



Graduate School of Development Studies

**Remittance and Socio-Economic Conditions of
Nigerian Migrants in The Netherlands**

Research Paper presented by:

Emmanuel Olusola Oke
(The Netherlands)

In partial fulfilment of the requirements for obtaining the degree of
MASTERS OF ARTS IN DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

Specialisation:
**Economics of Development
(ECD)**

Members of the examining committee:

Dr. Robert Sparrow (supervisor)
Dr. Peter de Valk (reader)

The Hague, The Netherlands
September, 2008

Disclaimer:

This document represents part of the author's study programme while at the Institute of Social Studies. The views stated therein are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Institute.

Research papers are not made available for circulation outside of the Institute.

Inquiries:

Postal address: Institute of Social Studies
 P.O. Box 29776
 2502 LT The Hague
 The Netherlands

Location: Kortenaerkade 12
 2518 AX The Hague
 The Netherlands

Telephone: +31 70 426 0460

Fax: +31 70 426 0799

Table of Contents

List of Tables and Figures	4
List of Acronyms	5
Abstract	6
Chapter 1 Introduction	7
Chapter 2 Literature review and Theoretical framework	
2.1 Macroeconomic empirical determinants of remittances	12
2.2 Microeconomic empirical determinants of remittances	13
Chapter 3 Methodology and Data Collection	
3.1 The survey	17
Chapter 4 FINDINGS AND DATA ANALYSIS	
4.1 Data and Variables	21
4.2 Analysis	23
4.2.1 Remittances transfer methods (Channels)	25
4.3 Results and Discussion	26
4.4 Other Socio-economic Characteristics of Nigerian Migrants Affecting Remittances	27
4.4.1 Education	27
4.4.2 Income	28
4.4.3 Age	28
4.4.4 Gender	29
4.4.5 Household size of the remitter and integration into host society	29
4.4.6 Owning real estate in host country	29
Chapter 5 Conclusion and Recommendations	
5.1 Conclusion	30
5.2 Recommendations	31
References	33
Appendix	37
Notes	

List of Tables and Figures

Table 3.1 Survey result	19
Table 4.1 Share of income remitted	21
Table 4.2 Remittance by length of stay	22
Table 4.3 Usage of remittance	23
Table 4.4 Investment back home	24
Table 4.5 Respondent by location of immediate family	24
Table 4.6 Remittance Transfer Methods	26

List of Acronyms

FDI

OLS

CLAD

NELM

IMF

Abstract

The motivation of Nigerian migrants' remittances are the subject of this study based on survey of Nigerians' migrants living and working in The Hague, The Netherlands. For the analysis of both documented and undocumented migrants' remittance behaviour descriptive analysis is used. I focus on all individuals with a migration background but with different residency status. Major findings are: first, the degree of integration into host society matters. Second, the probability to remit is not dominated by income. Third, Nigerian migrants are not a homogenous group concerning their remittance behavior: Undocumented migrants send more remittances for insurance motives. This finding agrees with other studies done somewhere else. The study points to potentially interesting directions for future research: (a) deeper investigations of the extent to which the legal status of the migrant influences cross-border transfer behavior and (b) reconsidering the theoretical arguments since the motive for remittances might have changed during the ongoing globalization process.

Relevance to Development Studies

Recent papers in development economics and finance have begun to assign an important role to remittances as key ingredients in the growth prospects of developing nations and having a potentially positive impact as a development tool for developing countries.

Keywords

Documented Migrants

Undocumented Migrants

Legal

Illegal

Immediate family

Altruism

Remittances

MTN

Migration

Chapter 1

Introduction

In all migration contexts, remittances play an important role. By 1995 total remittances in the developing world exceeded total foreign aid flows and represents approximately 40% of global Foreign Direct Investment. In 2001 remittances to developing countries stood at \$72.3 billion, 42% of total Foreign Direct Investment (FDI). Remittances, projected by the World Bank to exceed US\$90 billion in 2003, constitute the largest source of financial flows to developing countries and are considered more stable than other flows such as foreign direct investment and foreign aid. (Dilip R. 2003). It is has been estimated that migrants' remittance flow to developing countries now surpass official development aid receipts. Remittance has been ranked as the second largest source of external inflow after foreign direct investment (FDI) to developing countries. (Ratha, 2005).

Maimbo and Ratha (2005) claimed that Nigeria is the single largest recipient of remittance in the Sub-Saharan Africa. Orozco (2003) also claimed that Nigeria received between 30 to 60 percent of remittance to the African region. Banjoko, (2005) claimed that Nigerian in the diasporas remitted at least up to \$28 billion within the last 8 years. Experts have argued that the amount being remitted through informal channels is probably 4 times this amount. This amounts to \$112 billion. According to the World Bank (2006a), remittance flows in 2005 have exceeded US\$ 233 billion worldwide. Moreover, recorded remittance flows to developing countries have doubled between 2000 and 2005, indicating a substantial increase in remittances sent by migrants to their families left behind. The traditional development literature has largely focused on the size and potential impact of migrants' remittances (Adams, 1992; Durand et al., 1996).

