

In the study area some people were engaged in different job for earning wages such as working in agricultural field, building house, construction of infrastructure, plumber and other social work etc. The wage income of migrant and non-migrant household received in last one year was shown in table 6.8.

Table 6.8 Income from Wages

| S.N. | Income (in NRs.) | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|-------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | <30000 | 20 | 30 |
| 2 | 30000-49999 | 7 | 11 |
| 3 | 50000 & above | 2 | 4 |
| 4 | Average Income | 27,034 | 32,777 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.8 shows that 29 migrant households earned wage income and 45 non-migrant households earned wage income. The average income of migrant household was Rs. 27,034 and that of non-migrant household was Rs. 32,777 in last one year non-migrant household earn wage income is greater than that of migrant household. The reason behind is that in migrant household there was no more worker to earn wage in the study area.

6.1.5 Small Business

In the study area some people were engaged in small business for generating income such as hotel, fruit shop, wine shop, stationary shop, meat shop etc. The income from small business of migrant and non-migrant household received in last year was presented in table 6.9.

Table 6.9 Income from Small Business

| S.N. | Income (in NRs.) | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | <1,00,000 | 10 | 7 |
| 2 | 1,00,000-1,49,999 | 15 | 13 |
| 3 | 1,50,000 & above | 35 | 15 |
| 4 | Average Income | 1,55,950 | 1,34,571 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.9 shows that out of 100 households 60 migrant household and 30 non-migrant household earned income from small business. The average income from small business of migrant household in last year was Rs. 1,55,950 and that of non-migrant household was Rs. 1,34,571. The number of migrant household earn more income from small business than that of non-migrant household because of remittance more number of migrant household are running small business hence there is positive impact of remittance income on small business.

6.1.6 Rent

Some people of the study area were engaged in rent for earning income e.g. house rent, shop rent, giving land for agricultural, animal farming for fix time etc. The

income from rent of migrant and non-migrant household received in last year was presented in table 6.10.

Table 6.10 Income from Rent

| S.N. | Income (in NRs.) | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non -migrant Households |
|------|-----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1 | <25,000 | 7 | 10 |
| 2 | 25,000-49,999 | 18 | 25 |
| 3 | 50,000 & above | 15 | 20 |
| 4 | Average Income | 41,850 | 42,527 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.10 shows that 40 migrant household and 55 non-migrant household earned incomes from rent. The income from rent was ranging from 0-25,000 to 50,000 and above in NRs. The average income from rent of migrant household in last year was Rs. 41,850 and that of non-migrant household was Rs. 42,527. More number of non-migrant household earn income from rent than that of migrant household is due to the more number of workers are in migrant household and they had more land.

6.1.7 Private Jobs

In the study area some of the people were engaged in private job for earning income e.g. private hospital, bank, school, office, marketing, etc. The income from private job of migrant and non-migrant household received in last year was presented in table 6.11.

Table 6.11 Income from Private Jobs

| S.N. | Income (in NRs.) | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | <1,00,000 | 7 | 6 |
| 2 | 1,00,000-1,99,999 | 8 | 20 |
| 3 | 2,00,000 & above | 20 | 30 |
| 4 | Average Income | 1,83,657 | 2,22,339 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.11 shows that 25 migrant household and 56 non-migrant household earned incomes from private job. The income from private job was ranging from 0-1,00,000 to Rs. 2 lakh and above. The average income from private job of migrant household in last year was Rs. 1,83,657 and that of non-migrant household was Rs. 2,22,339. More number of non-migrant household earns income from private job of non-migrant household than that of migrant household. In migrant household there were no more workers for private job.

6.1.8 Government Salary Income

In the study area some person were engaged in Government salary job e.g. Nepal army, Nepal police, Government school, hospital, Public service, University, etc. The Government salary income of migrant and non-migrant household was shown in table 6.12.

Table 6.12 Income from Government Salary

| S.N. | Income (in NRs.) | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|-------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | <1,50,000 | 10 | 5 |
| 2 | 1,50,000-2,99,999 | 13 | 25 |
| 3 | 3,00,000 & above | 7 | 15 |
| 4 | Average Income | 3,17,945 | 6,17,037 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.12 shows that 30 migrant household and 45 non-migrant household received Government salary income. The average Government salary income of migrant household was Rs. 3,17,945 and that of non-migrant household was Rs. 6,17,037. The data shows that non-migrant household receives Government in large amount than migrant household.

6.1.9 Remittance Income

In the study area the remittance income was received only by migrant household was listed. The remittance income of migrant household in last year was presented in table 6.13.

Table 6.13 Income from Remittance

| S.N. | Income (in NRs.) | Individual | Joint |
|-------------|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| 1 | <2,00,000 | 20 | 11 |
| 2 | 2,00,000-3,99,999 | 35 | 8 |
| 3 | 4,00,000-5,99,999 | 11 | 5 |
| 4 | 6,00,000 & above | 7 | 3 |
| 5 | Average Income | 3,17,945 | 9,34,982 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.13 shows that out of 100 migrant household 73 household received remittance from individual workers and 27 household received remittance income from joint workers in last year. The remittance income of last year was classified in four classes. 31 household receive remittance income less than Rs. 2,00,000 and 43 household receive between Rs. 2,00,000 to 4,00,000 , 16 household receive remittance income between Rs. 4,00,000 to 6,00,000 similarly, 10 household receive more than Rs. 6,00,000. The average remittance income of individual workers was Rs. 3,17,945 and income of joint workers was Rs. 9,34,982. The more individual workers were found to be receiving remittance between Rs. 2 to 4 lakh.

6.1.10 Level of Income and Remittance

To analyze the significant effect of remittance on household income mean difference test was applied. The average income from different sources and their difference is presented in table 6.14.

Table 6.14 Income Differences between Categories of Sample Households

| S.N. | Sources of Income | Migrant Households | | Non-migrant Households | | Test Statistics |
|------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------|------------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| | | n1 | $\bar{x} 1$ | n2 | $\bar{x} 2$ | Mean difference |
| 1 | Food crops | 100 | 33,720 | 100 | 39,730 | -6,010 |
| 2 | Cash crops | 100 | 31,010 | 100 | 23,980 | 7,030 |
| 3 | Fruits | 40 | 29,275 | 45 | 27,555 | 1,720 |
| 4 | Vegetables | 40 | 26,550 | 70 | 27,542 | -992 |
| 5 | Animal products | 90 | 57,870 | 100 | 48,930 | 8,940 |
| 6 | Wage | 29 | 27,034 | 45 | 32,777 | -5,734 |
| 7 | Small business | 35 | 1,55,950 | 60 | 1,34,571 | 21,379 |
| 8 | Rent | 40 | 41,850 | 55 | 42,527 | -677 |
| 9 | Private job | 35 | 1,83,657 | 56 | 22,239 | -38,682 |
| 10 | Government salary | 30 | 2,21,466 | 45 | 2,57,,888 | -36,422 |
| 11 | Total | 100 | 17,43,364 | 100 | 8,57,839 | 8,85,525 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

n1 and n2 Means the number of migrant and non-migrant sample households $x 1$ and $x 2$ indicates the mean income of migrant and non-migrant households respectively. The difference in average income from cash crops, food, fruits, animal products, small business etc. came out to be statistically significant whereas the average income from food crops, vegetables, wage, rent, government salary, private job were highly insignificant. It implies that remittance has positive influence on cash crops, fruits, animal products, and small business but, not in income from food crops, vegetables, wage, rent, government salary, private job. The total household income is statistically significant. The household income is strictly influenced by remittance.

