

**Asia Research Institute  
Working Paper Series No. 91**

**Migration and Social Development:  
A Family Perspective**

**Md Mizanur Rahman**

Department of Sociology  
National University of Singapore

mizan@nus.edu.sg

**July 2007**



The **ARI Working Paper Series** is published electronically by the Asia Research Institute of the National University of Singapore.

© Copyright is held by the author or authors of each Working Paper.

ARI Working Papers cannot be republished, reprinted, or reproduced in any format without the permission of the paper's author or authors.

**Note:** The views expressed in each paper are those of the author or authors of the paper. They do not necessarily represent or reflect the views of the Asia Research Institute, its Editorial Committee or of the National University of Singapore.

Citations of this electronic publication should be made in the following manner: Author, "Title," ARI Working Paper, No. #, Date, [www.nus.ari.edu.sg/pub/wps.htm](http://www.nus.ari.edu.sg/pub/wps.htm). For instance, Smith, John, "Ethnic Relations in Singapore," ARI Working Paper, No. 1, June 2003, [www.ari.nus.edu.sg/pub/wps.htm](http://www.ari.nus.edu.sg/pub/wps.htm).

#### **Asia Research Institute Editorial Committee**

Geoff Wade

Stephen Teo

Arianne Gaetano

Barbara Nowak

Valerie Yeo

#### **Asia Research Institute**

National University of Singapore

469A Tower Block #10-01,

Bukit Timah Road,

Singapore 259770

Tel: (65) 6516 3810

Fax: (65) 6779 1428

Website: [www.ari.nus.edu.sg](http://www.ari.nus.edu.sg)

Email: [arisec@nus.edu.sg](mailto:arisec@nus.edu.sg)

**The Asia Research Institute (ARI)** was established as a university-level institute in July 2001 as one of the strategic initiatives of the National University of Singapore (NUS). The mission of the Institute is to provide a world-class focus and resource for research on the Asian region, located at one of its communications hubs. ARI engages the social sciences broadly defined, and especially interdisciplinary frontiers between and beyond disciplines. Through frequent provision of short-term research appointments it seeks to be a place of encounters between the region and the world. Within NUS it works particularly with the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Business, Law and Design, to support conferences, lectures, and graduate study at the highest level.

## Migration and Social Development: A Family Perspective

**Md Mizanur Rahman**

---

Temporary labor migration is the predominant type of labor migration found in Asia, whereby millions of left-behind families are maintaining a better living in their home countries (Piper, 2004a). Such migration has its own dynamic relationship with the social relations that play a part in producing it because many migrants come and go at often regular intervals. The journey itself is significant as are the repeated interactions at destination worksites and, on return, in sending areas (Abril and Rogaly, 2001). Remittances and interactions among migrants as they travel, between migrant workers and others in the destination areas and back home are a source of development for families and communities of origin. The relationship between migration and development, that is, whether out-migration stimulates development or hinders development for sending countries, has been a prolific domain of migration research since the beginning of the debate in the 1970s (see Appleyard, 1989; Papademetriou and Martin, 1991; Hammer et al. 1997; Faist, 2000; Nyberg-Sorensen, Van Hear and Engberg-Pedersen, 2002; Hugo, 2003; Cohen, 2005; Parnwell, 2005; De Haas, 2005, 2007). The relationship has been referred to as an '*unsettled relationship*' (Papademetriou and Martin, 1991) or an '*unresolved relationship*' (Appleyard, 1992b) and most recently, a '*reciprocal relationship*' (de Haas, 2005).

Although the debate over the relationship is almost three decades old, most existing analyses still focus exclusively on economic development that overemphasizes economic growth, employment generation and increased productivity. Piper argues that the economist bias that characterizes much of the discourse on the migration-development nexus masks the potential for broader development implications of migration for the migrants and their families (Piper, forthcoming). Moreover, there is a clear lack of longitudinal research on the migration-development nexus not only in a distinctly Asian labor migration context but also in the global South. Existing studies, which are typically based on cross-sectional data, have not sufficiently looked at development as a process; therefore, they do not allow a glimpse into processual changes over time. Different types of migration have different impacts on the process of development in the sending countries and therefore, should be examined in disaggregation in order to understand the role that each specific type of migration actually

plays in the process of development. For instance, the developmental impact of migration for high-skilled, permanent migrants or diasporas in Europe or North America is supposed to be less than that for low-skilled and temporary labor migrants in Asia because despite their lower incomes, the latter group is much more oriented to their home countries.

This study attempts to advance the migration-development debate by emphasizing the role of migration in social development at the family level. More specifically, drawing on longitudinal data, this research documents the relationships between migration and development by showing how migration and resultant remittances create a condition that promotes human capital development, quality of life, social positioning, gender and intergenerational relations, and, last but not least, female empowerment. The paper attempts to push migration-development debates beyond the realm of economic development by a close consideration of family dynamics. Migration outcomes affect, first and foremost, families in third world countries (Pflegerl et al. 2003). This is because migrants are socialized to see the principles of ‘for the sake of the family’ at the cost of personal narrow interests. To them, remittance bears explicit social meaning and is “embedded in social relations of kinship” (Goldring, 2004: 820). Studies of migration have shown that any assessment of the impact of out-migration on sending communities cannot be understood outside of the context of the family in the developing world (Asis, 1995; Bjerer, 1997; Hugo, 2003; Massey et al. 1987; Wong et al, 2003).

Asis (2003: 105) maintains that the migration of individuals in the developing world is part and parcel of family strategies for survival or mobility. She emphasizes the impact of migration on Asian families in relation to sending and receiving countries. Yeoh et al also highlight that “the principle of ‘for the sake of the family’ or ‘all in the family’ – a principle which mobilizes family members to work towards common interests and is one of the mainstays of the ideology of Asian familialism – is clearly embedded in the Asian migration process” (Yeoh et al, 2002). As Grasmuck and Pessar (1991: 15) argue, “it is not individuals but households that mobilize resources and support, receive and allocate remittances, and make decisions about member’s production, consumption and distribution activities”. Therefore, this study deems it crucial to focus on the family as a unit of analysis for investigating the developmental potential of migration. However, in considering family, I take special interest in male out-migrants and their left behind wives, and younger men’s agency vis-à-vis older men.

My research is on male Bangladeshi low-skilled temporary migrant workers, who started their international wage employment in Singapore as unskilled migrant workers, especially in the construction industry. International migration has emerged as a location-specific phenomenon (Faist, 2000) and Bangladesh is not an isolated case in this regard (Rahman, 2004a). Most of the Bangladeshi migrants in Singapore hail from some selected districts in Bangladesh. Again, there are some villages in these districts from which most of the migrants originated. I have selected such a village, namely Gurail, under Tangail district in Bangladesh. Tangail is around 70 km away from Dhaka, the capital of Bangladesh. Gurail is home to a few hundred Singapore-sending migrants. Gurail reflects the general characteristics of a typical village in Bangladesh. Large-scale migration from Gurail to Singapore started mainly in the late 1990s. I first carried out ethnographic fieldwork in this village for my Ph.D. dissertation in 2001. During the survey period, I conducted a questionnaire survey among 50 migrant families, whose members were working in Singapore for one contract period, that is, two years or less than 2 years (but above 6 months). This was a purposive sampling.

This questionnaire survey had both structured and unstructured questions and was rich in information. One of the major objectives of this survey was to determine the impact of migration on the migrant families. I carried out a second questionnaire survey at the same village in 2006. I interviewed 50 selected migrant families with a migrant worker in Singapore for a period of more than two contract periods or at least 5 years. I acknowledge that I could not include all the 50 migrant families interviewed in 2001 during the 2006 survey. However, the 2006 survey covered the majority of the earlier respondent families. As the focus of the study was predominantly migrant families, I interviewed the wives of the male migrants overseas with a questionnaire having both structured and unstructured questions. Some detailed interviews with migrant families, especially senior members of migrant families and the left behind wives of migrants, was also carried out to help understand the family dynamics. However, I would like to acknowledge the fact that the duration of fieldwork was limited by financial and time constraints, and that this precluded more in-depth fieldwork.

The following section situates my research within the broader theoretical discussion of the migration-development nexus. Next, I describe temporary labor migration in Asia with special emphasis on Bangladeshi labor migration to Singapore. Then, I give the general characteristics of the two data samples followed by the empirical findings, with special regard

to migration and family dynamics. Finally, I discuss the social developmental implications of the research results.

### **THE MIGRATION-DEVELOPMENT NEXUS: THEORETICAL ISSUES**

The relationship between international migration and economic development in the home country has been traditionally explained from two contrasting theoretical approaches: the balanced growth approach's 'convergence point of view' and the asymmetrical growth approach's 'divergence point of view' (for details, see Fischer et al, 1997; Papademetriou and Martin, 1991; Spaan, et al. 2005; Hermele, 1997; Appleyard, 1992a, Battistella, 1992; Nyberg-Sorensen, 2004; Durand et al 1996; Massey and Parrado, 1994). The convergence school, rooted in neo-liberal economic theory, states that sending areas obtain major benefits from out-migration for their developmental process (Hermele, 1997). This approach primarily posits that emigration leads to an improvement in 'resource availability' and 'income distribution' in origin areas (Spaan et al. 2005). On the other hand, the divergence school argues that out-migration hinders development of the sending regions because it perpetuates a state of economic dependency that undermines the prospects for development (Hermele, 1997). Some scholars describe this situation as a "syndrome" (Reichert, 1981), "addiction" (Wiest, 1979) or a "dangerous dependency" (Stuart and Kearney, 1981).

Apart from these two perspectives, there exists a third approach called the 'time perspective'. According to this perspective, negative factors dominate the impact of migration in the short term, while positive factors will come to stimulate development in the long run (Russel et al. 1990; Appleyard, 1992b; Hermele, 1997). My study tends to fall within both the convergence and time perspectives. This study tends to support the convergence school because migration produces benefits for both migrants and their left-behind families in a substantial way. However, some of the benefits are not immediately tangible; they surface over time, for example, investment in human capital, social mobility outcome of migration or improved gender relations. Therefore, this study also espouses the time perspective. Thus far, the pioneers of the time perspective have mainly documented the potential of migration on economic development by showing "remittances, skill acquisition and higher agricultural productivity in the long run" (cited in Hermele, 1997: 140). My research highlights the impact of migration on social development by documenting social, cultural, political as well as economic implications of migration in the long run.



