European Journal of Business and Social Sciences, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp 66-74, **May 2013.** **P.P. 66 - 74**
URL: *http://www.ejbss.com/recent.aspx*
ISSN: 2235 -767X

DO REMITTANCES CONTRIBUTE TO IMPROVEMENTS IN LIFE STANDARD AT THE HOST AREA (WITH REFERENCE TO CHITRAL, KPK, PAKISTAN?

Akhtar Ali,

Assistant Professor, Rural Sociology Department, Agricultural University Peshawar

Prof. Dr. Rashid Khan,

Sociology Department, University of Peshawar

Prof. Dr. Musawar Shah,

Chairman, Rural Sociology Department, Agricultural University Peshawar

Dr. Yorid Ehsan Zia,

Assistant Professor, Quaid-e-Azam College of Commerce, University of Peshawar.

ABSTRACT

The present study entitled "Do remittances contribute to improvements in life standard at the host area (with reference to Chitral, KPK, Pakistan)": A Sociological analysis was conducted in District Peshawar and District Chitral. A sample size of 500 (250 migrants in District Peshawar and 250 respondents of their dependent family members back in District Chitral) was selected out of total 5000 through simple random sampling procedure. Interview schedule was used as a tool for data collection in the study area. Percentage and frequencies were used to know about the phenomenal aspects of the study. Moreover, T-test was used to measure the comparison before and after migration in the study area. The results disclosed that a highly significant (P=0.000) relationship was found between amount spent on health after migration. Similarly, amount spent on housing conditions after migration was highly significant (P=0.000). Moreover, amount spent on education of children after migration further disclosed highly significant relationship (P=0.000). Likewise, a significant relationship (P=0.000) was found on house hold goods after migration. Furthermore, amount spent after migration on daily use items showed a highly significant increase (P=0.000).

It is concluded from the findings that migrant's remittances were used as a tool for poverty alleviation in the study area. The results showed that migrants remittances improved the economic status of the households as well as social status i.e., improvement in health, household goods, and daily use items, housing conditions and investment in children education.

It was concluded that migrant's remittances contributed a lot in bringing the lot of local people. Improvement in life standard with visible changes in enjoying basic facilities like education, health care and recreational surfaced up due to concommited flow of remittances from place of migration (Peshawar) to place of destination (Chitral). Stabilization of proper channel from utilization of remittances on long term, lies in through local leaders and community participation were fundamental as policy recommendations.

***KEY POINTS**: Migration, Push factors. Pull Factors, Impact of Migration.*

Introduction

Migration is a global phenomenon with its well-known social and economic implications (Manner 2003).The social ,economic and other structural characteristics of a country are greatly influenced by migration (khan 2010;White &Woods 1980). Migration occurs under the influence of a number of factors (Kosinski & Prothero 1975; Bhagat & Mohanty 2009), and the locales particular development milieu determines the factors, responsible for migration (Mabogunje 1970; Zelinsky 1971). Internal migration is classified into four types on the basis of settlement status of native and destination places. These four types are; rural to rural, rural to urban, urban to urban and urban to rural (Bose, 1974).

In developing countries there is a big difference in socio-economic development between rural and urban areas, which has led to increased rural to urban migration, because this imbalance in socio-economic development is the major factor responsible for migration as shown by the history (Sorensen et .al., 2002) There are three factors responsible for increased population of urban areas 1) natural growth of population, 2) rural to urban migration,3) reclassification of rural areas as urban in the due course of time.

Rural to urban migration has accounted for two-fifth of the total urban growth in developing countries. The process can be considered as "over-urbanization" as long as (1) rural-urban migration results in misallocation of labor between rural and urban areas causing urban under-employment, un-employment and poverty,(2) The social cost for providing for a country growing population is increased by rural –urban migration(Gugler,1988).