6.2 Household Expenditure

The household expenditure was determined by their income of household. The migrant household received more income from remittance which effects on expenditure pattern the comparative study of household expenditure between migrant

and non-migrant household of last year on different sectors was presented in this section.

6.2.1 Expenditure on Clothing

In this study the expenditure on clothing was determined by income, family size, choice, festival, fashion, season etc. The household expenditure on clothing of both migrant and non-migrant household in last year is presented in table 6.15.

Table 6.15 Expenditure on Clothing

| S.N. | Expenditure (in NRs.) | No. of Migrant Households | No of Non-migrant Households |
|------|----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1 | <20,000 | 12 | 21 |
| 2 | 20,000-39,999 | 21 | 37 |
| 3 | 40,000-59,999 | 30 | 26 |
| 4 | 60,000 & above | 37 | 16 |
| 5 | Average Expenditure | 49,930 | 37,190 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.15 shows that the average expenditure on clothing of migrant household was Rs. 49,930 and that of non-migrant household was Rs. 37,190 in last year. This study shows that the expenditure on clothing was more in migrant household. The remittance income increased their purchasing power so they buy new clothes as their choice, fashion, season, etc. The remittance income has positive impact on expenditure on clothing.

6.2.2 Expenditure on Fooding

The expenditure on food item such as rice, meat, oil, fruits, milk, vegetables, etc. are included in this section. The expenditure on food item is determined by household income. The expenditure of household on food item of both migrant and non-migrant household in last year was presented in table 6.16.

Table 6.16 Expenditure on Fooding

| S.N. | Expenditure on Fooding | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | <50,000 | 5 | 24 |
| 2 | 50,000-69,999 | 30 | 41 |
| 3 | 70,000-89,999 | 46 | 24 |
| 4 | 90,000 & above | 19 | 11 |
| 5 | Average Expenditure | 73,900 | 63,500 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.16 shows that the average expenditure on food item in last year was Rs. 73,900 of migrant household and that of non-migrant household was Rs. 63,500. The difference of Average expenditure on food item between migrant and non-migrant household was Rs. 10,400. Average expenditure of migrant household was more than non-migrant household is because of remittance income. People from migrant household are consuming more amount of healthy food like milk, nuts, fruits, meat, etc.

6.2.3 Expenditure on Alcohol

In the study area maximum numbers of people are from tharu community. In tharu community alcohol is necessary for various programs like festivals, wedding ceremony, etc. They used alcohol for welcoming their guest and worship god. Nowadays, all ethnic groups are consuming alcohol. Alcohol is consuming by all class of people. Expenditure on alcohol in last year was presented in the table 6.17.

Table 6.17 Expenditure on Alcohol

| S.N. | Expenditure (in NRs.) | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | <20,000 | 11 | 28 |
| 2 | 20,000-39,999 | 15 | 32 |
| 3 | 40,000-59,999 | 25 | 10 |
| 4 | 60,000 & above | 16 | 5 |
| 5 | Average Expenditure | 27,660 | 19,730 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.17 shows that out of 100 respondents 67 households consume alcohol in migrant household and 75 households consume alcohol in non-migrant household. The average expenditure on alcohol of migrant household was Rs. 27,660 and that of non-migrant household was Rs.19,730. This study shows that the expenditure on alcohol was positively affected by remittance income. Generally, migrant household has more income than non-migrant household so they spent more income for alcohol. Migrant household consume branded alcohol than that of non-migrant household. More amount of remittance was used on unproductive sector like alcohol which has a negative socio-economic impact of remittance in the study area.

6.2.4 Expenditure on Festivals

In Nepal many festivals are celebrated by people. In the study area also people from different religion, caste celebrate festivals from their own way. Many festivals like dashain, tihar, lhosar, jatra, holi, eid, etc. were celebrated in study area. The expenditure on festival in last year of respondent's households was presented in table 6.18.

Table 6.18 Expenditure on Festivals

| S.N. | Expenditure (in NRs.) | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | <30,000 | 4 | 17 |
| 2 | 30,000-49,999 | 15 | 43 |
| 3 | 50,000-69,999 | 58 | 33 |
| 4 | 70,000 & above | 23 | 7 |
| 5 | Average Expenditure | 60,920 | 43,930 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.18 shows that the average expenditure on festival in last year was Rs. 60,920 of migrant household and that of non-migrant household was Rs. 43,930. The average expenditure on festivals was more in migrant household shows that the remittance income affects the celebration of festivals. In the study area people think expenses more money in festival determined their standard of life. In the study area in the name of festival large amount of remittance was used in unproductive sector.

6.2.5 Expenditure on Transportation

In the study area people use means of transportation for their busy life. Means of transportation is being used by all households in the study area. From the study migrant household spent more money than non-migrant household. The expenditure on transportation includes bus, aero planes, taxi, motorcycle, etc. and their maintenance cost, diesel, fuel, petrol etc. The expenditure on transportation on both migrant and non-migrant households in last year was shown in table 6.19.

Table 6.19 Expenditure on Transportation

| S.N. | Expenditure (in NRs.) | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|-------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | <10,000 | 5 | 18 |
| 2 | 10,000-19,999 | 20 | 38 |
| 3 | 20,000-29,999 | 40 | 33 |
| 4 | 30,000 & above | 35 | 11 |
| 5 | Average Expenditure | 25,990 | 20,970 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.19 shows that the average expenditure on transportation of migrant household was Rs. 25,990 and that of non-migrant household was Rs. 20,970. The average expenditure on transportation of migrant household is more because of remittance. Most migrant household spent their money for petrol, diesel because most migrant household use motorbike, scooter for means of transportation. The remittance income has positive impact on transportation.

6.2.6 Expenditure on Education

Another source for household expenditure is education. In the study area the expenditure on education like school fee, dress, book, pen, bag, pen, copy, meal, etc. is more of migrant household. In the study area migrant children are seeking for good and quality education which can secure their better future. People are seeking private school for quality education according to their income level. The expenditure on education of migrant and non-migrant households is shown in table 6.20.

Table 6.20 Expenditure on Education

| S.N. | Expenditure (in NRs.) | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|-------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | <20,000 | 6 | 20 |
| 2 | 20,000-39,999 | 13 | 24 |
| 3 | 40,000-49,999 | 33 | 26 |
| 4 | 50,000 & above | 48 | 30 |
| 5 | Average Expenditure | 49,710 | 36,750 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.20 shows that the average expenditure on education of migrant household is Rs. 49,710 and that of non-migrant household is Rs. 36,750. Migrant household had more expenditure on education than non-migrant household because through remittance receiving families can increase income so, naturally they can be able to provide family members with better and sophisticate education which some families cannot afford without remittance and it is well known that socio-economic condition of families is immensely affected by education. Migrant family member's children were sent to private school and hostel, day hostel. Some of the migrant worker's children live in urban area where their children are getting education in Government school. This shows that the expenditure on schooling of children was affected by remittance income. Remittance income improves the quality of children education.