On the basis of levels of analysis, studies of migration outcomes can be organized into two groups: macro-level approaches and micro-level approaches (for detailed discussion, see Cohen, 2005). Macro-level approaches largely contemplate national outcomes, e.g., foreign exchanges and labour patterns (Taylor et al., 1996; Rivera-Batiz, 1982; Stinner et al. 1982; Adams, 1991; Pessar, 1991; Burki, 1991; Connell, 2003; Stahl, 2003) while micro-level approaches focus on the local effects of remittances (Islam, 1991; Hugo, 2006; Rahman, 2000, 2004a; Baker et al. 1997; Hansen, 2000; Madhavan, 1985; Helweg, 1983; De Jong et al., 2002; Roberts and Morris, 2003; Rudkin, 1993; Lopez and Seligson, 1991; Gamburd, 1995). Although macro-level approaches to migration outcomes tell us a great deal about national patterns and outcomes, they cannot help us to understand what remittances mean for migrant families and the migrants themselves. As Cohen (2005: 88) suggests, “micro-level approaches offer a vital alternative to the unidimensional approaches of the past”. My study is basically a micro-level study that focuses on migrant families in a predominantly migration source village.

In the 1990s, the term ‘remittance’, which generally means cash flow from destination country to home country, has been expanded to embrace non-economic dimensions and consequences of migration (Nyberg-Sorensen, 2004; Goldring, 2004). For example, Peggy Levitt (1998) has introduced a new concept, namely *social remittance* - a local-level migration-driven form of cultural diffusion (Levitt, 1996, 1998). By social remittance, Levitt means the ideas, practices, identities and social capital that are transmitted through the migration circuit mainly from destination country to sending country. Along with this concept, we also find some other related concepts referring to non-economic remittances, for instance, *technical or technological remittance* (Nichols, 2002), which emphasizes the importance of skills and technology brought back by returning migrants, *political remittance*, which emphasizes political identities, demands and practices associated with migration (Fitzgerald, 2000; Rivera-Salgado, 2000; Smith, 1998, cited in Goldring, 2004: 805).

We also notice an expansion of the category of economic remittances over time (see Goldring, 2004). For example, Durand (1994) identifies several types of remittances based on their uses, such as remittances as wages or salary, remittances as investment and remittances as capital (cited in Goldring, 2003). Apart from this classification of remittances, we also find two other sets of classifications of remittances in the existing literature: family and collective remittances; and family, collective and investment remittances (see Goldring, 1999, 2004).



While *family remittance* is linked to worker remittances, *collective remittance* is used to describe a longstanding practice on the part of the migrant organizations, popularly called Hometown Associations. It describes “money raised by a group that is used to benefit a group or community with which it is affiliated” (Goldring, 2004: 808). One of the guiding principles in the development of a typology of remittances is to show that each type of remittance has a particular developmental potential for sending countries. However, the consequences of migration in general and labor migration in particular for sending countries are complex; therefore, alliance to any particular type of remittance may in fact provide us with a distorted and partial picture.

In my study, I use the term ‘family remittance’, also known as ‘worker remittance’ (Goldring, 2004), to simply imply that this is workers’ remittances, usually destined for relatively poor rural regions that are most in need of financial capital. Such remittance goes directly to the people who really need it, bypassing costly bureaucracy and corrupt government officials on the sending side (Kapur, 2003: 7). As Jones (1998) notes, “there is probably no other more ‘bottom-up’ way of redistributing and enhancing welfare among populations in developing countries than the remittances” (cited in de Haas, 2005: 1277). However, the dominant but oversimplified assumption for family remittances is that such remittance is mostly used for recurrent family expenses such as ‘income’ and for ‘consumption’ leading to a “passive and dangerous dependency on remittances” (see De Haas, 2005). De Haas identifies seven migration myths in relation to the migration-development nexus and this phenomenon of uses of remittances is noted as the fifth migration myth (Haas, 2005: 1274). He maintains that this pessimistic perspective is founded on a rather poor empirical and analytical basis (see also Hugo, 2003, 2006).

Along with methodological shortcomings, and exaggerated and unrealistic hopes of migration as an engine for development, De Haas also cites narrow and arbitrary concepts of development that partly explain why “prior work has been unduly pessimistic about the prospects for development as a result of international migration” (Taylor et al., 1996 cited in Haas, 2005). The importance of debating the migration-development nexus from the broader development perspective is also addressed in the recent transnational literature (Piper, 2006a; Spaan and Naerssen, 2005; Nyberg-Sorensen, 2003; Portes, 1995; Parnwell, 2005; Yeoh et al. 2003; Vertovec, 2004; Porio, 2006). A review by Parnwell (2005) on the links between transnational migration and development recasts migration from a primarily economic

process with social, cultural and political consequences into a social and cultural process with economic and political implications. Piper (2005) argues that uses of remittances on recurrent expenses and other so-called non-productive investments should be viewed from a broader development perspective as, she argues, such expenses often turn into investment in human development and the long-term societal consequences of human development are far-reaching. This paper can be situated within this broader context of development.

Literature on migration and family is considerably healthy (Asis, 2000, 2003, 2006; Erman, 1998; Emilio et al. 2005; Semyonov and Anastasia, 2005; Tyner, 2002; Townsend, 1997; Stevenson, 1997; Zlotnik, 1995; Kadioglu, 1994; Gunatilleke, 1992; Foster, 1995; Ahlburg, 1995; Pfliegerl, 2003; Parrenas, 2005; Gamburd, 2002; Hugo 2002; Bever, 2002; Zachariah et al., 2001; Islam, 1991; Stark, 1991). I broadly summarize some significant findings of migration's impact on families as follows: moderate changes in headships and gender roles within families; a medium for upward social mobility; families adjust well in the absence of male or female migrants; improved education, health care and quality of life of migrant families; the women left behind take on the roles previously assumed by the men; left-behind children learn to be more independent in the migration process and so on. We also find negative implications like misuses of remittances, broken families and lack of parenting for children. These studies broadly expand our understanding about the influence of migration on the family in a general way but they do not examine the impacts of migration from the broader development point of view.

My study deepens the insights into family dynamics from the social development point of view. In so doing, I provide an overview of uses of remittances and undertake a broad definition of investment to include all uses of remittances such as basic consumption, house-building, education, health care, dowry, and land-purchasing, and to argue that such investments in turn contribute to social development over the long-term. I also link some uses of remittances to conspicuous consumption and conspicuous generosity, and focus on the cultural aspect of migration as it transforms local worldviews to establish that these uses have relevance for raising migrant families' status in the rural social structure. I use migrant families' opinions about the quality of life, incomes and wedding opportunities as indicators of social status change. I shed light on the management of remittances and importance of 'migration capital' for socio-political leverages to illustrate the fact that it contributes to improved gender and intergenerational relations. I also emphasize the migrant wives' agency

in relation to their engagement in culturally compatible business ventures and ensuing female empowerment, as well as migrant males' agency in marriage decisions as some additional factors inducing social development.

## **TEMPORARY LABOUR MIGRATION IN ASIA**

In the past three decades, Asia has experienced tremendous changes in international population movements (Abella, 1997; Skeldon, 1997; Ananta and Arifin, 2004; Huang et al. 2005; Momsen, 1999; Gills and Piper, 2002; Piper 2006b; Iredale, et al. 2003; Oishi, 2005). Although we observe other types of migration - permanent migration, student migration, marriage migration, skilled migration - temporary labor migration has emerged as one of the predominant types of population movements in Asia. In this type of labor migration, labor-receiving countries actively pursue temporary labor migration programs to meet the domestic labor demand. Under this system, low-skilled migrant workers are usually invited to stay and work in the labor-importing countries for a definite period ranging from one to three years with a bundle of restrictions including repatriation after the end of the contract (see Ruhs, 2002). In general, foreign worker policy in Asia can be broadly summarized as follows: limiting labor migration, limiting the duration of migration and limiting integration (Piper, 2004a: 75). From the migrant worker perspective, although the strict regulations imposed on them have prevented their permanent settlement to a great extent, it has in other ways facilitated their regular authorized recruitment.

To gain from the increasing migration of labour and subsequent remittances, some less developed countries have pursued policies and diplomatic efforts to capture the international labour market for their surplus labour. Bangladesh is not running behind in this race. According to available data, the total cumulative figure for Bangladeshi documented migrants overseas until 2007 was approximately 4.5 million and for East and Southeast Asia alone, it was roughly half a million<sup>1</sup>. On average, around 200,000 Bangladeshis annually migrated overseas for temporary employment in the 1990s (Lian and Rahman, 2006). In turn, remittance has been a major source of foreign currency earnings. According to official data, Bangladesh received around US\$ 41 billion as remittances between 1976 and 2006 (Rahman

---

<sup>1</sup> This cumulative figure comes from the BMET, the official body responsible for keeping records of authorized migrant workers. However, it does not keep records for returning migrants. [http://www.bmet.org.bd/Reports/Flow\\_Migration.htm](http://www.bmet.org.bd/Reports/Flow_Migration.htm) accessed on May 7, 2007 at 9.07 am

and Yeoh, forthcoming)<sup>2</sup>. Remittances even exceed the net earnings of the garment industry, the highest foreign exchange generator and leading source of employment in Bangladesh, which amounts to more than US\$ 3.5 billion a year (Ullah and Panday, 2007).

Singapore is a sought after destination for Bangladeshi low-skilled migrant workers (see Rahman, 2004b). Presently, there might be as many as 50,000 Bangladeshi migrant workers in Singapore and almost all of them are male (Rahman and Lian, 2005). The ban on women migrating from Bangladesh (see Dannecker, 2005; Siddiqui, 2001) ensures that there is almost no female labor migration to Singapore. Instead of what de Haas (2005) calls, “uselessly and harmfully trying to stop inevitable migration”, Singapore has devised a sophisticated foreign manpower policy based on a “demand-driven system” to allow for regular circulation of foreign labor (see Rahman, 2007). Broadly, the demand-driven system serves both parties – employers and migrants. On the one hand, it is efficient in satisfying the needs of employers and therefore is capable of generating higher benefits for Singapore. On the other hand, it is economically beneficial for the migrants as well as their home countries because it spawns the inflow of foreign exchange for the less-developed source countries. There were around 620,000 foreign workers in Singapore in 2005 (*The Sunday Times*, Singapore November 13, 2005).

Of the 620,000 foreign workers, 540,000 are work permit holders and the remaining 80,000 are employment pass holders (*The Sunday Times*, November 13, 2005). Singapore offers some specific programs for low-skilled foreign workers to make their stay in Singapore economically meaningful for both parties. Migrant workers who have earned skill certificates are offered possibilities of extended stay, presently up to 15 years. They can also take leave to see their families back home during their contract period. This provision of long term employment opportunities with corresponding economic rewards and regular family visits is supposed to make a difference in the development potential of migration at the micro level. Although this is meant to be a temporary migration, the phenomenon has been practiced as permanent in Singapore. As a result, prospective migrant workers can consider temporary migration as a permanent occupation through extended stays over one’s life-cycle.

---

<sup>2</sup> See, [http://www.bmet.org.bd/Reports/Flow\\_Migration.htm](http://www.bmet.org.bd/Reports/Flow_Migration.htm) accessed on May 7, 2007 at 9.43 pm

## GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TWO SAMPLES

This section compares and contrasts some basic socio-demographic characteristics of migrant families based on the data collected during the 2001 survey and 2006 survey in Gurail. I first present the 2001 survey data so that later discussion can be advanced by building on these findings (Table 1).