By drawing a marked difference between push and pull factors as deteriorating living conditions pertaining to agriculture with sub-standard marketing facilities, deteriorating infrastructure with no supporting institutions which could ensure the smooth provision of credit to small scale farmers, while on the other hand, the urban dwellers are fully acquainted with better job access, education and health care. This has, in turn, multiplied the problems for the urban settlement in the shape of over-population based on stress on local economic conditions with substandard public services couple with fragile infrastructure to meet this growing burden. This process also embodies the very notion of urbanization with rapid population growth thus making a prevalent condition difficult to live in. Efficient governance at local level to be only the key to capture this problem. This governance must contain the paradigm shift with reference to authority towards municipalities along with polices and plans more action oriented based on quick response for poor urban people. This planning can certainly can address the issues revolving around slums up gradation, improvement in water supply and management, Sanitation allied with efficient infrastructure (Hopkins, 2000).

Migration is a global phenomenon, signifies individual to nation movement with social, economic and political dimensions on consistent basis from one place to another involving rapid transformation. As a natural process always in process of seeking comfortable while acquiring on modernization and development (Hopkins, 2002).

This paper is based on as focusing the effects of migration from Chitral to Peshawar on the relative life standard of the migrants. The paper proceeded with analyzing the difference on the socio-economic profile of the respondents in light of this intra state migration.

Materials and Methods

The universe of the study KPK, Peshawar with population comprising those Chitralese migrated from Chitral to Peshawar. A sample size of 500 respondents were randomly selected including businessmen and skilled persons as representative of each household and their dependent family members back in District Chitral through proportional allocation as 50: 450 for businessmen and workers strength respectively.

Showing the distribution of respondents and their characteristics

Nature of respondents	Area	Number
Businessmen	Peshawar	25
Businessmen families	Chitral	25
Skilled workers	Peshawar	225
Skilled workers families	Chitral	225
Total		500

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table-I: Frequency and Percentage Distribution according to the amount spent on Health before and after migration.

Amount spent on health before and after migration	Before migration		After migration	
Spiritual treatment	0------ 2000	211(84.4%)	500-10000	102(40.8%)
Home-made treatment	2001----- 4000	17(6.8%)	10001-20000	60(24%)
Hakim	4001---- 6000	17(6.8%)	20001-30000	72(28.8%)
Qualified doctors	6001—8000	5(2.0)	30001-40000	11(4.4%)
Private-doctor	0	0	40001-50000	5(2.0%)
Amount spent on housing conditions				
Mud-houses	1-50000	136(54.4%)	1-100000	134(53.6%)
Semi-concrete houses	50001-100000	111(44.4%)	100001-200000	100(40.0%)

Concrete houses	100001-150000	3(1.2%)	200001-300000	16(6.4%)
Educational Level of children				
Primary	1---15000	213(85.2%)	1—13750	24(9.6%)
Metric	15001----30000	36(14.4%)	13751—27500	83(33.2%)
Intermediate	30001—45000	1(0.4%)	27501—41250	120(48.0%)
Higher education	0	0	41251—55000	23(9.2%)
Amount spent on households goods				
Washing machine	1----5000	249(99.6%)	1----25000	66(26.4%)
Refrigerator	5001----10000	1(0.4%)	25001---50000	12(4.8%)
Furniture	0	0	50001---75000	172(68.8%)
Amount spent on daily use items				
Grocery	1---15000	139(55.6%)	1---15000	35(14.0%)
Clothes/shoes	15001---30000	107(42.8%)	15001---30000	62(24.8%)
Food	30001—45000	4(1.6%)	30001—45000	142(56.8%)
Vehicle expenses	0	0	45001-60000	11(4.4%)
Total		250(100)		250(100)

The above table depicted that out of total (84.4%) of the respondents spent an amount of PRs.(0 to 2000) on spiritual treatment for health , followed by (6.8%) of the respondents spent up to PRs. (2001—4000) on home made treatment, (6.8%) of the respondents spent up to PRs.(4001—6000) on Hakeem and (2%) of the respondents spent up to PRs. (6001—8000) on Qualified doctors for health before migration. In rural areas the access to social and health facilities was either difficult or due to the historical development of biases that created Islands Privilege" in urban areas (Harrison, 1982; Lipton, 1976). Similarly, in rural Africa, economic deprivation has profound effects on health and other livelihood outcomes (Zulu, Dodoo, & Ezeh, 2002).