6.2.7 Expenditure on Health Care

In the study area migrant household spent more money than non-migrant household for health care. Health care includes regular health check up, hygienic food, treatment, exercise etc. Health is basic need for all. Expenditure on health care of both migrant and non-migrant household is last year was shown in table 6.21.

Table 6.21 Expenditure on Health Care

| S.N. | Expenditure (in NRs.) | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|-------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | <10,000 | 3 | 11 |
| 2 | 10,000-19,999 | 11 | 35 |
| 3 | 20,000-39,999 | 25 | 21 |
| 4 | 40,000-59,999 | 26 | 17 |
| 5 | 60,000 & above | 35 | 16 |
| 6 | Average Expenditure | 47,140 | 31,150 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.21 average expenditure of migrant household on health care was Rs. 47,140 and that of health care was Rs. 31,150. The average expenditure of health care of migrant household is more than that of non-migrant household. Migrant household spent more income on health care because of remittance income. Remittance income increases the purchasing power so they seek for good health. Remittance income has positive impact on health care.

6.2.8 Expenditure on Information and Communication

Information and communication is also another part of expenditure. Means of information and communication used in the study area are mobile phone, telephone, television, telex, internet, email, fax, expenditure on newspaper were included in this section. The expenditure on information was directly related with income of the household. Due to remittance the purchasing power of household had increased so they spent more amounts on information and communication. The expenditure on information and communication of respondent's household of last year was presented in table 6.22.

Table 6.22 Expenditure on Information and Communication

| S.N. | Expenditure (in NRs.) | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | <10,000 | 7 | 28 |
| 2 | 10,000-19,999 | 36 | 53 |
| 3 | 20,000-29,999 | 45 | 15 |
| 4 | 30,000 & above | 13 | 4 |
| 5 | Average Expenditure | 24,460 | 15,350 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.22 shows that the average household expenditure on information and communication in last year of migrant household was Rs. 24,460 and that of Non-migrant household was Rs. 15,350. The average expenditure on information and communication of migrant household is more than non-migrant household. Remittance income was used to increase people to access on information and communication this is because of more number of migrant people use computer, laptop, internet, mobile to communicate.

6.2.9 Expenditure on House Repairing

Frequent construction and repair of house indicates a decent status and living standard. So, it is needed to know whether the household increase or decrease this cost with the inflow of construction. In this section expenditure on house repair of both migrant and non-migrant household was included. Expenditure on house repair of both migrant and non-migrant household in last year was shown in table 6.23.

Table 6.23 Expenditure on House Repairing

| S.N. | Expenditure (in NRs.) | No. of Migrant Households | No of Non-migrant Households |
|------|----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1 | <10,000 | 7 | 15 |
| 2 | 10,000-19,999 | 12 | 7 |
| 3 | 20,000-29,999 | 21 | 8 |
| 4 | 30,000 & above | 20 | 10 |
| 5 | Average Expenditure | 33,130 | 25,425 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.23 shows that out of 100 respondents 60 migrant household had spent on house repair and 40 non-migrant household had spent on house repair during last year. The average expenditure on house repair of migrant household was Rs. 33,130 and that of non-migrant household was Rs. 25,425. The average expenditure on house repair of migrant household is more than non-migrant household was due to remittance income has positive impact on remittance.

6.2.10 Expenditure on Pilgrims

Pilgrims was another title for household expenditure. In the study area most people goes Haridwar, Ugratara, Khaptad, Godawari, Ghoda ghodi lake, etc. for pilgrims and some people goes Kathmandu for pilgrims. The expenditure on pilgrims of both migrant and non-migrant household of last year was shown in table 6.24.

Table 6.24 Expenditure on Pilgrims

| S.N. | Expenditure (in NRs.) | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | <5,000 | 3 | 7 |
| 2 | 5,000-9,999 | 5 | 18 |
| 3 | 10,000-14,999 | 12 | 8 |
| 4 | 15,000 & above | 20 | 7 |
| 5 | Average Expenditure | 10,950 | 10,175 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.24 shows that out of 100 respondents 40 household from migrant and 40 from non-migrant household had gone to pilgrims during last year. The average expenditure of migrant household on pilgrims was Rs. 10,950 and that of non-migrant household was Rs. 10,175. The average expenditure of migrant household on pilgrims is more than non-migrant household is due to remittance income. Remittance income had affected on pilgrims.

6.2.11 Durable Goods

In this research the questionnaire contains a question have you and your family member bought any durable goods during last year. The list of the durable goods is presented in table 6.25.

Table 6.25 Distribution of Durable Goods

| S.N. | Items | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|-------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | Car | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Two wheeler | 20 | 15 |
| 3 | Computer/Laptop | 5 | 2 |
| 4 | Solar energy | 7 | 3 |
| 5 | Washing machine | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | Telephone/Mobile phone | 40 | 35 |
| 7 | Cable/Dish | 15 | 9 |
| 8 | Inverter | 7 | 4 |
| 9 | Iron press | 6 | 3 |
| 10 | Gas/Stove | 10 | 7 |
| 11 | Jewelries | 5 | 4 |
| 12 | Refrigerator | 4 | 3 |
| 13 | Furniture | 10 | 6 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.25 shows that none of the respondents from migrant as well as non-migrant household had bought a car during last year. 20 migrant household had bought two wheelers like bike, cycle and 15 non-migrant household had bought two wheelers. 4 migrant household bought refrigerator and 3 non-migrant household had bought refrigerator. 5 migrant household had bought computer/laptop and 2 non-migrant household had bought computer/laptop. 7 migrant household had bought solar energy and 3 non-migrant household had bought solar energy. None of the migrant as well as non-migrant household has bought washing machine during last year. 40 migrant household had bought telephone/mobile phone and 15 migrant had bought cable dish and 9 non-migrant household had bought cable dish. 7 migrant household had bought inverter and 4 non-migrant household had bought inverter. Similarly, 6 migrant household had bought iron press and 3 non-migrant household had bought iron press. 10 migrant household had bought stove and 7 non-migrant household had bought gas stove during last year.

This research shows that people are interested in buying durable goods is increasing and most of the people are willing to buy durable goods due to its features. In the study area the numbers of car using households is less due to high cost and maintenance cost only few numbers of families are seen having car. Most of the people have two wheelers in the study area because this are used for the business purpose as well as saving the time. In the study area the mass number of people are using gas stove because concept of community forests wood are not easily available and the law are being strict.

6.2.12 Expenditure on Durable Goods

Goods such as car, two wheeler, refrigerator, computer, laptop, telephone, solar energy etc. were included in this section. The expenditure on durable goods was determined by income of both migrant and non-migrant household. The expenditure on durable goods of both migrant and non-migrant household was presented in table 6.26.

Table 6.26 Expenditure on Durable Goods

| S.N. | Expenditure (in NRs.) | No. of Migrant Households | No of Non-migrant Households |
|------|----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1 | <50,000 | 96 | 76 |
| 2 | 50,000-99,999 | 10 | 3 |
| 3 | 1,00,000-1,49,999 | 8 | 3 |
| 4 | 1,50,000-1,99,999 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 2,00,000 & above | 12 | 7 |
| 6 | Average Expenditure | 45,813 | 33,110 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.26 shows that the average expenditure on durable goods of migrant household was Rs. 45,813 and that of non-migrant household was Rs. 33,110 in last year. The average expenditure on durable goods of migrant household was more than that of non-migrant household. This title shows that there is more difference on expenditure on durable goods between two groups is due to remittance income.