### The 2001 Survey Results

Bangladesh is predominantly a Muslim country: in 1998, 83 percent were Muslim and 16 percent Hindu. Among the respondents, 94 percent were Muslims and six percent Hindus. The age composition of the migrants is very important for temporary migration as most migrant worker-receiving countries prefer younger foreign workers. According to the 2001 data, 62 percent of migrants were below 25 and 68 percent were unmarried. Migrants tended to be educated; only six percent were illiterate while 56 percent had more than six years of certified schooling. According to the World Development Report 2003 of World Bank, Adult Literacy in Bangladesh was 59 percent<sup>3</sup>. Therefore, this paper suggests that migrant workers tend to be more literate than the national aggregate. Regarding occupational pursuits before migration, a majority of the migrants, 64 percent, were earning their livelihood by means of self-employment. By 'self-employment', I mean working in farming, informal economic activities or traditional arts (household industries e.g. weaving and pottery). In the rural setting, families prefer to be known as self-employed families to wage-employed families, especially in the informal economy, rather than as wage-employed families because local cultural notions of work associate wage employment with inferior status.

The extended family in rural Bangladesh is a predominant type of family and the data also reflects this; 70 percent of the migrants were from extended families. The dominance of migration from extended families is not surprising, if we consider the role that extended families play in the pooling of financial resources for migrants' passages and of social supports for the left-behind families (see also, Hugo, 2002; Gamburd, 2002; Rahman, 2003).

---

<sup>3</sup> People's Progress Report on Bangladesh MDG 2005: An Overview, Page No. 22, available online, accessed on 9 May 2007, at 11.47 am. <http://www.millenniumcampaign.org>

Prior to the migration of a family member, 14 percent of families had no cultivatable land<sup>4</sup> and 20 percent had 151-400 decimal land. A family of six to eight members usually requires approximately 400-500 decimal arable land for subsistence living in this area<sup>5</sup>. Thus, all the migrant families were in fact short of the amount of land needed for subsistence living. 68 percent of the families relied primarily on remittances for family maintenance. The 2001 survey documents a sobering picture. The bulk of the migrant families reported financial loss from their members' migration; they had been dispossessed of their land and many of them were in debt to the money-lenders. Only eight percent reported satisfaction. One of major reasons for this unsuccessful migration is attributed to the regional financial crisis in the late 1990s that swept across the East and Southeast Asia in 1997-1998 and affected migrant workers in the region disproportionately.

### **The 2006 Survey Results**

Migrants who undertook remigration after the first survey, or who migrated in the interim between surveys, benefited in myriad ways from the migration process. At the time of the 2006 survey, I found many more people were involved in the migration process than during the 2001 survey. Of the migrant families interviewed during the 2006 survey, 64 percent had one member working in Singapore for five to seven years and 34 percent had one member working in Singapore for seven to nine years. 86 percent of the migrants were married and 68 percent of them belonged to nuclear families. In relation to income earnings, 72 percent of migrant families had no male members involved in the local economy and this is a sharp rise from 32 percent in the 2001 survey. As the majority of the migrant families are nuclear families consisting of wives and one or two children, or extended families that include non-working elderly parents and in-laws, the rate of involvement in the local economy is expected to be low (Table 1).

---

<sup>4</sup> National figures suggests that in rural Bangladesh, nine percent of rural families are landless and 50 percent have less than 99 decimal land on average (Statistical Yearbook of Bangladesh, 1996). The land holding pattern is skewed with about 50 percent of the households being functionally landless (22 percent of households owning no land other their homestead and 28 percent owning only 0.50 acre) while six percent of the land-owning households control more than 40 percent of the total land (SAAPE Poverty Report 2003, Bangladesh) available online, accessed on 15 April, 2007, at 9.07 pm 2003:18 [http://www.saape.org.np/resources/publications/poverty\\_report03/pov\\_report03.htm](http://www.saape.org.np/resources/publications/poverty_report03/pov_report03.htm)

<sup>5</sup> The fertility of the land depends on the geographical location. Villagers in Gurail reported that a family of six to eight members will need between 400 and 500 decimal land for subsistence living.

In 2006, 62 percent and 32 percent of the migrant families were currently dependent on remittances for primary and secondary living expenses respectively, which is a sharp decline from the findings (86 percent and eight percent respectively) of the 2001 survey. These findings indicate that migrant families have not only coped with the initial losses from migration but also adapted to the patterns of uses of earnings derived from local incomes. For instance, many migrant families, especially wives of the migrants, are involved in money-lending business (see my discussion below) and they make tidy profits out of it. Such families are in a position to divert the profits to family expenses, leaving remittances unused for basic consumption or other purposes. In terms of absolute land-holding patterns before and after migration, I find slight increase of land-holding in the 2006 survey. Landholding is considered a symbol of material success in rural Bangladesh. With regard to the overall impact of migration on migrant families, 94 percent of families reported positive impacts in the 2006 survey, a rise from eight percent in the 2001 survey (Table 1). The data on the management of remittances and status changes will be provided later in the relevant sections.

## **SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS: EMPIRICAL FINDINGS**

### **Uses of Remittances at the Family Level**

The uses of remittances are particularly important in any analysis of the development potential of migration because it can, to some extent, resolve the ambiguity in the relationship between migration and development. I set out the major uses of remittances by each migrant family (Table 2). I could not quantify the amount of cash used in each field because of two reasons: (i) migrant families usually did not maintain any record, and (ii) there was a possibility of gathering inflated data. I identify 13 major uses of remittances. As I have shown in the preceding section, the majority of migrant families in the 2001 survey experienced poor flows of remittances; I therefore present only the findings from the 2006 survey data. To document the remittance use dynamics at the family level, I added a set of questions focusing on *past uses of remittances* and *intended or future uses of remittances* in the questionnaire. Therefore, I organize data on the basis of ‘*past uses of remittances*’, that is, in the specific areas where remittance has already been used and ‘*future uses of remittances*’, that is, in the intended areas where remittance may be used in the near future.

The three major uses of remittances were as follows: basic consumption, debt repayment and house-building/renovation. Given their socio-economic background, it is no surprising that most of the families would spend the remittances to first meet the basic consumptive needs of the family followed by the repayment of debt incurred with the expenses of migration. Once the debt was paid, families channeled remittances to house construction/renovation. I attempt to locate the position of these three uses of remittances in the future and find that there is a tendency toward decreasing dependence on remittances for basic consumption, that is, from 98 percent to 64 percent. This decline in dependency on remittances suggests that migrant families may depend on remittances exclusively in the early phase of migration because the family's financial resources are usually being used for migration. In the later phases, they tend to generate incomes locally to maintain themselves. This tendency in generating or using local incomes for family maintenance demands attention because it suggests that families tend to show less dependence on remittances over time as opposed to the situation described as 'dangerous dependency' or 'addiction' in the divergence school literature (see Reichert, 1981; Wiest, 1979; Stuart and Kearney, 1981). I also find a sharp decline in debt repayment, which means that families have successfully repaid the debts incurred in the process of migration, and a decline in remittances for house-building/renovation, which indicates that the phase of house construction or renovation is over for most of the migrants.

The next three uses of remittances are as follows: education, loans to relatives and donations for socio-religious benefits. Investment in education for improved human capital occupies the fourth position in the order of uses of remittances, proving that migrant families are concerned about the future of their children. They value education over other commonly held social and religious values in rural Bangladesh, for instance, giving financial help to relatives who are in need of cash or making donations to socio-religious groups or to support projects that have strong religious connotation. Once education is secured and obligations to relatives and socio-religious organizations are met, families concentrate on how to consolidate their social and economic position in society. Therefore, they allocate remittances to land-purchasing, savings and status-enhancing ceremonies, followed by meeting the migration expenses of close relatives and caring for family members in need of medical treatment.

Investment is the focal point for the migration-development relationship from an economic perspective. Lindstrom (1996) broadly identifies two uses of remittances that can be considered as economic investments: 'fixed capital assets' and 'productive assets'. The



motivation for investment in fixed capital assets, for example, land, housing, loans or fixed deposit in banks, comes from the fact that it can be sold in the future without a loss and preferably, with some gain. Another field of investment of remittances is in productive assets that generate income over the long term to satisfy future income needs; examples are farmland, livestock, tractors or irrigation equipments. Based on the findings presented here, it is obvious that migrants spend much of their remittances on uses that are not recognized as ‘investments’ in the economic sense. However, if we broaden the concept of investment to include those expenses that have significant relevance to human resource development, such as education, health care and quality of life, the development outcome of migration becomes much more evident.

### **Socio-Cultural Aspects of Spending of Foreign Earnings**

Studies of international migration conducted in a variety of countries as well as findings from my own study village document that a portion of remittances is used on conspicuous consumption and conspicuous generosity (Üçok, 2006; Gitmez, 1991; Habib, 1985; Islam, 1991; Stahl and Habib, 1991; Straubhaar, 1988, Papademetriou and Emke-Poulopoulos, 1991; Malkin 2004). The consumption practices of migrant families, which are perceived to be manifestly ‘unproductive’ in classical economic terms, are the despair of the policy makers in the countries concerned. Consumption is a social practice of every day life and is full of symbolism (Douglas and Isherwood, 1979; found in Üçok, 2006:3). Migrant families’ consumption practices provide important clues to the consolidation of migrant identity and social status. Although the unproductive spending habits of migrants are often blamed on the culture of the particular emigrant community in question, this tendency, in effect, seems to be universal. There is evidently something about the manner in which the migrant situation and the money earned through it are conceptualized that differentiates the ensuing economic behavior from other types of consumption patterns.

The expectation of the community members of Gurail seems to indicate that money earned through working overseas is seen as being of a different kind from money that is earned locally. Villagers often perceive the foreign job as being less physically arduous. As a result, they see ‘foreign earnings’ as ‘easy money’, which is not fully earned. As such, there is an

expectation that the money should also be disbursed more freely<sup>6</sup>. Economic psychologists have pointed out that such income is treated very differently from identical sums obtained through other means (Zelizer, 1989: 350). Typically, earning money easily and spending it freely are characteristic of the life-style of the upper class who, because of their affluence, are obliged to act as patrons for the poorer and less fortunate villagers. This in turn secures them status. Apart from this, in the context of community, gifts are distributed to counteract the possibly harmful consequences of envy by neighbors and relatives. The new foreign goods mark families as part of a migrant network. Thus, I suggest that migrant families within such communities spend their money conspicuously to indicate that it has been earned easily and are lavish in their generosity to fellow villagers as well as to village causes in order to have a louder voice in local discussions, to secure community goodwill and to achieve a higher social standing.