Migration is relocation of people's residency from one place to other for various reasons. According to many studies, migration is both catalyst and consequence of economic and social change. Migration is primarily a response to real and perceived inequalities in socio-economic opportunities that are themselves a result of dependent and/or uneven sectoral and regional development. A major influence on migration has been radical changes in expectations over what constitutes a satisfactory standard of living, a desirable occupation and a suitable mix of accessible services and amenities. Social influences on migration are important, especially in terms of access to education and health services; such social influences are in turn often a function of economic issues.

Migration of Nigerians got to its highest level during the economic hardship experienced for two decades of economic stagnation and macroeconomic instability, corruption and poor resources management Nnaemeka C. (2005). According to Adedokun (2003), majority of Nigerian emigrate to Europe, North America, the Middle East and South Africa from 1980's following economic downturn, introduction of liberalization measures and emergency of repressive military dictatorship. Many professional, especially scientists, academics and fresh graduates left Nigeria for Europe, North

America but there are also large numbers of unskilled Nigerians with little or no education that gone abroad to become street cleaner, security guards, taxi driver and factory workers Bah et al (2003).

Much has been written on a number of categories of foreigners that lived in the Netherlands, such as Turks, Surinamese and Moroccans, but little is known about the way of life and the specific problems of the Nigerian community in the Netherlands. One of the major reasons for this paper is to study about Nigerian living in The Netherlands in one of the main cities where they are located, Den Haag. Nigerians are mainly located in the three big cities, The Hague, Rotterdam and Amsterdam. All these Nigerian came from Nigeria to live and work in the Netherlands with the aim to better their socio-economics conditions and those families left behind.

There are many Nigerian migrants living and working in The Netherlands even though little is known about them. These Nigerian migrants range from highly educated professionals (who are working with multinational companies) to semi-educated (either come as a student or visiting visas and decided not to go back). Other categories are those with little or no education who came with visiting visas or from other European countries to live in The Netherlands legally (if she/he seeks for refuge and granted) or illegally.

The last categories of Nigerian migrants are those born in The Netherlands (second generation). Nigerian, in this study is considered to be everyone holding a Nigerian passport or Nigerian nationality together with any other (Dutch / other countries) nationality. The total numbers of Nigerian living in the Netherland are not known apart from the fact that they belong to minority migrants many of them are undocumented. In this study both documented and undocumented Nigerian are object of the study. This study is more interested in undocumented groups because the general believe is that these groups faced more difficult socio-economic conditions. Little or nothing is known about these groups; they do not exist in the country officially.

Due to the increasing relevance of international migration, the economic performance of migrants represents an important factor for both the host (receiving) and sending countries. In the host countries, the economic of the migrants and societal integration of immigrant minorities into the host-countries' society have become a matter of intense debate among economists and policy makers. At the same time, the socio- economic situation of migrants is important for the remittances. For example, Mazzucato et al, (2006) in their study of trans-national migration and economy of funerals in Ghana, find that migrants have paid 70 percent of the funeral's finances. In this study, it was discovered some of the migrants do not have well-paying jobs and some are unemployed yet they remit for burial in their home country.

The economic literature on the performance of immigrants in their host country, which follows the contributions by Chiswick (1978) and Borjas (1985), concentrates predominantly on the analysis of migrants' earnings and employment status (Borjas, 1994; Zimmermann, 2005). Only a few studies have examined the socio-economic conditions of migrants in relation to remittances. However, an investigation of such a long-run indicator of economic well-being may be relevant because the capacity of immigrants to send remittances to their home countries does not only reflect their economic

performance in the host country but also allows us to draw inferences about their future plan. Sociologists often used socio-economic status as a means of predicting behaviour. Socio-economic status such as: occupation, education, income, wealth and place of residence could be very good in predicting remittance behaviour of migrants. Investigating socio-economic status of Nigerian migrants living and working in the Netherlands would not be an easy task since most of them are undocumented, their education has little relevance to their occupation which automatically affects income and wealth.

This study does not intend to break any new ground on the remittance and its contribution to development. Task such as impact of remittance on growth and development, cost of sending money and channels (formal and informal) have been covered by some erudite scholars. While they point to the importance of remittances sent as alternative sources of AID and FDI, question still remain as to how socio-economic conditions of migrants in host countries affect remittances.