6.2.13 Expenditure Pattern and Remittance

The expenditure pattern between migrant household and non-migrant household is included in this section. In the study area the average expenditure between migrant and non-migrant household is found different. To test the difference in household expenditure between migrant and non-migrant household mean difference test was applied. The following table shows that there is considerable difference in mean expenditure between those two groups of sample household in different expenditure items. The difference of average expenditure is shown in table 6.27.

Table 6.27 Expenditure Difference between Categories of Sample Household

| S.N. | Expenditure Items | Migrant Households | | Non-migrant Households | | Mean Difference |
|------|-------------------------------|--------------------|-------------|------------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| | | n1 | \bar{x}_1 | n2 | \bar{x}_2 | |
| 1 | Clothing | 100 | 49,930 | 100 | 37,190 | 12,720 |
| 2 | Food | 100 | 73,900 | 100 | 63,500 | 10,400 |
| 3 | Alcohol | 80 | 41,283 | 88 | 26,306 | 14,977 |
| 4 | Festival | 100 | 60,920 | 100 | 43,930 | 16,990 |
| 5 | Transportation | 100 | 25,990 | 100 | 20,970 | 5,020 |
| 6 | Education | 100 | 49,710 | 100 | 36,750 | 12,960 |
| 7 | Health care | 100 | 47,140 | 100 | 31,150 | 16,260 |
| 8 | Information and communication | 100 | 24,460 | 100 | 15,350 | 9,110 |
| 9 | House repair | 100 | 33,133 | 100 | 25,425 | 7,708 |
| 10 | Pilgrimage | 60 | 10,950 | 40 | 10,175 | 775 |
| 11 | Durable goods | 100 | 45,813 | 100 | 33,101 | 12,712 |
| 12 | Total | 100 | 4,63,229 | 100 | 3,43,847 | 1,19,382 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017*.

n1 and n2 Means the number of migrant and non-migrant sample households. x_1 and x_2 indicates the mean expenditure of migrant and non-migrant household respectively.

Table 6.27 shows that the difference in mean household expenditure on different expenditure item found to be highly significant statistically. From this result it can be concluded that remittance has been influential to change the food and non-food

expenditure as education, clothing, health, information and durable goods from this table it can be concluded that remittance had significant impact on household expenditure. It also is notable that remittance income has changed the livelihood among the sample household in the study area.

6.3 Financial Statement

The financial activities of respondents or the individual households are determined by their household income. The financial activities like as bank deposit, insurance of individual household was included in this section. The comparative study of financial activities of migrant and non-migrant household was shown below.

6.3.1 Saving

The questionnaire contains a question about have you had any saving of you and your family member and where does you save your money if you have saved it. The status of saving is shown in table 6.28.

Table 6.28 Distribution of Saving

| S.N. | Heading | No. of Migrant Households | No of Non-migrant Households |
|------|----------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1 | At home | 30 | 27 |
| 2 | At bank | 20 | 15 |
| 3 | At cooperative | 5 | 3 |
| 4 | Others | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | Total | 55 | 45 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.28 shows that out of 100 migrant households 30 migrant household had saving their money at home, 20 household had at bank, and 5 household at cooperative and rest 45 household had no saving. Accordingly, among 100 non-migrant household only 27 household had save their money at home, 15 at bank, 3 at cooperative and rest 55 household had no saving.

6.3.2 Insurance

The questionnaire contains a question about have you had any life insurance of you and your family member and how much insurance premium do you paid per month. The status of insurance is presented in table 6.29.

Table 6.29 Distribution of Household Insurance

| S.N. | Heading | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|-------------|----------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | Life insurance | 42 | 32 |
| 2 | Total | 42 | 32 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.29 shows that out of 100 migrant household 42 household had life insurance and rest of 58 household had no life insurance. Similarly, out of 100 non-migrant household only 32 household had life insurance and rest 68 household had no life insurance. More number of migrant household had life insurance means that some part of remittance income was used for social security.

The payment of insurance premium of individual household was presented in table 6.30.

Table 6.30 Distribution of Insurance Premium

| S.N. | Premium (in NRs.) | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|-------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | <500 | 20 | 15 |
| 2 | 500-999 | 11 | 9 |
| 3 | 1,000-1,499 | 8 | 6 |
| 4 | 1,500 & above | 5 | 2 |
| 5 | Average Premium | 936 | 769 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.30 shows that 20 migrant and 15 non-migrant household paid Rs. 0-500 per month. 11 migrant and 9 non-migrant household had paid monthly premium of Rs. 500-1,000, 8 migrant and 6 non-migrant household paid Rs. 1,000-1,500. Similarly, 5 migrant and 2 non-migrant household paid more than Rs. 1,500. The average payment

of migrant household was Rs. 936 and that of non-migrant household was Rs.769 per month.

6.4 Investment

Investment of the individual household is the important source of capital formation. Investment of the individual is determined by the income level. In this section the investment on different sectors are included. Investment is also the source of income in the study area. In this research the questionnaire contains a question about have you and your family have any investment during last year and if you have invested the status of investment is shown in table 6.31.

Table 6.31 Distribution of Household Investment

| S.N. | Heading | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | Real state | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Share, Debenture | 2 | 1 |
| 3 | Ornaments/jewelries | 5 | 3 |
| 4 | Loan to needed people | 6 | 4 |
| 5 | Small business | 9 | 6 |
| 6 | Agriculture farm | 19 | 16 |
| 7 | Others | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | Total | 41 | 30 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.31 shows that out of 100 households of migrant households only 41 households had been able to invest their income. Similarly, 30 Non-migrant households had been able to invest their income. The number of migrant household who invest is more is due to remittance income. None of migrant household and non-migrant household had invested in real state. 2 migrant household had invested on share and debenture and 1 non-migrant household had invest on share and debenture. 5 migrant household had invested on ornaments and jewelries and 3 non-migrant household had invested on ornaments and jewelries. 6 migrant household and 3 non-migrant household invest on giving loan to needed people. 9 migrant household had invested on running small business and 4 non-migrant household had invested on

running small business. Similarly, 19 migrant household had invested on agricultural farm and 15 non-migrant household had invested on agricultural farm. In the study area more people are interested in investing their income in agricultural farm is because of short run profit and people have more skill than other fields of investment people of this area are unfamiliar to the share/debenture. Less number of household are investing in the field like Real state, share, and debenture is due to lack of knowledge and Risk. People are also not investing in giving loan to needed people is due to the people access of bank and merchant takes more interest from the loan needed people. Remittance had played a positive role for investment.

6.4.1 Investment Amount

In this study Investment like Real state, Share Debenture, Ornament/jewelries, Loan to needed people, Small business, Agricultural farms are included. Obviously the migrant household had more income to invest than that of non-migrant household. So the annual investment amount of migrant household was more than that of non-migrant household. The Investment amount of both household was shown in table 6.32.