### **Gender Relations**

Temporary labor migration induces manifold processes in gender relations among the family members left behind. The existing literature has broadly identified two domains wherein the most obvious changes in gender relations are noticed: the division of labor between women and men and women's participation in decision-making (see Hugo, 2002; Asis, 2003; Kaspar, 2004; Khaled, 1995; Pfliegerl et al., 2003). I likewise illustrate changes in gender relations with reference to transformations in the spheres of remittances and decision-making as well as division of labor within the migrant families. I also consider changes in family headship. In order to assess the impact of migration on gender relations in the family, it is important to distinguish nuclear families from extended families. In the 2001 survey, 32 percent of the migrants were married and 30 percent of the migrants were in nuclear families; that is, the majority of the migrants were unmarried living in extended families.

In my 2006 sample, 86 percent of the male migrants were married and 68 percent of the migrant families were living in nuclear families, indicating that the majority of migrants were married and living in nuclear families. On average, such families consisted of five persons,

---

<sup>6</sup> I must stress that money earned as a result of short-term international migration is only one type of income that is seen to be unearned. Such patterns of consumption behavior are manifested in other cases as well, for example, in the case of money obtained through a lottery or through illegal means. In addition, Bangladeshis use a term 'kacha poisha' (easily earned money) to imply such earnings. They frequently say "kacha poisha thaka na", that is, "this type of easily earned money does not stay long with the earners".

excluding the overseas migrant and usually consisting of parents, children and sometimes senior in-laws (Table 4). Some nuclear families included unmarried brothers on temporary stays to offer a helping hand in their brothers' absence. With the formation of nuclear families, concomitant changes can be expected to occur in family headship, receipt and control of remittances, decision-making and division of labor. The data shows that 72 percent of the migrant families were headed by wives of the migrants left behind. Interestingly, migrants' wives are also found to occupy the position of family head in extended families although this varied depending on the age of wives, the number of children and other personal attributes of individual migrant wives.

One way to explore intra-family relations is by documenting the extent of control that men and women have over family resources. 78 percent of the migrant wives were the principal recipients of the remittances. With regard to the control over uses of remittances, 72 percent of the migrant wives enjoyed exclusive privileges over the uses of remittances (Table 4). In both nuclear and extended households, a mixed type of receipt and control of remittances was found. Gender-specific labor domains are noticed in Gurail: household chores and childcare are exclusively carried out by women while outside activities, for example, economic and social activities, are largely performed and maintained by male members. In addition, there are some specific tasks within the family that are often performed by both parties such as raising live-stock and weaving although women often take on heavier and more complicated tasks, for example, storing rice straw, rice processing activities, cultivating vegetation in the household plot, preparing cow dung cakes, cleaning the cowshed and rearing the calves. In the case of the nuclear family, most wives assumed the tasks formerly carried out by their husbands.

Migrants' wives, especially those who are family heads, are loaded with extra work. This is because in addition to fulfilling her normal tasks, the wife has to replace her husband in all his roles inside and outside the home. Sometimes, migrant wives receive the help of other women in the village in exchange for non-monetary payments, e.g. food, clothes, other trivial things. Most of the wives interviewed did not view their workload as negative and conveyed a feeling of being successful *de facto* family heads, even though their husbands remained formal household heads. Being recipients and administrators of remittances, most migrant wives had a clear role in family decision-making. 82 percent of married migrants' wives reported having a primary role in family decision-making. The remaining 16 percent who had

a more limited role were mostly newlywed wives and those living in extended families. Therefore, women's increasing power is seen mainly in nuclear families.

This study is limited to the analysis of migrant wives. As a result, it is not possible to compare and contrast the data with nonmigrant family wives to ascertain the extent to which migration affects gender relations in a traditional society like Bangladesh. However, given the access to remittances and authority over management of remittances, it is plausible that migrant wives enjoy considerable leverage in the division of labor and decision-making in their own families, over and above their nonmigrant family counterparts. As I have discussed later, the access to foreign labor market or migration should be equated not only with remittances, but also with 'migration-specific social capital' or 'migration capital' that migrant wives and other members of migrant families possess over nonmigrant families. The key characteristic of 'migration capital' is its convertibility – it may be translated into other forms of capital (Faist, 2000). The access to and convertibility of migration capital particularly empowers migrant wives to expand social relations beyond traditional boundaries, and those who aspire to join the foreign labor market contributing even further to improving gender relations at the community level.

### ***Dhadon: A Gendered-Specific Business Enterprise***

While male family members may invest remittances in a wide range of ventures within the village or beyond, a migrant wife usually encounters difficulty establishing contact with the world outside the home and family due to cultural barriers. As a result, the scope of investment of remittances varies according to the gender of the person making the investment. In order to make lucrative investments locally without violating cultural norms of gender, most migrant wives invest in a type of business popularly known as '*dhadon*' in rural Bangladesh. The *dhadon* is a business where one lends money for profit and the whole operation is run from one's home, thereby requiring minimal contact with the outside world, and thus is appropriate for women. *Dhadon* generally serves the rural population whose credit needs are not met or taken into consideration by the formal credit institutions. Theoretically, Muslims should not engage in *dhadon* or money-lending business. Islam prohibits *riba* - the

taking of interest<sup>7</sup>. In spite of religious obstruction, *dhadon* is a commonly accepted practice in rural Bangladesh.

The inadequate institutional response to the huge unmet credit needs of the rural population has partly contributed to the rise of many microcredit organizations like Grameen Bank and BRAC. However, most microcredit organizations usually offer credit to targeted groups, e.g., the poorest of the poor (Hashemi and Morshed, 1997). The amount of credit, which is very low, and the demand for so-called ‘group formation’, which acts as ‘social collateral’ for such loans recovery (see Johnson and Rogaly, 1997; Khadria, 2007), leave a vast section of the status-conscious rural population out of their reach. *Dhadon* fills this gap. It operates in line with social networks; it requires only an ‘individual guarantor’, instead of a group, as “social collateral,” in which an individual takes the responsibility of payment for default, allowing borrowers’ social standings to be unaffected on the community level. There is a huge demand for *dhadon* in migration source villages because an increasing number of people are seeking loans to finance the opportunity costs of overseas employment. This in turn creates demand often beyond the financial resources of formal financial institutions, including microcredit bodies. Moreover, the left-behind families require loans because they are often in need of cash at the early phase of their members’ migration.

Villagers take up credit from migrant wives for a myriad of purposes. Depending on the purpose for the loan, interest rates for the borrowed money vary, usually up to 100 percent per annum. If money is borrowed for consumption purposes like food, weddings or agricultural investments, interest rates will be low; if the loan is for international migration, interest rates will be high, in anticipation that the overseas employment will yield higher rewards for the borrower. In Gurail and many other migration-source villages, *dhadon* has been increasingly known as a migrants’ wives business (Rahman, 2000). Interestingly, a good portion of borrowers are also women who often take up loans for personal business ventures, e.g. small poultry firms, vegetable gardening and so on. This contributes not only to the empowerment of individual migrant wives but also to rural women in general, as women borrow from other women. On the community level, this credit relation is of high importance

---

<sup>7</sup> Its consequences on the economic life of some Muslim countries are such that Islamic Banking has been developed as an alternative form to Western banking. In Bangladesh, there are few Islamic banks and they have established branches all over the country in the last few decades. However, they are not popular among the rural people.

because beneficiaries' or prospective beneficiaries' families see the migrant wives as 'rescuers' at a time of crisis. The social impact of *dhadon* is that it produces a sense of social obligation on the part of the beneficiaries or prospective beneficiaries, to migrant wives as benefactors, contributing to the improved gender relations in the society.

### **Social Mobility**

Migration not only allows one to move from one society to another, it also facilitates a change in social class and status (Üçök, 2006: 16). Piore (1979) comments that "migration is not just a 'step out' but also a 'step up'" or as Jurgens (2001) puts it, "[m]igration represents not only movement through space but also movement through and across different social class/status structures in different national labor markets". Recent literature on Asian migration suggests that migration induces upward social mobility for migrant families (Asis, 1995; Khaled, 1995; Thieme and Wyss, 2005; Arif, 2004). In the Bangladeshi context, Leen Boer reported, as early as 1981, that rural-urban migration produced a more rigid social structure, in which the opportunities for upward mobility for the village poor increased and the risks of downward mobility for the village rich decreased (Boer, 1981: 28).

Focusing on a source village in Bangladesh for migrants to London, Gardner (1995) has shown the increasing presence and importance of overseas migration in village life. More than economic investments, her focus was on the qualitative shifts in worldviews, culture and social relationships of local people as a result of migration. As Gardner (1992; 2005) illustrates, while the 'homeland' in Bangladesh refers to spirituality and religiosity, 'abroad' is linked to material bounty and economic transformation. Local desire has become centred on work abroad as the only route to material prosperity. As Gardner (1995) states, "at one level, images of 'home' and 'abroad' refer to inequality between nations, at another, to local social organization, for the locality of individuals ascribes their status and economic position". In my own work in migration source villages (2003), I found that international migration is increasingly considered a status symbol and migrant families envisage migration, in addition to marriage, education, house-building and economic prosperity, as a key strategy to reinvent themselves in the rural social class hierarchy.

Although a migrant worker moves overseas as an individual, he views his trip not only for his own well-being but also for the well-being of his family and other close groups like the *bari*.

*Bari* is a Bengali word which denotes a group of families sharing the same courtyard. Members of the *bari* are generally blood related and belong to the same lineage. The reputation of a *bari* depends on the behavior, vocation and achievement of *bari* members. It is the moral and social responsibility of *bari* members to uphold the *bari* tradition over individual interests. Failure to do so incurs shame (for details, see Wood, 1994). Therefore, migration outcomes are customarily shared with the family and the *bari*. This family orientation of migrants has far-reaching implications for social mobility beyond individual migrants. To examine the role that migration plays in social mobility, I collected data on migrant families' present status in relation to 'quality of life', 'incomes' and 'wedding opportunities' compared to pre-migration status. On the whole, migrant families' present status compared with pre-migration status in these areas is supposed to provide a clear picture of whether migration leads to social mobility and if it does, what the dominant trend is.

I apply 'wedding opportunity' as an indicator of social mobility because in the context of rural Bangladesh, marriage is not simply a union of two individuals; it is also a merger of two *baris* and their broader social networks. Marriage opens up opportunities for both parties to expand and share previously inaccessible resources embedded in social networks. In the rural context, migration increases the opportunity of marriage for migrant family members because of their possession of valuable migration-specific social capital. During the 2001 survey in Gurail, migrant families reported a downward social mobility in all three indicators (Table 3). However, migrant families consolidated their social standing over time. Table 3 demonstrates that longer stays overseas have a clear bearing on upward social mobility. All migrant families in the 2006 survey reported better conditions in relation to standard of living, incomes and wedding opportunities. It is thus understandable that because of access to the foreign labour market and resultant migration-specific social capital, a number of migrant families experienced substantial upward social mobility over time.