Evidences suggest that most migrants are vulnerable and insecure people in their new location. Migrants who would have to send money to dependent families tend to have less means of getting employment, building savings or undertaking financially rewarding investments in their new location. Majority of studies were concerned about how to expand remittances by reducing cost of sending remittances and good management of remittance in order to aid growth and development. Louis De Sipio (2001) tries to examine remittances from the perspective of the senders who lived in United State. He said, according to various surveys, 60 percent of Latino immigrants sent money home, majority of whom are low income earners; most of them are young and poorly educated. These migrants are neither permanent residents nor US citizens.

The proposed study's main objective is to identify and analyse the motive for remittance and to examine socio-economic conditions of the Nigerian living and working in the Netherlands on remittances.

Specifically, the study seeks to ascertain the socio-economic conditions of migrants, such as income-generating activities (occupations), educational background of remitters and their income, status of remitters (legal or illegal), age and gender. This study would seek also to understand the future plans of remitters and how these plans affect remittances.

This study would like to answer these questions: What motivate Nigerian migrants to send remittances? Does socio-economics conditions of migrants affects remittances? Are remittances the same across individual migrants? What determine the channels (formal or informal) used in sending remittance?

The study is descriptive and exploratory in its nature. It is planned to explore the motives for remittances in relation to socio-economic conditions of Nigerian migrants living in the Netherlands which no study has ever been done before. Different types of methods have been used by different authors to undertake this type of study. Methods ranging from quantitative to qualitative have been used in different studies. In this study I used survey method by using administered questionnaire to canvass information from the migrants in the host country, The Netherlands. A structured questionnaire is used to interview the respondents in this study; this allowed face to face

discussion and make it easier to probe into the views of the respondents. I used a closed question in order to motivate my respondents to participate in the survey and for easy coding.

Based on the survey it is found that significantly higher proportion of the respondents send remittances to Nigeria for different motives. Large number of respondents in this study claimed that remittances sent are used for family consumption which shows altruistic motives. Irrespective of socio-economic condition of the respondents, employed or unemployed, legal or illegal, educated or uneducated all these respondents send remittance. Respondents are homogenous in their remittance behaviour with respect to the share of income remitted (remittances as a percentage of income). Respondents' remittances did not decline over time contrary to what the theory predicted, "Remittances decay". Remittance increases as respondents' income increases, but average percentage of income remitted decreases. This might be due to increase in responsibilities of migrants in the host country or unsuccessful migrants emigrate to other countries or being deported.

The extent to which socio-economics affect remittance is not known. The study confirmed that migrants end up with unskilled and undesired positions in the host country (Kuddat A. & Ozakan, 1976). These migrants tend to lose their original skills as there is no opportunity to practice them. Therefore the attained educational level of migrants has nothing to do with migrants' occupation. The frequency of remittance is not known as well since these migrants do not have proper record keeping of remittance. It is found in this study that less than 10% of the respondents used formal or official channels in sending remittances. All respondents claimed that, the differences between official rate and black market rate is the major factor for sending remittances via Nigeria shops or cash with family or friends travelling home. Other reasons provided for the choice of sending method are: convenience, recommendation, safety and reputation. Speed, cost or reliability which makes official channels better does not play any significant role in the selection of sending method by respondents.

The scope of this research is limited, due to time, resources constraint and getting respondents. It is difficult to use any scientific sampling technique in this research, this is because majority of Nigerian migrants are undocumented. Neither the total population is known nor are the addresses of respondents known. Since there is no population base to draw from for any kind of random or stratified sampling. Also the sampled migrants could not be selected on a purely random basis neither the probability of the sampling error nor reliable confidence intervals could be calculated. As a result of these problems, the result of this research can not be generalised.

The rest of the paper will be organised as follows: chapter 2 will do literatures review and theoretical framework on determinant of remittance and socio-economics of migrants on remittances. Chapter 3 explains the methodology and data collections. Chapter 4 presents summaries of findings and analysis. The last chapter concludes the findings of the paper and possible recommendations. References and Appendixes of questionnaire and results are attached at the last part of the paper.

Chapter 2

Literature review and Theoretical framework

Lucas and Stark (1985) started the debate of determinant of remittance with their ground-breaking paper “Motivations to remit: Evidence from Botswana”, which is still the basis of the current discussion and extensions. Lucas and Stark studied remittances on a household level and hypothesized the main determinants to be “pure altruism”, “pure self-interest” and “tempered altruism or enlightened self-interest”. Any kind of contractual arrangements between the migrant and household left behind can be in the latter category, for example co-insurance, exchange-motives, loan repayment.