Table 6.32 Investment Amount

| S.N. | Investment Amount (in NRs.) | No of Migrant Households | No of Non-migrant Households |
|------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1 | <50,000 | 7 | 6 |
| 2 | 50,000-99,999 | 15 | 8 |
| 3 | 1,00,000-1,99,999 | 14 | 12 |
| 4 | 2,00,000 & above | 5 | 4 |
| 5 | Average Investment | 1,17,171 | 88,166 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.32 shows that out of 100 respondents only 41 migrant household had invested their income and 30 non-migrant household had invested their income. The average investment amount of migrant household was Rs. 1,17,171 and that of non-migrant household was Rs. 88,166 in last year. The average investment amount of migrant household was more than that of non-migrant household. This shows that there is more difference on investment amount between two groups.

6.5 Household Health

Health is one of the important basic needs. Health is essential for all and its role has great impact on socio-economic status of the people. In the study area one question was asked whether their household member got any health problem during last year. Their answer is presented in table 6.33.

Table 6.33 Household Health Problem during last year

| S.N. | Health Problem | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|------|----------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | Yes | 21 | 25 |
| 2 | No | 79 | 75 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.33 shows that out of 100 respondents 21 migrant household had health problem and 25 non-migrant household had health problem. In the study area mostly communicable disease had occur during last year. It is because of pollution, unsafe drinking water, polluted environment, uneducated people, etc.

6.5.1 Household for Treatment

In this research it is found that most number of people choose private hospital for serious health problem some people are careless about their health. Some people still believes in dhami, jhankri in the study area. Household gone for treatment for both migrant as well as non-migrant household was shown in table 6.34.

Table 6.34 Household for Treatment

| S.N. | Place | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | Government service/Hospital | 8 | 17 |
| 2 | Private Hospital | 9 | 2 |
| 3 | Pharmacy | 4 | 4 |
| 4 | Dhami/Jhankri | 0 | 2 |
| 5 | Total | 21 | 25 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.34 shows that 8 migrated household had gone to Government service/hospital for treatment and 17 non-migrated household had gone to Government service/hospital. 9 migrated household had gone to private hospital for treatment and 2 non-migrated household had gone to private hospital for treatment. 4 migrated household had gone to pharmacy for treatment and 4 non-migrated household had gone to pharmacy for treatment. Similarly, none of the migrant household gone to dhami/jhankri for treatment and 2 non-migrated household had gone to dhami/jhankri for treatment. In the study area non-migrant household are choosing more Government hospital due to cheap service provided and migrated household are choosing private hospital for treatment is because of remittance income and there is positive relationship between remittance income and treatment.

6.5.2 Money Spent on Treatment

In the study area migrated household spent more money than non-migrated household for treatment. Migrated household has more money than non-migrated household for the purpose of treatment. The money spent on treatment of both migrated household as well as non-migrated household during last year was listed below in table 6.35.

Table 6.35 Money Spent on Treatment

| S.N. | Expenditure (in NRs.) | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | <500 | 1 | 12 |
| 2 | 500-999 | 2 | 5 |
| 3 | 1,000-1,499 | 5 | 3 |
| 4 | 1,500-1,999 | 8 | 3 |
| 5 | 2,000 & above | 5 | 2 |
| 6 | Average Expenditure | 2,566 | 856 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.35 shows that the average expenditure on treatment of migrated household is Rs. 2,566 and that of average expenditure on treatment of non-migrated household is Rs. 856. The average expenditure on treatment of migrated household is more than that of non-migrated household. This study shows that migrated household is

spending more income for treatment for better result. Hence, remittance income has positive impact on treatment.

6.6 Household Education

Education is the essential basic needs of human beings. In this section number of children who had gone to school, level of education like primary, lower secondary, secondary, plus two and higher education. Categorization of educational institution and annual expenditure of last year was included.

6.6.1 Number of School Going Children

In the study area nowadays it is found that more number of children is joining the school for education and this number are increasing. There is positive thinking about increasing towards the people of this research area. The number of children's who go to school for both migrated and non-migrated household was listed in below table 6.36.

Table 6.36 Number of School Going Children

| S.N. | No. of Children | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | One | 10 | 7 |
| 2 | Two | 52 | 23 |
| 3 | Three | 30 | 51 |
| 4 | Four | 8 | 19 |
| 5 | Average Schooling Children | 2.36 | 2.82 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.36 shows that the average schooling children of migrant household is 2.36 and average schooling children of non-migrant household is 2.82. 10 migrated household had one member who goes to school and 7 non-migrated household had one member who goes to school. 52 migrated household had two members who goes to school and 23 non-migrated household had two members who goes to school. 30 migrated household had three members who go to school and 51 non-migrated household had three members who goes to school. Similarly, 8 migrated household

had four members who goes to school and 19 non-migrated household had four members who goes to school. Form the study it is known that in migrant household mostly two children goes to school and similarly, in non-migrant household mostly three children goes to school. This is due to in migrant household mostly they live in nuclear family.

6.6.2 Level of Education

Level of education includes primary, lower secondary, secondary, plus two and higher education. In the study area migrant household students are less in secondary level, plus two and higher education is because of leaving their study for foreign employment. The level of education of both migrant and non-migrant household is shown in table 6.37.

Table 6.37 Level of Education

| S.N. | Level | No. of Migrant Households | No. of Non-migrant Households |
|-------------|------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | Primary | 29 | 11 |
| 2 | Lower secondary | 44 | 35 |
| 3 | Secondary | 10 | 30 |
| 4 | Plus two | 12 | 23 |
| 5 | Higher education | 5 | 11 |
| 6 | Total | 100 | 100 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.37 shows that 29 students from migrant household and 11 students from non-migrant household were in primary level. 44 students from migrant household and 35 students from non-migrant household were in lower secondary level. 10 students from migrant household and 30 students from non-migrant household were in secondary level. 12 students from migrant household and 23 students from non-migrant household were in plus two. Similarly, 5 students from migrant household and 11 students from non-migrant household were in higher education. From the research it is known that after secondary level the number of students is low because of foreign employment. Remittance income has affected higher education of migrant household.

6.6.3 Categorization of Educational Institutions

From the research it is found that most number of students from migrant household prefer to go private school. The categorization of educational institution of both migrant and non-migrant household is shown in table 6.38.

Table 6.38 Categorization of Educational Institutions

| S.N. | Member | Migrant Households | | | Non-migrant Households | | |
|------|--------------|--------------------|-----------|---------|------------------------|-----------|---------|
| | | Government | Community | Private | Government | Community | Private |
| 1 | Son | 9 | 25 | 45 | 17 | 20 | 25 |
| 2 | Daughter | 1 | 8 | 12 | 19 | 14 | 5 |
| 3 | Total | 10 | 33 | 57 | 36 | 34 | 30 |

Source: *Field Survey, 2017.*

Table 6.38 shows that most number of migrant household had joined private school and most number of non-migrant household member had joined Government school. The more number of migrant members had joined private school because of the remittance income. More remittance income is used in educational sector for the betterment of their family members due to the increment in purchasing power from the remittance more peoples is investing their money in technical education. In the study the number of private school joining family member from migrant household is increasing day by day. Thus, there is positive relationship between remittance income and education.

CHAPTER: SEVEN

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Summary of Findings

The prime objective of this study is to assess the impact of remittance income in the study area. This study also attempts to find out the impact of remittance income on consumption, expenditure, financial transaction, investment pattern.