Since benefits of migration are usually shared across *bari* lines, the bearing of upward social mobility permeates throughout *baris*. When junior members migrate, senior members of the family and *bari* are often invited to join in local politics, welfare organizations or rural development committees (school, irrigation, road improvement committee, village protection committee, etc.) and thus offered special positions in the local status hierarchy. For *baris*, international migration has also been a source of new identity. For example, individuals in rural Bangladesh are generally known to the outside world as members of a particular *bari* or

lineage. Each *bari* has its own distinctive name and in general, the name of the lineage is the name of the *bari*; however, dynamism exists based on an individual member's achievements. International migration is deemed a fundamental achievement resulting in, amongst many, a renaming of some *baris* in line with the destination country, for example, *Singapuri bari*. Thus, the outcome of migration for social standing spills over from individual migrants to their families and *baris*.

### **Generational Dynamics**

The effect of migration on intergenerational dynamics is a complex process: on the one hand, it provides ground for sons to exercise rights of choice of marriage partners, management of remittances and nucleation of family; on the other hand, it opens up a door for parents to claim special privileges in the greater communities because of their access to migration capital. In rural Bangladesh, the extended family was, historically, the fundamental unit of social organization and of production. The patriarch had exclusive rights to organize the work tasks, deploy the family's labor, accumulate the earnings and distribute them for family welfare (Wood, 1994; Baluja, 2003; Faraizi, 1993; Pryer, 1992). Presently, parents are rarely the sole holders of economic assets and the only persons with the privilege of decision-making. Structural changes in the economy have forced family members to look for work outside the family, which is seen as eroding the authority of traditional senior figures and giving individual family members more freedom in decision-making (see also, Hugo, 2003). In general, the farther away from home the work is, the greater the sons' ability to claim rights to exercise freedom of choice in family affairs.

In former times, the bridegroom's father or grandfather chose the bride he was to marry. When the grandfather was still alive he had the last word because he was the senior person in the family and everybody had to listen to him. At that time, the father paid for everything, because the money was in his hand, and he also had his son in his hand because he was living with him before and after marriage. The father decided what the son had to do. Today things have changed. Many migrants choose their bride on their own. They no longer listen to their parents. He is free because he pays the marriage expenses on his own.

(A village man, Gurail, October 2006)



Women's agency in labor migration in Asia has recently been documented (see Abdul Rahman, 2005; Parker, 2005). I report here on male agency in the context of the patriarchal family. In the traditional context, the bridegroom's father and other senior male family members were responsible for choosing the bride for younger male members of the family. Sons in the extended families were obliged to obey the decision imposed on them. Due to many factors, including migration, this situation has changed over time (Naved et al. 2001). The seniors' right to choose a daughter-in-law based on their own interests – for example, the additional input of labor power and source of cash (dowry) – has gradually been questioned because migration has given sons an economic position substantially independent of their traditional seniors. Possessing his own source of cash, the migrant son increasingly claims for himself the right to choose his own marriage partner. Probably the younger generation's wish to realize their own aspirations against the will of parents has always existed, and it is through migration that they have gained the economic power to have their own, independent voice.

An often neglected but important domain of social development outcomes of migration for families is the privileges they enjoy in their home communities because of their newly acquired 'migration capital' or 'social capital' in the form of access to a migration network (Taylor, 1986; Massey et al. 1987; Faist, 2000). Scholars have analytically differentiated three mechanisms of social capital that facilitate cooperation and integrate groups: obligation, reciprocity and solidarity (Faist, 2000). The key characteristic of social capital is its convertibility – it may be translated into other forms of capital to gain access to overseas or local resources. So far, migration-specific social capital is used to explain the causes and maintenance of migration, because of its role in gaining access to foreign employment and the benefits it brings (MacDonald and MacDonald, 1974; Boyd, 1989; Gurak and Caces, 1992). However, in the sending community context, migration-specific social capital may also be used to mobilize local resources or to muster popular support in local elections.

The political impact of labor migration has hardly received any attention in the existing literature. This is partly because it is commonly assumed that such influence should work at the aggregate level, especially in the case of diaspora and permanent migration. In the migration literature, the latter types of migration are often linked to political rights, national election process and dual citizenship issues (see Goldring, 2004; Salhi and Netton, 2006; Thapan, 2005; Koslowski, 2005; Gardner, 1995). This paper reports a new trend in the

migration-politics relationship in the context of labor migration. It is found that some parents and senior male relatives of migrants in Gurail and the neighboring villages had considerable leverage in mobilizing villagers in favor of their own candidates in the 2003 local government election. This is not a special case in Gurail. I have also heard of similar cases in other migration source villages where migration-specific social capital played a crucial role in local election. Thus, migration provides a context in which both parties share and claim privileges contributing to the reciprocal intergenerational relations.

## CONCLUSION

This paper has addressed the migration-development nexus with a special emphasis on social development outcomes at the level of family through a case study of a temporary labor migration-source village in Bangladesh, Gurail. The paper has shown that when the impacts of migration are examined in the social developmental context as a process through time, the relationship between migration and development appears much more *settled*, which is positive for both migrants and their families. Migration opens up windows of opportunity for migrant families and their kinship networks in the long run. Temporary labor migration has so far been neglected in the broader debate on the migration-development nexus partly because of its overwhelming negative economic outcomes. My study has found that it initiates a process of social development at the family level over time. Temporary migrants' remittance, which is also known as 'family remittance,' reaches the people who really need it.

This paper has cautioned that a lack of immediate visible material improvement from migration should not always be considered a failure of development. I found that while many families had "not improved" by the most frequently voiced village standards in 2001, they had "improved markedly" by 2006. Poor families burdened with debt required a number of years receiving steady remittances before showing signs of social and material success. This paper has also shown that the division between the uses of remittances for productive investment and for consumption to be so simplistic that we often cannot grasp its far-reaching implications for the migrant families and other close groups. The use of remittances to ensure family maintenance, education and health that otherwise could not be obtained contributes to 'human capital' and reduces poverty, which are key developmental objectives. I have reported that a portion of remittances is used for conspicuous consumption and generosity. However, it is important to consider that such consumptive practices increase social capital

embedded in social relations. I have shown that one of the roles of improved social capital is that it increases the wedding opportunities for members of migrant families. A study conducted by Gamburd (2002) on domestic workers from Sri Lanka also documented how families who put their money to productive uses – land, housing, businesses and dowry – prioritized these uses according to a local hierarchy of goals and objectives. Only after land, housing and dowry had been secured was money put into businesses. In my study, I also found that migrant families prioritized spending based on local cultural expectations. Thus, this study has demonstrated the need to consider local views and conditions in order to understand migrants' own perceptions of what constitutes development.

Among the major areas of family lives that have been affected by migration, generational dynamics, social mobility and gender relations are noteworthy. The paper has shown how temporary migration affects intergenerational relations in a reciprocal manner: while migrant sons gain autonomy in a number of spheres including choosing their life-partners, work and income- spending, parents and senior male members of migrant families earn social recognition and wider societal acceptance because of their access to migration-specific social capital. This paper has documented how members of the left-behind families enjoy privileges in the communities of living because of their access to the 'migration capital'. It is found that migration-specific social capital is used to gain other forms of capital and to muster popular support in the local government election. The research has shown that international labor migration is a status symbol and a source of identity that migrant families often exploit to reconsolidate their social position in a rural status hierarchy. Since the social benefits of migration are shared across *bari* lines, the markers of social repositioning spill over from migrants to their families and *baris*.

The paper has reported that temporary migration has induced changes in gender roles in two specific spheres: the division of labor between women and men, and women's participation in decision-making. Although migration has increased the workloads for the wives, they conveyed a feeling of success as *de facto* family heads in the management of family chores, remittances, welfare and relations with the outside world. Migration also contributed to the increased decision-making role for left-behind wives. Local gender biases are surmounted through embarking on a special type of business that is both culturally compatible and economically rewarding. Migrant wives' engagement in *dhadon* has not only benefited them socially and economically, it has also benefited other women in the community, triggering a

process of improved relations across society. What is particularly important here is that the temporary migration of millions of male labor has induced migrant wives who are left behind to gain a variety of skills in dealing with the outside world. This will have long term social development implications for the wider Bangladeshi society.

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I wish to thank Brenda S. A. Yeoh, Nicola Piper and Arianne Gaetano for their comments, suggestions and guidance. I wish to also extend my thanks to the following people: Habibul Haque Khondker, Lian Kwen Fee, Shapan Adnan, Binod Khadria, C.R. Abrar (RMMRU, Bangladesh), and Khurshed Alam (BISR, Bangladesh) for their support and encouragement.

**REFERENCES**

Abdul-Rahman, Noorashikin

2005 “Shaping the Migrant Institution: The Agency of Indonesian Domestic Workers in Singapore”, in Lyn Parker (ed.), *The Agency of Women in Asia*, Marshall Cavendish Academic: Singapore

Abella, Manolo

1997 *Sending Workers Abroad*, International Labour Organization (ILO), Geneva

Abril, Elana Ruiz and Ben Rogaly

2001 “Migration and Social Relations: An Annotated Bibliography on Temporary Migration for Rural Manual Work”, IIAS/IISG, CLARA Working Paper No. 16, Amsterdam

Adams, Richard H., Jr

1991 The Economic uses and impact of international remittances in rural Egypt, *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 39, pp695-722

Ahlburg, Dennis A.

1995 “Migration, Remittances and the Distribution of Income: Evidence from the Pacific, *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*. Volume 4, Number 1, pp157-168

Ananta, Aris Evi Nurvidya Arifin (eds),

2004 *International Migration in Southeast Asia*, ISEAS: Singapore

Appleyard, Reginald

1989 “Migration and Development; Myths and Reality, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp486-499

1992a Migration and Development: A Critical Relationship, *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*, Vol.1, 1992

1992b “International migration and development—an unresolved relationship”, *International Migration*, 30(3/4): 251-66.

Arif. G.M

2004 “Effects of Overseas migration on household consumption, education, health, labor supply in Pakistan” in Hisaya Oda “*International Labor Migration from South Asia*”, ASEDIP 70, IDE, Japan, pp143-180

Asis, Maruja M.B.