However, there was visible change appeared to spent amount on health after migration. Majority of the respondents i.e.(40.8%) claimed that they increased to spent amount on health PRs.(500—10000) on Spiritual treatment, followed by (24%) of the respondents up to PRs.(10001-20000) on home made treatment, (28.8%) of the respondents up to PRs.(20001-30000) on Hakim ,(4.4%) of the respondents claimed up to PRs.(30001-40000) on qualified doctors and (2%) of the respondents disclosed up to PRs.(40001-50000) on private doctors after migration in the targeted areas.

These results pointed out that remittances played an important role to invest more on health after migration of the respondents. These findings were supporting the out-come that migration increases the awareness about health in addition to the direct effect on wealth, which had led to lower rates of infant deaths and higher birth weights in Mexico (Hildebrandt & McKenzie, 2005).

Furthermore, majority of the respondents i.e.(.54.4%) claimed that they spent between PRs. (1 to 5000) on Mud house before migration, followed by (44.4%) of the respondents between Rs.(50001—10000) on semi-concrete houses and (1.2%) of the respondents between Rs. (100001—150000) on concrete houses. Majority of the households were living in stone made houses in hilly areas and were not able to invest more in their houses due to extreme poverty.

Likewise, The distribution of households on the basis of amount spent on housing conditions after migration showed that majority (53.6%) of the respondents claimed between Rs. (1—100000) on mud houses, followed by (40%) of the respondents disclosed between Rs (100001—200000) on semi-concrete houses and (6.4%) of the respondents between Rs. (200001—300000) on concrete houses. It was concluded from the data that after migration the people earned money and invested a lot on their houses. Rachel Murphy (2002) found that during the interview of the respondents the question of priority was the amount spent on house building.

Results further highlight that the highest number i.e.(85.2%) of the respondents spent an amount between up to Rs. (1—15001) on primary children education before migration, followed by (14.4%) of the respondents up to PRs. (15001—30000) on metric, while (0.4%) of the respondents had spent up to PRs. (30001—45000)on intermediate per year. Majority of the households invested less money on children education due to poverty. In this regard, Afsar (1995) claimed that as compared to non migrants the migrants often benefited more because of their innovative, risk taking and desperate nature. The benefits included higher or regular income, gain in wealth, greater access to public services and education.

The investment on children education increased after migration of one of the household member. In this regard (48%) of the respondents spent an amount of Rs. 27501 to Rs. 41250 on intermediate education after migration, followed by (33.2%) up to (13751—27500) on metric and the remaining (9.6%) of the respondents claimed between up to Rs.(1—13750) on primary education. Similarly, Mansuri 2006) says that in rural Pakistan temporary migration is an important factor for higher school enrollment of girls.

Furthermore, majority of the respondents i.e.(99.6%) spent an amount between up to Rs.(1—5000) on washing machine before migration while (0.4%) had spent an amount between up to (5001—10000) on refrigerator before migration**.** In this perspective (Oda, 2007) explained his findings that households of migrants had better economic position than those of non migrants due to foreign remittances.

In addition, the table disclosed that (68.8%) of the respondents had spent an amount from PRs .5001 to PRs. 7500 on furniture after migration followed by (26.4%) of the respondents as between of Rs.(1---2500) on washing machine while (4.8%) of the respondents claimed as between Rs. (2501—5000) on refrigerator

after migration . Most of the sample households had durables such as refrigerators, air conditioners, televisions, etc. in significant number after migration.