To fulfill the objective of the study, Attariya municipality of Kailali district was selected and 100 sample surveys were conducted during 2017. The sample size was 100 respondents from migrated households and 100 respondents from non-migrated households were chosen from the study area. The primary data was collected through questionnaire and interview. Some secondary data was used from office of Attariya municipality. Some secondary data was used from published by CBS, Economic survey of Ministry of Finance and other Government office, published data like previous thesis and Journals. Data were presented in table and analyzed by using simple statistical tools like average, percentage and mean difference.

7.2 Conclusion

- About 35 of the employees joined in foreign employment due to low income in home land. 30 employees were abroad due to attractive salary. Similarly, 25 employees were in abroad due to influence by returns from foreign employment and rest 7 and 3 employees were in abroad due to for repaying the debt and conflict.
- The main destination of Nepalese workers are Gulf Countries like Saudi Arabia, UAE, Bahrain, Qatar and other preferred Country were Malaysia, South Korea and USA.
- The economic status of 49 migrant households was lower, 40 households was middle and 30 households were upper before joining foreign employment.
- Nearly, half of the respondents were Janajati, 27 were Chhetri and rest was Brahmin and Dalit.

- Out of 200 respondents 15 were literate, 78 were passed lower secondary level, 55 were passed secondary level, 30 were passed plus two level and 22 were passed higher level education.
- The average land holding size of migrant households was 34.3 Kattha and non-migrant households was 38.8 Kattha.
- More migrant households bought land during last 2 year.
- The average annual income of migrant households from different agricultural and non- agricultural sources is more than that of non-migrant households.
- The average annual expenditure of migrant household on heading is more than that of non-migrant household. The statistics shows that the household expenditure is positively associated with remittance income.
- 42 migrant and 32 non-migrant household had life insurance.
- The average monthly insurance premium of migrant households is more than that of non-migrant households.
- The average Bank balance of migrant households is more than that of non-migrant households. This shows that there is significant impact of remittance on Bank balance.
- More number of migrant households had used information related items like television, radio, telephone, computer, laptop etc.
- 100 percent of both groups used mobile phone and telephone.
- More number of migrant households used computer, inverter, motorbike, refrigerator, solar energy etc.
- 73 migrant and 27 non-migrant households earned remittance income from individual employees and joint employees.
- The average schooling children of migrant households is 2.36 and that of 2.82 in non-migrant households.

7.3 Recommendations

- Mostly unskilled and semi-skilled workers go to foreign employment so they involve in different work. They are low paid it leads to the low level of remittance so; Government must provide the technical skill and orientation classes to the migrant workers before joining to the foreign employment. New

and effective policy should be made to identify the new potential destination and create better opportunities.

- Theoretical education must be replaced by technical education for increment the skill of the youth for better opportunities.
- There is increment of active population migration to Foreign Countries even rural areas are also becoming youth less day by day. It might be harmful for economical, social, political, environmental aspect to get relief from this, we should create employment opportunities in home Country.
- Lack of modern, scientific, quality education and opportunities are main problem for backward caste and ethnic groups so special package and program needed to carry out for addressing them.
- Many workers are compelled to go foreign employment. There must be a suitable environment (social, political and economic) to stay in home Country.
- Government should make special program for those migrants who had complete their foreign job. Their earning skill and resources might be beneficiary for nation.
- Government of Nepal has legally opened 110 Countries in number for the Nepalese workers but, most of the workers are concentrated to the Gulf Countries and Malaysia. The workers of this destination cannot earn sufficient income than other destination like Japan, Hong Kong, Korea etc. So, the Ministry of Nepal should be make new policy to identify new destination and create opportunities to go these destination.
- Nepalese economy has received large amount of remittance but, remittance are still being transferred through informal channel. Former channel should be promoted. At least one formal institution must be established to facilitate transfer remittance in each destination.
- Most of the Nepalese people have come from rural areas and low income level. Therefore, Government should make favorable policy to facilitate them by providing loan in minimum interest rates.

- In rural areas remittance should be utilize in productive sector so that their family need not to go abroad respectively.
- Dead body of foreign migrants entering in international airport every day without any compensation from employee office, which is major problem of foreign employment so, Government should take immediate action to avoiding this problem.
- Brain drain is major problem to Country like Nepal. To get rid out of this Government should provide golden opportunities for educated people.
- Effective economic diplomacy should be implemented for the Government to increase the demand of labor in the foreign labor market.
- Remittance has given positive impact on household economic indicators but, this is not satisfactory. Maximum part of the remittance has been used in unproductive sectors like purchase of land, ornaments, alcohol consumption, festivals, marriage ceremony etc. Thus, the policy should be made to give more information to the respondents using their remittance into productive sector and should be given more opportunities to them in using their newly learnt skill.
- Most of the respondents have not utilized their remittance and newly learnt skill when they came back home so policy should be made to compulsory investment to the national level.
- Government of Nepal should ensure safety for migrant people in Foreign Countries.

REFERENCES

- Ale, L. (2004). *International Labor Migration: A case study of pudibhudi vdc, Kaski* . Kathmandu: An unpublished M.A thesis submitted to central department of Geography, Tribhuvan University.
- Bhatta, P. D. (2015) *Financial Literacy and productive use of remittance in Nepal: A case study of Dhangadhi municipality of Kailali District*. Kirtipur: Unpublished Thesis of M.A., Central Department of Economics.
- Bhattarai, P.P. (2010). *Study of Foreign Employment and Remittance: A case study of Urlabari VDC, Morang*. Unpublished M.A thesis submitted to Central Department of Economics, T.U.
- Chaudhary, I.A. (2014). *Impact of remittance on socio-economic condition of Bangladesh. Innovative Issues and Approaches in social Science* vol.7, No. 3.
- CBS (2011). *Population Census National Report*, Central Bureau of Statistics, GON.
- Elglama, A. (2009). The economics of remittances: The theories and issues. *A paper presented at the Regional High- Level Seminar on International Remittance for economic development*, 9-13 March 2009, Banjul, Gambia.
- IMF.(1993). *Balance of Payment* . Washington D.C: International Monetary Fund .
- Kansakar, V. (1993). *Migration and Rural development*. Kathmandu: CEDA, T.U .
- Karna, S.K. (2008). *The Remittance economy towards building a strong economic nation state. Nepalese Journal of Development and rural studies*. Central department of rural development, Tribhuban University.
- Karna, S.K. (2017). Labor Migration and Remittance inflows In R.P. Gyanwaly (Ed.) *Political economy of Nepal* (pp.137-172) Kathmandu: fridrich Ebert Stiftung.
- Khatiwada, P. (2017). *Remittance and its channelization into productive sector in Angkhop VDC of Taplejung district*. Unpublished master's thesis in economics Central Department of Economics, Tribhuvan University, Kirtipur. .