1995 “Overseas Employment and Social Transformation in Source Communities: Findings from the Philippines”, *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*, Vol. 4, No. 2-3, pp327-246

2000 “Imaging the Future of Migration and Families in Asia”, *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp255-274

2003 “International Migration and Families in Asia”, in Robyn Iredale, Charles Hawksley and Stephen Castles (eds.), *Migration in the Asia Pacific: Population, Settlement and Citizenship Issues*, Edward Elgar: Celtenham, UK

2006 “Living with Migration: Experiences of left-behind children in the Philippines”, *Asian Population Studies*, Volume 2, Number 1/March, pp45-67

Baker, Susan Gonzalez, Robert G. Cushing, and Charles W. Haynes

1997 “Fiscal Impacts of Mexican Migration to the United States”, in *At the Crossroads: Mexican Migration and US Policy*, F.D. Bean, R.O. de la Garza, .B.R. Roberts and S. Weintraub eds. Lanham, MD:Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, pp 145-176,

Baluja, Raari Flagstad

2003 *Gender Roles at Home and Abroad: The Adaptation of Bangladeshi Immigrants*, LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC: New York

Battistella, Graziano

1992 “Migration: Opportunity or Loss?” In Grazia Battistella and Anthony Paganori (ed.) *Philippine Labor Migration: Impact and Policy*, Scalabrini Migration Center, Philippines.

Bever, Sandra Weinstein

2002 “Migration and the Transformation of Gender Roles and Hierarchies in Yucatan”, *Urban Anthropology*, Vol. 31 (2), pp 199-230

Bjeren, Gunilla

1997 “Gender and Reproduction”, in *International Migration, Immobility and Development*, Edited by Thomas Hammar et a., Oxford and New York: Berg

Boer, Leen

1981 “Migration and Social Mobility in Bangladesh: The Marginalization of Peasant Migration”, *The Journal of Social Studies*, (University of Dacca), 13, 23-30 (1981 Jul)

Boyd, Monica

1989 “Family and Personal Networks in International Migration: Recent Developments and New Agendas”, *International Migration Review*, Vol. 23, No.3, pp 638-70

Burki, Shahid Javed

1991 “Migration from Pakistan to the Middle East, In Papademetriou and Martin (Ed.), *The Unsettled Relationship: Labor Migration and Economic Development*. New York: Greenwood Press.

Cohen, Jeffrey H

- 2005 “Remittances Outcomes and Migration: Theoretical Contests Real Opportunities”, *Studies in Comparative International Development*, Spring 2005, Vol. 40, No. 1, pp88-112

Connell, John

- 2003 “An Ocean of Discontent? Contemporary Migration and Deprivation in the South Pacific”. In *Migration in the Asia Pacific: Population, Settlement and Citizenship*, R Iredale, C. Hawsley and S Castles, eds. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar

Dannecker, Petra

- 2005 Transnational Migration and the Transformation of Gender Relations: The Case of Bangladeshi Labour Migrants, *Current Sociology*, Vol. 53(4): 655-674

De Haas, Hein

- 2005 “International Migration, Remittances and Development: Myths and Fact”, *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 26, No. 8 pp1269-1284

- 2007 The Impact of International Migration on Social and Economic Development in Moroccan Sending Regions: a Review of the empirical literature”, Working Paper, Paper 3, International Migration Institute, University of Oxford

De Jong, Gordon F., Aphichat Chamrathirong, and Quynh-Giang Tran

- 2002 “For Better, For Worse: Life Satisfaction Consequences of Migration”, *International migration review*, 36 (3): 838-863

Douglas, Mary and Baron Isherwood

- 1979 *The World of Goods: towards an anthropology of consumption*, London, New York: Routledge

Durand, Jorge

- 1994 *Mas alla de la linea: patrones migratorios entre Mexio y estados Unidos, Mexico*, D.F.: Consejo Nacional para la cultura y las Artes

Durand, Jorge, Emilio A Parrado and Douglas S Massey

- 1996 “Migradollars and Development: A Reconsideration of the Mexican Case”, *International Migration Review*, 30 (2)423-44

Emilio A Parrado, Flippen Chenoa and McQuiston, Chris

- 2005 “Migration and Relationship Power among Mexican Women, Demography, Vol.2, pp. 347 (May)

Erman, Tahire

1998 The Impact of Migration on Turkish Rural Women: Four Emergent patterns, *Gender and Society*, 12,2, April, 146-167

Faist, Thomas

2000 *The Volume and Dynamics of International Migration and Transnational Social Spaces*, Clarendon Press, Oxford

Faraizi, Aminul Haque.

1993 *Bangladesh, peasant migration and the world capitalist economy*, New Delhi: Sterling Publishers

Fischer, Peter A., Reiner Martin and Thomas Straubhaar

1997 "Interdependencies between Development and Migration", in Thomas Hammar, Grete Brochmann, Kristof Tamas and Thomas Faist (eds.), *International Migration, Immobility and Development: Multidisciplinary Perspective*, Berg: Oxford

Fitzgerald, David

2000 *Negotiating Extra-Territorial Citizenship: Mexican Migration and the Transnational Politics of Community*, La Jolla, C.A.: Center for Comparative Immigration Studies

Foster, John

1995 "The Relationship between Remittances and Savings in Small Pacific Island States: Some Econometric Evidence", *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*, Volume 4, Number 1, pp117-139

Gamburd, Michele Ruth

2002 *Transnationalism and Sri Lanka's Migrant Households: The Kitchen Spoon's Handle*, Vistaar Publications, New Delhi

1995 "Sri Lanka's "Army of Housemaids": Control of Remittances and Gender Transformations, *Anthropologica*, 37, 1, 49-88

Gardner, Katy

1995 *Global Migrants, Local Lives: Travel and Transformation in Rural Bangladesh*. Oxford: Clarendon Press

1992 "International Migration and the Rural Context in Sylhet", *New Community*, 18(4): 579-590

Gills, Dong-Sook S. and Nicola Piper (eds.)

2002 *Women and work in globalizing Asia*, London ; New York : Routledge



Gitmez, Ali S.

- 1991 "Migration without Development: the Case of Turkey", in Demetrios G. Papademetriou and Philip L. Martin (eds.), *The Unsettled Relationship: Labor Migration and Economic Development*, Greenwood Press, New York: 115-34

Goldring, Luin

- 2003 "Re-thinking Remittances: Social and Political Dimensions of Individual and Collective Remittances", Cerlac Working Paper Series, <http://www.yorku.ca/cerlac/weblications1.htm#WORKING> accessed in May 2005
- 2004 "Family and Collective Remittances to Mexico: A Multi-dimensional Typology", *Development and Change*, 35 (4): pp799-840
- 1999 "Power and Status in Transnational Social Space", in *Migration and Transnational Social Space*, L. Pries ed. 162-186, Comparative Urban Community Research, Brookfield: Ashgate

Grasmuck, Sherri and Patricia R Pessar

- 1991 *Between Two Islands: Dominican International Migration*, Berkeley: University of California Press

Gunatilleke, G. (ed.)

- 1992 *The Impact of Labor Migration on Households: A Comparative Study in Seven Asian countries*, Tokyo: UNU Press

Gurak, Douglas T. and Fe Caces

- 1992 'Migration networks and the shaping of migration system', in Mary Kritz, Lin Lean Lim, and Hania Zlotnick (eds.), *International Migration Systems: A Global Approach*, Clarendon Press, Oxford: 150-76

Habib, Ansanul

- 1985 "Economic Consequences of International Migration for Sending Countries: Review of Evidence from Bangladesh", Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Department of Economics, University of Newcastle, Australia.

Hansen, Karen Tranberg

- 2000 *Salaula: The World of Secondhand Clothing and Zambia*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Hashemi, S.M. and L Morshed

- 1997 "Grameen Bank: A Case Study" in Wood G D and I A Sharif (eds.), *Who needs Credit? Poverty and Finance in Bangladesh*, Zed Books, London

Helweg, A.W.

1983 “Emigrant Remittances: Their Nature and Impact on a Punjabi Village”, *New Community*, 10:67-84

Hermele, Kenneth

1997 “The Discourage on Migration and Development”, in Thomas Hammar, Grete Brochmann, Kristof Tamas and Thomas Faist (eds.), *International Migration, Immobility and Development: Multidisciplinary Perspective*, Berg: Oxford

Huang, Shirlena Brenda S.A. Yeoh and Noor Abdul Rahman (eds.)

2005 *Asian women as transnational domestic workers*, Singapore: Marshall Cavendish,

Hugo, Graeme

2002 “Effects of International Migration on the Family in Indonesia”, *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*, Vol. 11, No.1. 13-46

2003 *Migration and Development: A Perspective from Asia*, IOM Migration Research Series, No. 14, Geneva: IOM

2006 “Migration and Development in Asia”, Conference Paper, Presented at International Conference on Population and Development in Asia: Critical Issues for a Sustainable Future, 20-22 March, 2006, Phuket, Thailand

Iredale, Robyn, Charles Hawksley and Stephen Castles (eds.)

2003 *Migration in the Asia Pacific: Population, Settlement and Citizenship Issues*, Edward Elgar: Celtenham, UK

Islam, Mainul

1991 “Labor Migration and Development: A Case Study of a Rural Community in Bangladesh”, *Bangladesh Journal of Political economy*, 11(2), Pp 570-587

Jurgens, Jeffrey

2001 “Shifting Spaces: Complex identities in Turkish-German Migration”, Ludger Pries (ed.), *New transnational social spaces : international migration and transnational companies in the early twenty-first century*, London: Routledge

Johnson, S and B Rogaly

1997 *Microfinance and Poverty Reduction*, Oxfam (UK and Ireland) and ActionAid (UK)

Jones, RC

1998 “Remittances and Inequality: A question of migration stage and geographical scale”, *Economic Geography*, 74(1) pp8-25

Kadioglu, Ayse

1994 “The Impact of Migration on Gender Roles: Findings of Field Research in Turkey”, *International Migration*, 32, 4, 533-560

Kapur, D

2003 “Remittances: the New Development mantra, paper prepared for the G-24 Technical Group Meeting, 15-16 September (Geneva: Palais des Nations). Available online, accessed on March 11, 2007 at 11.55 am [http://www.unctad.org/en/docs/gdsmdpbg2420045\\_en.pdf](http://www.unctad.org/en/docs/gdsmdpbg2420045_en.pdf)

Kaspar H.

2004 Impact of International Labour Migration on Gender Relations: A Case Study of Kalabang, Nepal. Master Thesis, Department of Geography, University of Zurich

Khadria, Binod

2007 “Social Collateral and Human Capital”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, March 31, 2007

Khaled, Louhichi

1995 “Migration and Women’s Status: The Jordan Case”, *International Migration*, Vol. 33, No. 2, 235-251

Koslowski, Rey (ed.)

2005 *International Migration and the Globalization of Domestic Politics*, London: Routledge

Levitt, Peggy

1998 “Social Remittances: Migration Driven, Local-Level Forms of Cultural Diffusion”, *International Migration Review*, Vol. xxxii, Nov. 4, 1998

1996 Social Remittances: A Conceptual Tool for Understanding Migration and Development, Working Paper Series N. 96.04, October 1996

Lian, Kwen Fee and Md Mizanur Rahman

2006 “International Labor Recruitment: Channeling Bangladeshi migrants to East and Southeast Asia, *Asia-Pacific Population Journal* (with Lian Kwen Fee), Volume 21, No. 1, (April 2006) pp 85-107

Lindstrom, David P.