It is further explored that majority of the respondents i.e.(55.6%) spent amount between PRs.(1----15000) on grocery before migration, followed by(42.8%) of the respondents who spent between PRs.(15001—30000) on clothes/shoes and (1.6%) of the respondents who spent between (30001—45000) on food before migration. The findings of Arrehag *et al*., (2005) were similar who found that most of the respondents claimed that they used remittances primarily on 'clothing and food', compared to when they were questioned what the remittances had allowed them to buy, showing that people did not always use the transfer in the way in which they claim they intend to. As against, calculation on the purchase of daily use items after migration indicated that (56.8%) of the respondents spent an amount PRs.(30001 to PRs. 45000) on food after migration, followed by (24.8%) of the respondents who claimed amount spent between (15001—30000) on clothes/shoes and (14%) PRs.1 to PRs,15000 on grocery. It is concluded from the data that there is a big difference in the purchase of daily use items before and after migration of the household's members in the targeted areas.

Table 2 Showing T-test statistics.

Statement	Before		After		Mean difference	T-value	Significant value(2-tailed)
	Mean	Standard Error	Mean	Standard Error			
Amount Spent on Health	**1232.76**	**103.785**	**15239.48**	**664.276**	**-14006.720**	**-22.020**	**0.000**
Amount Spent on Housing Conditions	**53844.00**	**1465.627**	**126800.00**	**6595.700**	**-72956.000**	**-11.310**	**0.000**
Amount Spent on Education of children	**10978.80**	**399.069**	**30010.00**	**1395.485**	**-19031.200**	**-14.024**	**0.000**
Amount Spent on Household Goods	**60.00**	**44.649**	**7604.00**	**310.954**	**-7544.00**	**-24.564**	**0.000**
Amount Spent on Daily Use Items	**15858.00**	**526.543**	**33313.60**	**1672.071**	**-17455.600**	**-11.396**	**0.000**

H_0= Amount spent per year after migration don't affect health.

H_1= Amount spent per year after migration affect health.

Table 2 provides information that amount spent after migration on health services was highly significant as indicated (P=0.000). It is apparent that the null hypothesis is rejected and a relationship between amounts spent after migration on health services is confirmed. Moreover, It further indicates towards conformity of the mean value (-14006.720) that migration has positively contributed towards improvements in health services. Similar conclusion were also disclosed by (UNDP, 2009) that Visiting and returning migrants may bring back health-improved practices such as drinking safe water and better sanitation etc.

H_0 =Amount spent per year after migration do not affect housing conditions

H_1= Amount spent per year after migration affect housing conditions.

It is pertinent to mention that amount spent after migration on housing conditions was highly significant relationship (P=0.000).Thus the null hypothesis is rejected and a relationship between the amount spent after migration on housing conditions is confirmed.

Amount spent after migration affect housing conditions in the targeted areas as indicated by the mean value (-72956.000).It is clearly depicted from this relationship that migration has positively contributed towards improvement in house hold conditions. Mexican migrants were more likely to make investments in housing than other activities which increases household production as disclosed by (Durand et al., 1996).

H_o=Amount spent per year after migration don't affect children education.

H_1=Amount spent per year after migration affects children education.

The study further explored that amount spent after migration on educational level of children showed a highly significant relationship (P=0.000) .It is apparent that null hypothesis is rejected and a relationship between amount spent after migration on education of children is confirmed by the mean (-19031.200). It is clear from this relationship that migration has positively contributed towards improvement in educational level of the children as concluded by World Bank, (2007). Remittances from family members are often used for investment in education and healthcare, which improves the human capital base of the household for future generations.

H_o= Amount spent per year after migration don't affect house hold goods.

H_1=Amount spent per year after migration affects house hold goods.

On conformity to the above results, a highly significant (P=0.000) relationship was explored on household goods spending after migration. Thus leading to the acceptance of more spending as with rejection of null hypothesis respectively. Moreover, it was further endorsed by the mean value (-7544.00). These findings indicate towards the positive relationship between household improvements in goods. Supporting findings as disclosed by (Gage et al, 1997), where a linear relationship was detected between parents, number of children and household conditions.