- Lewis, W. (1954). *Economic Growth with Unlimited Supply of Labor*. Ministry School Vol. 22, 139-191.
- MOF (2016). *Economics survey, FY 2015/16*.GON, MOF.
- MOF (2017). *Economics survey, FY 2016/17*.GON, MOF.
- MOLE (2017). *Economics survey, FY 2016/17*.GON, Ministry of Labor and Employment.
- Nepal Rastra Bank (2008). *Study of Remittance receiving in Nepal from India*, Based on Survey in New Delhi, Kathmandu.
- Nepal Rastra Bank (2012). *Impact Evaluation of Remittance: A case study of Dhanusha District*, Janakpur Nepal. Nepal Rastra Bank, Banking Development Unit.
- Panta, B., & Budha, B. B. (2016). *Remittances and Exchange Rate Linkages: Experiences of Nepal*. NRB Working Paper No. 33. Kathmandu: Nepal Rastra Bank.
- Para. 40. Addis Abba Action Agenda. *The third international conference on financing development 2015*.
- Pathak, S. (2016). *Net benefit from foreign employment in Nepal: A case study of Thansing VDC of Nuwakot District*. Kirtipur: Unpublished Thesis of M.A., Central Department of Economics.
- Rajkarnikar, R. (2009). *Socio-Economic Contribution of Foreign Employment: A case study of siddipur VDC Lalitpur District*. Kathmandu: An unpublished M.Phil. thesis submitted to CEDECON, Tribhuvan University.
- Revenstein, E. (1985). The Laws of Migration. *Journal of Royal Statistical Society* Vol 7.
- Russel, S. S. (1995) International Migration; Implication for the World Bank' *HRO working Paper*
- Seddon, D. (2000). Foreign Labor Employment and Remittance Economy: The core of Nepal . *The Economic Journal of Nepal* .

Sharma, H. (2006). *Explaining the Remittance Behavior and the Role of Remittance in the GDP Growth in Nepal*, Retrieved from www.kepe.gr on March 8.

Sherpa, D. (2011). *Labour Migration and Remittances in Nepal*. Nepal: ICIMOD.

Shrestha, B. (2008). "Contribution of Foreign Employment and Remittances to Nepalese Economy", *Economic Review*, No. 20. P 1-15

Todaro, M.P. (1976). *International Migration in Development Countries: A Review of Theory, Evidence, Methodology and Research priorities*. Geneva: ILO.

UN Report. (2016). India top remittance receiving Country in 2016. *Indian Express*

The World Bank. (2016). *Bilateral estimates of migrants stocks in 2013*, Washington DC. The World Bank.

The World Bank. (2016). *Migration and Remittances Fact Book 2016*, Washington DC. The World Bank.

Retrieved from

www.mof.gov.np

www.nepalnews.com

APPENDIX-A

Questionnaire for Remittance Receiving Households

This questionnaire has been prepared in order to collect information for the study entitled **Impact of Foreign Employment and Remittance in Socio-economic Status: A Case Study of Attariya Municipality of Kailali District**. The study or research will be carried out under the guidance of prof. Dr .Sohan Kumar Karna, central department of economics, T.U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu. What I have hoped is you all the respondents with whom I requested to give your precious ideas or information will kindly co-operate with me to fill this questionnaire. Your data or information or ideas will be invaluable to accomplish this thesis study.

Name of Respondents:.....

Address:

Date:

Researcher

Uttam Kunwar

A. GENERAL INFORMATION OF RESPONDENTS

1. Name:.....
2. Age:.....Year
3. Sex: A. Male B. Female
4. Qualification:.....
5. Caste:.....
6. No. of Family Members:.....
7. No. of Dependent:.....
8. Occupation Before:.....
A. Yes B. No
If Yes
9. Access of Housing Facilities.
- 9.1 Condition of House
A. Made with Rod, Concrete and Cement (RCC)
B. Made with Stone, Mud with Roof of Tin and Slate
C. Made with Stone, Mud and Timber with Thatched Roof
- 9.2 Types of Toilet
A. Toilet with Flush B. Toilet without Flush
C. Communal Toilet D. No Toilet Facility.
- 9.3 Sources of Drinking Water
A. Well B. Hand pump C. Tap D. Others.....
10. Landholding Size
A. Own Land.....
B. Rental Land.....
11. Food Sufficiency from Own Land
A. Less than 3 Month B. 3-6 Month C. 6-9 Month
D. 9-12 Month E. Left for Sale
12. How many Members of your Household Joined in Foreign Employment?

| S.N. | Name | Employed Country | Relation with Head of Household |
|------|------|------------------|---------------------------------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

13. Reason for Foreign Employment

- A. Due to Low Income in Homeland
 - B. Due to Attractive Salary
 - C. Influenced by Returnees from Foreign Employment
 - D. For Repaying the Debt
 - E. Conflict
 - F. If Other
14. Economic condition of household before foreign employment.
- A. Lower Income Level(Yearly Income is not Enough for Subsistence of Family)
 - B. Medium Level (Yearly Income Maintains Subsistence Level of Expenditure)
 - C. Upper Level (Yearly Income is Greater than Expenditure)
15. Sources of Money for Foreign Employment.
- A. From Own Sources
 - B. From bank
 - C. From Merchant/Money Lender
 - D. From Selling Various Things Including Land.
 - E. Others.....

B. HOUSE HOLD INCOME

16. Farm Income of Last One Year.
- A. Food Crops Rs.....
 - B. Cash Crops Rs.....
 - C. Vegetables Rs.....
 - D. Fruits Rs.....
 - E. Animal Products Rs.....
17. Non-farm Income of Last One Year
- A. Wage Rs.....
 - B. Small Business Rs.....
 - C. Rent Rs.....
 - D. Private Jobs Rs.....
 - E. Government Salary Rs.....
 - F. Others Rs.....
18. Remittance Income
- Your Families Total Remittance Income of Last Year
- A. Individual Rs.....
 - B. Joint Income Rs.....

C. HOUSEHOLD EXPENDITURE

19. Your Families Total Expenditure of Last Year

- A. Clothing Rs.....
- B. Fooding Rs.....
- C. Alcohol Rs.....
- D. Festival Rs.....
- E. Transportation Rs.....
- F. Education Rs.....
- G. Health Care Rs.....
- H. Information and Communication Rs.....
- I. House Repairing Rs.....
- J. Pilgrims Rs.....
- K. Others. Rs.....

D. EXPENDITURE ON DURABLE GOODS

20. Did You Bought the Following Durable Goods Last Year?

- A. Yes
- B. No

If Yes Specify

| List | Yes | No | Amount |
|---------------------------|-----|----|---------|
| A. Car | | | Rs..... |
| B. Two Wheelers | | | Rs..... |
| C. Refrigerator | | | Rs..... |
| D. Computer/Laptop | | | Rs..... |
| E. Solar Energy | | | Rs..... |
| F. Washing machine | | | Rs..... |
| G. Telephone/Mobile phone | | | Rs..... |
| H. Cable/Dish | | | Rs..... |
| I. Inverter | | | Rs..... |
| J. | | | Rs..... |
| K. | | | Rs..... |
| L. | | | Rs..... |
| M. | | | Rs..... |

E. HOUSEHOLD SAVING

21. Have you been able to Save Your Money?
A. Yes B. No
22. Where do you keep the Money if you have Saved It?
A. At Home B. At Bank C. At Co-operatives D. Others.....
23. Do you have any Life Insurance?
A. Yes B. No
24. How much Insurance Premium do you Pay Per Month?
Rs.....

F. HOUSEHOLD INVESTMENT

25. Have you been able to invest your Money?
A. Yes B. No
- If yes, your family's total investment of last year
- A. Real estate Rs.....
- B. Share, Debenture Rs.....
- C. Ornaments/Jewelers Rs.....
- D. Loan to Needed People Rs.....
- E. Small Business Rs.....
- F. Agriculture Farm Rs.....
- G. Others Rs.....