1996 “Economic Opportunity in Mexico and Return Migration from the United States”, *Demography*, Volume 33, Number 3, August 1996: 357-374

Lopez, John Robert and Mitchell A. Seligson

1991 "Small Business Development in El Salvador: The Impact of Remittances", In *Migration, remittances and Small Business Development: Mexico and Caribbean Basin Countries*, S. Diaz-Briquet and S. Weintraub eds. Pp 175-206, Boulder: Westview

MacDonald, John S. and Leatrice D. MacDonald

1974 "Chain Migration, Ethnic Neighborhood Formation and Social Networks", In Charles Tilly (ed.), *An Urban World*, Little Brown and Co. Boston: pp 226-36

Madhavan, M.C.

1985 "Indian Emigrants: Numbers, Characteristics and Economic Impact", *Population and Development Review*, 11 (3): 457-481

Malkin, Victoria

2004 "We Go to get ahead" Gender and Status in Two Mexican Migrant Communities, *Latin American Perspectives*, Issue 138, Vol. 31, No. 5, September 75-99

Massey, Douglas S. Emilio A. Parrado

1994 "Migradollars: The Remittances and Savings of Mexican Migrants to the United States", *Population research and Policy Review*, 13: 3-30

Massey, Douglas S., Rafael Alarcon, Jorge Durand, and Humberto Gonzalez

1987 *Return to Aztlan: The Social Process of International Migration from Western Mexico*, University of California Press.

Momsen, Janet Henshall (ed.)

1999 *Gender, migration, and domestic service*, London : Routledge

Naved, R.T., M. Newby, and S. Amin.

2001 "The Effects of Migration on Marriage of Female Garment Workers in Bangladesh." *International Journal of Population Geography*, 2001, 7(2): 91-104.

Nichols, Sandra

2002 "Another Kind of remittance: Transfer of Agricultural Innovations by migrants to their communities of origin", Paper presented at the Second Colloquium on International Migration: Mexico-California, University of California, Berkeley, 29 march

Nyberg-Sorensen, Ninna

2003 "From Transnationalism to the Emergence of a New transnational research field: A Review Essay", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27 (2):465-469

- 2004 “The Development Dimension of Migrant Remittances”, Migration Policy Research, Working Paper Series, No. 1- June, Department of Migration Policy, Research and Communications
- Nyberg-Sorensen, Ninna, Nicholas van Hear and Poul Engberg-Pedersen
- 2002 “The Migration-Development Nexus: Evidence and Policy Options State-of-the-Art Overview”, *International Migration*, Vol. 40 (5)
- Oishi, Nana.
- 2005 *Women in motion : globalization, state policies, and labor migration in Asia*, Stanford, Calif. : Stanford University Press, 2005.
- Parnwell, Michael J.G.
- 2005 “Transnational Migration and Development: A Conceptual Overview”, *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*, Vol. 14, No.1-2, pp 11-34
- Papademetriou, Demetrios G., and Philip L. Martin (Ed.)
- 1991 *The Unsettled Relationship: Labor Migration and Economic Development*, Greenwood Press, London.
- Papademetriou, Demetrios G. and Ira Emke-Poulopoulos.
- 1991 “Migration and Development in Greece: the Unfinished Story,” in Papademetriou D. G. and P. L. Martin (Ed.), *The Unsettled Relationship: Labor Migration and Economic Development*. New York: Greenwood Press
- Parker, Lyn (ed.)
- 2005 *The Agency of Women in Asia*, Marshall Cavendish Academic: Singapore
- Parreñas, Rhacel Salazar
- 2005 *Children of global migration: transnational families and gendered woes* Stanford, Calif. : Stanford University Press,
- Pessar, Patricia R
- 1991 “Caribbean Emigration and Development, In Papademetriou and Martin (Ed.), *The Unsettled Relationship: Labor Migration and Economic Development*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Pfleglerl, Johannes, Siew-Ean Khoo, Brenda S.A. Yeoh and Verene Koh (eds.)
- 2003 *Researching Migration and the Family*, Asian MetaCentre for Population and Sustainable Development Analysis: Singapore

Pflegerl, Johannes,

- 2003 Family and Migration Research Developments in Europe: A General Overview, in Johannes Pflegerl, Siew-Ean Khoo, Brenda S.A. Yeoh and Verene Koh (eds.) *Researching Migration and the Family*, Asian MetaCentre for Population and Sustainable Development Analysis: Singapore

Piper, Nicola

- 2004a "Rights of Foreign Workers and the Politics of *Migration* in South-East and East Asia" *International Migration*, vol. 42, no. 5, pp. 71,

- 2004b "Gender and Migration Policies in Southeast and East Asia: Legal Protection and Socio-cultural Empowerment of Unskilled Migrant Women", *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*, Volume 25, Issue 2, pp 216-231

- 2005 "Gender and Migration", A Paper prepared for the policy analysis and research programme of the global commission on international migration, available online <http://www.gcim.org/attachements/TP10.pdf> accessed on November 25, 2006 1: 42 pm

- 2006a Economic migration and the transnationalisation of the rights of foreign workers: a concept note, Working Paper, Working papers series 58, Singapore : Asia Research Institute, National University of Singapore,

- 2006b "Gendering the Politics of Migration", *International Migration Review*, 40 (1), 133-164

Piore Michael J.

- 1979 *Birds of Passage: Migrant Labor and Industrial Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Porio, Emma

- 2006 "Filipino Migration and Global Householding: A Preliminary Review", Paper presented at the International Conference on Population and Development in Asia: Critical Issues for a Sustainable Future Phuket, Thailand: 20-22 March 2006

Portes, A

- 1995 Transnational Communities: Their Emergence and Significance in the Contemporary World System, in Proceedings *The Political Economy of the World-System: Latin America in the World-Economy*, University of Miami, North-South Center

Pryer, J.

- 1992 "Purdah, Patriarchy, and Population Movement: Perspectives from Bangladesh," in *Gender and Migration in Developing Countries*, Sylvia Chant, ed. Pp. 139-153. London: Belhaven Press,

Rahman Md Mizanur

- 2003 “Bangladeshi Workers in Singapore: A Sociological Study of Temporary Labour Migration to Singapore”, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Sociology, National University of Singapore.
- 2004a “Migration and Poverty in Bangladesh: Ironies and Paradoxes”, in Hisaya Oda (ed.), *International Labor Migration from South Asia*, Institute of Developing Economies, JETRO, Japan, ASED 70, 2004, pp181-208
- 2004b “Migration Networks: An Analysis of Bangladeshi Migration to Singapore”, *Asian Profile*, Vol. 32, No. 4 (August Issue 2004), pp 367-390
- 2000 “Emigration and Development: The Case of a Bangladeshi Village”, *International Migration*, Volume 38, No. 4 (2000) pp. 109-130 (22)
- 2007 “Management of Foreign Manpower in Singapore”, in Tong Chee Kiong and Lian Kwen Fee (eds.), *Social Policy and Social Engineering in Singapore: Options for a Post-industrial State*, Brill Academic Publishers

Rahman, Md Mizanur and Brenda S.A. Yeoh

"The Social Organization of Hundi: The Remittance Transfer from East and Southeast Asia to Bangladesh", *Asian Population Studies*, Forthcoming

Rahman, Md Mizanur and Lian Kwen Fee

- 2005 “Bangladeshi Workers in Singapore: The Views from Inside”, *Asia-Pacific Population Journal*, Vol. 20, No. 1: (April 2005) pp 63-89

Reichert, J.S.

- 1981 “The Migrant Syndrome: Seasonal US Wage Labor and Rural Development in Central Mexico”, *Human Organization*, 40:56-66

Rivera-Batiz, Francisco L.

- 1982 “International Migration, Non-Traded Goods and Economic Welfare in the Source Country”, *Journal of Development Economics*, 11 (1): 81-90

Rivera-Salgado, Gaspar

- 2000 “Transnational Political Strategies: the Case of Mexican Indigenous Migrants”, in Nancy Foner, Ruben Rumbaut and Steven Gold (eds.) *Immigration research for a new century*, New York, NY: Russell Sage foundation

Roberts, Kenneth D., and Michael D.S. Morris

- 2003 “Fortune, Risk and remittances: An Application of Option theory to Participation in Migration Networks”, *International Migration Review*, 37 (4): 1252-1281

Skeldon, Ronald

1997 “*Migration and Development: A Global Perspective*”, Harlow: Longman

Rudkin, Laura

1993 “Gender Differences in Economic Well-being among the Elderly of Java”, *Demography* 30 (2): 209-226

Salhi, Zahia Smail and Ian Richard Netton (eds.)

2006 *The Arab Diaspora: Voices of an Anguished Scream*, Longdon: Routledge

Semyonov, Moshe and Gorodzeisky Anastasia

2005 Labour Migration, Remittances and Household Income: A Comparison between Filipino and Filipina Overseas Workers, *International Migration review*, Vol. 39, No. 1, pp 45

Siddiqui, Tasneem

2001 *Transcending Boundaries: Labor Migration of Women from Bangladesh*, University Press Limited: Dhaka

Smith Robert C

1998 Transnational Localities: Community, Technology and the Politics of Membership within the Context of Mexico and US Migration”, *Comparative Urban and Community Research*, 6: 196-238

Spaan, Ernst, Ton van Naerssen and Felicitas Hillmann

2005 “Shifts in the European Discourses on Migration and Development”, *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*, Vol. 14, No. 1-2, pp35-69

Spaan, Ernst and Ton von Naerssen

2005 “Asia and Europe: Transnationalism, Multiple Linkages and Development”, *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*, Vol. 14, No. 1-2, pp1-9

Stahl, Charles W.

2003 “International Labour Migration in East Asia: Trends and Policy Issues”, in Robyn Iredale, Charles Hawksley and Stephen Castles, eds., *Migration in the Asia Pacific – Population, Settlement and Citizenship Issues*, Edward Elgar: Cheltenham, UK

Stahl, C. and Ansanul Habib

1991 “Emigration and Development in South and Southeast Asia” In Papademetriou, D., and P. Martin (Ed.). *The Unsettled Relationship: Labor Migration and Economic Development*. New York: Greenwood Press.



Stark, Oded

1991 *The Migration of Labor*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Stevenson, Thomas B

1997 Migration, family and Household in Highland Yemen: the impact of Socio-economic and political change and cultural ideals on domestic organization, *Journal of comparative family studies*, 28,2, 14-53

Stinner, WF., K de Albuquerque, and R.S. Bryce-Laporte, eds.