H_o= Amount spent per year after migration don't affect livestock.

H_1=Amount spent per year after migration affects livestock.

According to study amount spent after migration on livestock showed a highly significant relationship (P=0.000). It is clear from the significant value that null hypothesis is rejected and a relationship between amounts spent after migration on livestock is confirmed, which was further endorsed by the mean value (-49484.000). So a positive relationship of money and number of livestock was the eminent out come of this relationship. Which were in line to Funkhouser (1992) finds that, in Nicaragua, remittances increase self-employment in men, but reduce labor supply in women.

H_o= Amount spent per year after migration don't affect indoor- recreational facilities.

H_1= Amount spent per year after migration affects indoor-recreational facilities.

The above mentioned working hypothesis was approved as indicated by the significant relationship (P=0.000) with the rejection of null hypothesis. It means that spending on indoor recreational activities was significantly increased after migration. This was also confirmed by mean value (-11593.200) which led to the confirmation of a positive and high co-relation between the fore mentioned variables.

Conclusion and Suggestions

There has been considerable increase in inflows of migrant remittances from Peshawar to District Chitral which led to the improvement in household conditions as a return due to increase both in income and consumption respectively. Remittances were found as major contributors in eradicating poverty and bringing improved life standard with enjoying basic amenities of life in the place of migration (Chitral) and even in migration (Peshawar). Thus improvements include the health aspect, education and recreational facilities. The provision and availabilities of such facilities were proved highly determinant in the status enhancement of the respondents in the study area. Keeping into considerations the effects of migration, proper use of remittances, under the umbrella of local leadership for making it more durable in terms of structural and functional perspectives of the area were suggested as policy recommendations.

References

1. Manner, C.K. (2003) "A Model of Rural-Urban Migration and Fertility', the journal of developing Areas, vol.37 no.1.pp.55-71.
2. Khan, J.H. (2010) Socio-Economic and Structural Analysis of Internal Migration: A Micro Level Analysis, Serials Publications, New Delhi, p.72.
3. Kosinski.L.A.&.Prothero.R.M(ed)(1975)People on the move: Studies in Internal Migration. Methuen & Co.Ltd., London, p.12.
4. Mabogunje, A.L.(1970) 'System Approach to a Theory of Rural-Urban Migration, Geographical Analysis,vol.2,pp.1-17.
5. Bose, A. (1974) Studies in India's Urbanization 1901-1971, Tata Mc Graw Hill Publishing Co. Ltd., New Delhi, pp.40-143.
6. Sorensen, N.N., Hear, N.V and Pedersen, P.E (2002) 'The Migration- Development Nexus Evidence and Policy Options', International Organization for Migration, p. 7.
7. Gugler, J. 1988. "*Over-Urbanization Reconsidered*." in J. In Gugler ed. The Urbanization of the Third World. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
8. Hopkins, J. (2000). Meeting the Urban Challenges: the john Hopkins University Bloomberg School of Health, Baltimore Maryland: USA. Retrieved from http.//www.infoforhealth.organization/pr/m 16ed sum.shtml
9. Zulu, E. M., F. N. Dodoo, and A.C. Ezeh. (2002). Sexual risk-taking in the slums of Nairobi, Kenya, 1993-1998. *Population Studies* 56(3): 311-323.
10. Hildebrandt, N., & D. McKenzie. 2005. ―The Effects of Migration on Child Health in Mexico.*World Bank Policy Research Paper*, No. 3573, The World Bank
11. Gage, J.A., Sommerfelt, E., Paini, A.L. (1997). Household Structure and Childhood Immunization in Niger and Nigeria. *Demography 34(2): 295-309.*
12. Durand, J., W. Kandel, E.A. Parrado, and D.S. Massey, 1996, "International migration and development in Mexican communities", Demography 33(2), 249-264. *Economic Review, 19*(2), 320-335
13. Funkhouser, E. 1992. Remittances from international migration: A comparison of El Salvador and Nicaragua. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 77 (1): 137-146