G. HOUSEHOLD HEALTH

26. Does your any Family Member have Health Problem during Last Year?
A. Yes B. No
- If Yes what was the Health Problem?.....

27. Where does your Family go for Treatment?

| S.N. | Place | yes | No |
|------|-----------------------------|-----|----|
| 1 | Government service/Hospital | | |
| 2 | Private Hospital | | |
| 3 | Pharmacy | | |
| 4 | Dhami /Jhakri | | |

28. How much Money did you spend on Treatment (Last Year)?
Rs.....

H. HOUSEHOLD EDUCATION

29. No. of School Going Children

A. One B. Two C. Three D. Four

30. Level of Education

| S.N. | Level | Numbers |
|------|------------------|---------|
| 1 | Primary | |
| 2 | Lower Secondary | |
| 3 | Secondary | |
| 4 | +2 | |
| 5 | Higher Education | |

31. Categorization of Educational Institution and Annual Expenditure of Last Year

| Member | Government | Community | Private | Annual Expenditure |
|----------|------------|-----------|---------|--------------------|
| Son | | | | |
| Daughter | | | | |

I. OWNERSHIP OF ASSETS

32. Does your Household have the Following Items?

| List | Yes | No |
|--------------------|-----|----|
| A. Car | | |
| B. Bike | | |
| C. Refrigerator | | |
| D. Solar Energy | | |
| E. Washing Machine | | |
| F. Computer | | |
| G. Inverter | | |
| H. Telephone | | |
| I. Cable/ Dish | | |

Signature of Respondents

Thanks for your time, consideration and hospitality.

APPENDIX-B

Questionnaire for Non- Remittance Receiving Households

This questionnaire has been prepared in order to collect information for the study entitled **Impact of Foreign Employment and Remittance in Socio-Economic Status: A Case Study of Attariya Municipality of Kailali District**. The study or research will be carried out under the guidance of prof. Dr .Sohan Kumar Karna, central department of economics, T.U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu. What I have hoped is you all the respondent with whom I requested to give your precious ideas or information will kindly co-operate with me to fill this questionnaire. Your data or information or ideas will be invaluable to accomplish this thesis study.

Name of Respondents:.....

Address:

Date:

Researcher

Uttam Kunwar

A. GENERAL INFORMATION OF RESPONDENTS

1. Name:.....
2. Age:.....Year
3. Sex: A. Male B. Female
4. Qualification:.....
5. Caste:.....
6. No. of Family Members:.....
7. No. of Dependent:.....
8. Access of Housing Facilities .
- 8.1 Condition of House
 - A. Made with Rod, Concrete and Cement (RCC)
 - B. Made with Stone, Mud with Roof of Tin and Slate
 - C. Made with Stone, Mud and Timber with Thatched Roof
- 8.2 Types of Toilet
 - A. Toilet with Flush B. Toilet without Flush
 - C. Communal Toilet D. No Toilet Facility.
- 8.3 Sources of Drinking Water
 - A. Well B. Hand pump
 - C. Tap D. Others.....
9. Land Holding Size
 - A. Own Land.....
 - B .Rental Land
10. Food Sufficiency from Own Land
 - A. Less than 3 Month B. 3-6 Month C. 6-9 Month
 - D. 9-12 Month E. Left for Sale
- B. HOUSEHOLD INCOME**
11. Farm Income of Last One Year.
 - A. Food crops Rs.....
 - B. Cash crops Rs.....
 - C. Vegetables Rs.....
 - D. Fruits Rs.....
 - E. Animal Products Rs.....
- 12 Non-farm Income of Last One Year
 - A .Wage Rs.....
 - B. Small Business Rs.....

- C. Rent Rs.....
- D. Private Jobs Rs.....
- E. Government Salary Rs.....
- F. Others Rs.....

C. HOUSEHOLD EXPENDITURE

13. Your Families Total Expenditure of Last Year

- A. Clothing Rs.....
- B. Fooding Rs.....
- C. Alcohol Rs.....
- D. Festival Rs.....
- E. Transportation Rs.....
- F. Education Rs.....
- G. Health Care Rs.....
- H. Information and Communication Rs.....
- I. House Repairing Rs.....
- J. Pilgrims Rs.....
- K. Others.....

D. EXPENDITURE ON DURABLE GOODS

14. Did you Bought the Following Durable Goods Last Year?

- A. Yes
- B. No

If Yes Specify

| List | Yes | No | Amount |
|---------------------------|-----|----|---------|
| A. Car | | | Rs..... |
| B. Two Wheelers | | | Rs..... |
| C. Refrigerator | | | Rs..... |
| D. Computer/Laptop | | | Rs..... |
| E. Solar Energy | | | Rs..... |
| F. Washing Machine | | | Rs..... |
| G. Telephone/Mobile phone | | | Rs..... |
| H. Cable/Dish | | | Rs..... |
| I. Inverter | | | Rs..... |
| J. | | | Rs..... |
| K. | | | Rs..... |
| L. | | | Rs..... |
| M. | | | Rs..... |

E. HOUSEHOLD SAVING

15. Have you been able to save your Money?
A. Yes B. No
17. Where do you keep the Money if you have saved it?
A. At home B. At bank C. At co-operatives
D. Others.....
18. Do you have any Life Insurance?
A. Yes B. No
19. How much Insurance Premium do you pay per Month?
Rs.....

F. HOUSEHOLD INVESTMENT

20. Have you been able to invest your Money?
A. Yes B. No
- If yes, your family's total investment of last year
- A. Real estate Rs.....
- B. Share, Debenture Rs.....
- C. Ornaments/Jewelers Rs.....
- D. Loan to Needed People Rs.....
- E. Small Business Rs.....
- F. Agriculture Farm Rs.....
- G. Others. Rs.....

G. HOUSEHOLD HEALTH

21. Does your any Family Member have Health Problem during Last Yea?
A. Yes B. No
- If Yes what was the Health Problem?.....

22. Where does your Family Go for Treatment?

| S.N. | Place | Yes | No |
|------|-----------------------------|-----|----|
| 1 | Government Service/Hospital | | |
| 2 | Private hospital | | |
| 3 | Pharmacy | | |
| 4 | Dhami /Jhakri | | |

23. How much Money did you spend on Treatment (Last Year)? Rs.....

H. HOUSEHOLD EDUCATION

24. No. of School Going Children

A. One B. Two C. Three D. Four

25. Level of Education

| S. N. | Level | Numbers |
|-------|------------------|---------|
| 1 | Primary | |
| 2 | Lower secondary | |
| 3 | Secondary | |
| 4 | +2 | |
| 5 | Higher education | |

26. Categorization of Educational Institution and Annual Expenditure of Last Year

| Member | Government | Community | Private | Annual Expenditure |
|----------|------------|-----------|---------|--------------------|
| Son | | | | |
| Daughter | | | | |

I. OWNERSHIP OF ASSETS

27. Does your Households have the following Items?

| List | Yes | No |
|--------------------|-----|----|
| A. Car | | |
| B. Bike | | |
| C. Refrigerator | | |
| D. Solar Energy | | |
| E. Washing Machine | | |
| F. Computer | | |
| G. Inverter | | |
| H. Telephone | | |
| I. Cable/ Dish | | |

Signature of Respondents

Thanks for your time, consideration and hospitality.