1982 *Return Migration and Remittances : Developing a Caribbean Perspective*, Research Institute on Immigration and Ethnic Studies, Occasional Paper No. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution

Straubhaar, Thomas

1988 *On the Economics of International Labor Migration*, Verlag Paul Haupt Bern und Stuttgart: London

Thieme, Susan and Simone Wyss

2005 “Migration Patterns and Remittance Transfer in Nepal: A Case Study of Sainik Basti in Western Nepal”, *International Migration*, Vol. 43 (5) pp 59-98

Taylor, J Edward et. al

1996 International Migration and National Development, *Population Index*, 62 (2): 181-212

Taylor, J. Edward

1986 “Differential Migration, networks, information and risk” pp 147-71 in *Migration Theory, Human Capital and Development*, edited by Oded Stark, Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press

Thapan, Meenaskshi (ed.)

2005 *Transnational Migration and the Politics of Identity*, Save: Thoands Oaks

Townsend, Nicholas W

1997 Men, Migration and Households in Botswana: An exploration of connections over time and space, *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 23,3, Sept, 405-420

Tyner, James A

2002 “The Globalization of Transnational Labour Migration and the Filipino Family: A Narrative, *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*, 11,1, 95-116

Üçok, Mine

2006 “Transnational Consumption Practices for Social Mobility: A Study of Turkish Immigrants in Denmark”, The Academy for Migration Studies in Denmark, AMID Working Paper Series, No. 58/2006,

Ullah, AKM Ahsan and Pranab Kumar Panday

2007 “Remitting Money to Bangladesh: What do migrants prefer?” Research Note, *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*, Vol. 16, No.1, 121-136

Vertovec, Steven

2004 “Cheap Calls: the Social Glue of Migrant Transnationalism”, *Global Networks*, 4 (2):219-224

Weyland, Karin

2004 “Dominican Women ‘con un pie aqui y orto alla’: transnational practices at the crossroads of local/global agendas”, in *Dominican Migration: Transnational Perspectives*, E. Sagas and S.E. Molina, eds. Pp 154-176, Gainesville: University of Florida Press

Wiest, R. E

1979 “Implications of International Labor Migration for Mexican Rural Development”, in *Migration across Frontiers: Mexico and the United States*, Ed. F. Camara and R. Van Kemper, Albany: Institute for Mesoamerican Studies, State University of New York pp85-97

Wood, Geoffrey D.

1994 *Bangladesh: Whose Ideas, Whose Interests?* University Press Limited, Dhaka

Wong, Theresa, Eu Khim Ng, Brenda S.A. Yeoh and H.T. Abdullah Khan

2003 Migration and the ‘Asian’ Family in a Globalizing World: A Selective Review, in Johannes Pfliegerl et al. (eds.), *Researching Migration and the Family*, Asian MetaCentre for Population and Sustainable Development Analysis, Singapore

Yeoh, Brenda S.A., Elspeth Graham and Paul J. Boyle

2002 “Migrations and Family Relations in the Asia Pacific Region”, *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 1

Yeoh, Brenda S.A., Katie D. Willis and Abudl Khader S.M. Fakhri

2003 “Introduction: Transnationalism and its Edges”, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 26 (2): 207-217

Zachariah, K.C. E.T. Mathew, and S. Irudaya Rajan

2001 “Social, Economic and Demographic Consequences of Migration on Kerala, International Migration, Vol. 39 (2) 43-71

Zelizer, Viviana

1989 “The Social Meaning of Money: Special Monies.” *American Journal of Sociology*, 1989, 95 (2): 342-77.

Zlotnik, Hania

1995 Migration and the family: the Female Perspective, *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*, 4, 2-3, 253-271

## TABLES

**Table 1: Socio-Economic Characteristics of Migrant Families, Gurail, Survey of 2001 and 2006**

| <b>Socio-Economic Attributes of Migrant Families</b>    | <b>2001 (%)</b> | <b>2006 (%)</b> | <b>Socio-Economic Attributes of Migrant Families</b> | <b>2001 (%)</b> | <b>2006 (%)</b> |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|--|-----------------|-----------------|
| <b>1.1 Person Interviewed</b>                           |                 |                 | <b>1.8. Earning Members (Family)</b>                 |                 |                 |
| Returnees   | 92              | 0               | One Member   | 50              | 18              |
| Wives   | 0               | 84              | Two Members  | 12              | 6               |
| Others members  | 8               | 14              | Three to Four Members                                | 6               | 0               |
| Missing data  | 0               | 2               | No Local Earning Member                              | 32              | 72              |
|   |                 |                 | Missing Data   | 0               | 4               |
| <b>1.2. Age Structure of Migrants</b>                   |                 |                 | <b>1.9. Economic Activities</b>                      |                 |                 |
| Below 20  | 14              | -               | Self-Employed of families                            | 64              | 24              |
| 21 to 25  | 48              | -               | Wage-Employed  | 4               | 0               |
| 26 to 30  | 24              | -               | No Local Work  | 32              | 72              |
| 31 to 35  | 10              | -               | Missing Data   | 0               | 4               |
| Above 35  | 4               | -               |  |                 |                 |
| <b>1.3. Types of Family</b>                             |                 |                 | <b>1.10. Families' Cultivable Lands</b>              |                 |                 |
| Nuclear   | 30              | 68              | <b>Before Migration</b>                              |                 |                 |
| Extended  | 70              | 32              | No Land  | 14              | 16              |
|   |                 |                 | Below 50 Decimal                                     | 24              | 24              |
| <b>1.4. Marital Status</b>                              |                 |                 | 51 to 100 Decimal                                    | 22              | 20              |
| Married   | 32              | 86              | 101 to 150 Decimal                                   | 18              | 18              |
| Unmarried   | 68              | 14              | 151 to 200 Decimal                                   | 16              | 14              |
|   |                 |                 | Above 201  | 6               | 6               |
| <b>1.5. Religion</b>                                    |                 |                 | Missing Data   | 0               | 2               |
| Islam   | 94              | 94              | <b>After Migration</b>                               |                 |                 |
| Hindu   | 6               | 6               | No Land  | 42              | 14              |
|   |                 |                 | Below 50 Decimal                                     | 12              | 24              |
| <b>1.6. Level of Education of Migrants</b>              |                 |                 | 51 to 100 Decimal                                    | 24              | 26              |
| Primary (5 yrs)   | 38              | -               | 101 to 150 Decimal                                   | 16              | 20              |
| Secondary (5-10 yrs)                                    | 44              | -               | Above 151 Decimal                                    | 6               | 12              |
| Higher Secondary (10+2 yrs)                             | 6               | -               | Missing Data   | 2               | 4               |
| Graduate (12+2 yrs)                                     | 6               | -               |  |                 |                 |
| Illiterate (cannot read and write)                      | 6               | -               | <b>1.11. Outcome of Migration</b>                    |                 |                 |
|   |                 |                 | Positive   | 8               | 94              |
| <b>1.7. Occupation of Migrants (Prior to Migration)</b> |                 |                 | Negative   | 90              | 4               |
| Self-employed   | 60              | -               | No Comment   | 2               | 2               |
| Wage-employed   | 4               | -               | <b>1.12. Role in family Sustenance</b>               |                 |                 |
| Unemployed  | 14              | -               | Primary role   |                 |                 |
| Student   | 20              | -               | Secondary Role                                       | 86              | 56              |
| Returnee (overseas)                                     | 2               | -               | No Role  | 8               | 32              |
|   |                 |                 | Missing Data   | 4               | 12              |
|   |                 |                 |  | 2               | 0               |

Source: Authors' Fieldwork, 2001, 2006

**Table 2: Uses of Remittances at Gurail, 2006**  
**‘Past Use’ and ‘Future Use’, N=50**

| <b>Areas of Expenses of Remittances<br/>by Migrant Families</b> | <b>Past Uses of<br/>Remittances<br/>Frequency<br/>(Percent)</b> | <b>Near Future Uses of<br/>Remittances<br/>Frequency<br/>(Percent)</b> |
|---|---|--|
| Basic Consumption of Family                                     | 98  | 64   |
| Debt repayment  | 84  | 2  |
| House-making/ renovation  | 72  | 20   |
| Education   | 62  | 42   |
| Lending money to relatives                                      | 58  | -  |
| Donation (socio-religious benefits)                             | 52  | 98   |
| Land-Purchasing   | 48  | 48   |
| Savings   | 42  | 92   |
| Socio-cultural Ceremonies                                       | 40  | 38   |
| Investment (firming and non-firming)                            | 38  | 74   |
| Paying of others' migration Cost                                | 36  | 18   |
| Medical   | 22  | 8  |
| Others  | 2   | 10   |

Source: Authors' Fieldwork, 2006

**Table 3: Socio-Economic Position of Migrant Families**  
**A Comparison, 2001 and 2006**

| <b>Gurail, n=50, 2001</b>  | <b>Percents</b> | <b>Gurail, n=50, 2006</b>  | <b>Percents</b> |
|----------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------------|
| <b>Standard of Living</b>  |                 | <b>Standard of Living</b>  |                 |
| Better                     | 6               | Better                     | 88              |
| Same                       | 16              | Same                       | 6               |
| Worse Off                  | 82              | Worse off                  | 4               |
| Missing Data               | 0               | Missing Data               | 2               |
| <b>Incomes of Family</b>   |                 | <b>Incomes of Family</b>   |                 |
| Better                     | 2               | Better                     | 90              |
| Same                       | 16              | Same                       | 6               |
| Worse Off                  | 80              | Worse Off                  | 4               |
| Missing Data               | 2               | Missing Data               | 0               |
| <b>Wedding Opportunity</b> |                 | <b>Wedding Opportunity</b> |                 |
| Better                     | 4               | Better                     | 64              |
| Same                       | 32              | Same                       | 22              |
| Worse Off                  | 22              | Worse Off                  | 4               |
| No Comment                 | 40              | No Comment                 | 6               |
| Missing Data               | 2               | Missing Data               | 2               |

Source: Authors' Fieldwork, 2001, 2006

**Table 4: Migration and Family Dynamics  
Gurail, N=50, 2006**

| <b>Marital Status of Migrants</b> | <b>Percents<br/>(Overseas)</b> | <b>Control over Remittances</b>                                      | <b>Percents</b> |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| Married                           | 86                             | Wives  | 72              |
| Unmarried                         | 14                             | Male heads   | 22              |
| Divorce                           | 0                              | Mixed  | 46              |
| <b>Types of the Family</b>        | 68                             | <b>Recipients of Remittances</b>                                     |                 |
| Nuclear                           | 32                             | Wives (Principal)  | 78              |
| Extended                          |                                | Male heads of family (principles)                                    | 22              |
|                                   |                                | Mixed type of recipients   | 48              |
| <b>Heads of the Family</b>        |                                | <b>Role in Family Decision-making<br/>(Wives of Migrants) (n=43)</b> |                 |
| Migrants' Wives                   | 72                             | Yes (Overwhelming)   | 82              |
| Senior Male members               | 28                             | No   | 16              |
|                                   |                                | Missing Data   | 2               |

Source: Author's Fieldwork, 2006