One of the major aims of the migrants once they come into host country is to better their life and the life of those left behind at home. Decision to remit may be clearly linked to the causes of migration, according to the theory of New Economics of Labour Migration (NELM), D., Arango, et al. (1994). This they do by sending money and other material back home to support their family. It is natural to assume that remittances are sent to the family left behind due to altruistic feelings of the migrant. This can be modelled in a Becker type setting where the migrant derives positive utility from the consumption of the family. The migrant thus cares about poverty, shocks, etc. of the family and consequently sends remittances. If this theory is true, there should be a positive relationship between adverse conditions of the receiving household and remittances sent. Remittances should also increase with migrant income (the migrant has more to share) and altruism and decrease with recipient income (Funkhouser, 1995). However, income does not necessarily have a linear effect as Cox, Eser and Jimenez (1997) demonstrate; income may have a different effect at different points of the income distribution.

Apart from altruism theory; self-interest or investment is also another motive to remit. According to this theory a migrant sends remittances with the aim to inherit family inheritance, to demonstrate laudable behaviour as an investment for the future or with the intent to return home. If a migrant wants to invest at home, the household can be a trustworthy and well-informed agent. If a migrant intends to return home, he may already invest in mortgage or other businesses and will ask the family to be the agent. The migrant may also send remittances to invest in his reputation at home. Household head in the sending country sometimes used inheritance as a blackmailing device to receive remittances. According to this theory, remittances increase with the household's assets and income, the probability of inheriting (dependent on the age of parents, number of siblings, etc.), the migrant's wealth and income, and decreases with risk aversion.

Remittances may be sent to parents to ensure that the remitter's own children also take care of him in old age (Cox & Stark, 1994), known as the demonstration effect. There is this believe in some cultural settings, that children must take care of their parent especially when they are old. Care and transfers have to be visible to the grandchildren in order to generate maximum effect.

The New Economics of Labour Migration (NELM) hypothesis states that due to market failures in the sending country (for example some countries without social-security system), a household member migrates to a non-correlated labour market, entering a type of co-insurance agreement with the household left behind. Remittances are sent home when the household experiences shocks and to enable the household to invest in new technology. At the same time, the household also supports the migrants, e.g. by paying costs of migration or during spells of unemployment in the city/urban in case of rural-urban migration. Remittances consequently increase when the household's income decreases or a shock occurs (like for altruism), but also when the risk-level of the migrant increases. Risks at home and risks in the foreign country should not be correlated for this co-insurance agreement to work properly.

Another type of contractual agreement between the household and family is loan repayment, for example repaying human capital investment or the cost of migration. A household finances a potential migrant's education if the family implicit lending rate is lower than the market interest rate and the youth borrowing rate is higher than the family implicit lending rate (Poirine, 1997). According to this theory, better education will enhance migrant chances to find a better-paid job in the city or abroad due to the education acquired and will send remittances to repay the family for the initial investment. At this stage the migrant might also become a lender, by financing other migrant family members, which increases overall remittances.

In practice, only paying-back can be measured and there should be a positive link between the migrant's education level and remittances. This could also be interpreted as altruism however due to the close link between education and income. A final contractual arrangement is the exchange motive (Cox, 1987). Here transfers in the wider sense are paid to the household at home for services provided (e.g. child care). The theory can also be applied to remittances, whereby remittances buy various types of services, usually by temporary migrants (Rapaport and Docquier, 2005).

2.1 Macroeconomic empirical determinants of remittances

While this study focuses on the household level microeconomic determinants of remittances, it is still important to list the important literature on macroeconomic determinants to have an encompassing view of the remittances situation. Empirical macroeconomic papers usually focus on the number of workers, wage rates and economic situation in host country, economic situation in country of origin, the exchange rates and relative interest rate between the sending and receiving country and political risk and facilities to transfer funds (i.e. institutions). The stock of migrant workers in a host country is seen to be an obvious motive for remittances: the greater the volume of workers, the greater the volume of remittances. Freund and Spatafora (2005) estimate that a doubling of the stock of migrants would lead to a 75 per cent increase in recorded remittances. The economic activity in the migrant workers' host country is important because improved economic

conditions in the host country allow migrants to increase their employment and earnings prospects, which in turn allows migrants to send more money home (IMF, 2005).

The state of the economy in the migrants' home country is also important since negative shocks in the home country may increase the need for remittances to be sent, which may induce current migrants to send money or cause migration in the first place (IMF, 2005).

According to Ratha D. (2006), while capital flows tends to rise during upswings of economic cycles and decline in bad times, remittances tend to be countercyclical relative to recipient countries' economies. They tend to rise when the recipient country suffers an economic downturn following a financial crisis, natural disaster or political conflict, as migrants transfer more funds during hard times to help their family and friends.

Economic policies and institutions in the home country, like exchange rate restrictions and black market premiums, may discourage remittances from being sent and may also shift remittances from the formal to the informal sector (IMF, 2005 and El-Sakka & McNabb, 1999). Macroeconomic instability such as high inflation or real exchange rate hyperinflation may have a similar negative effect.

Investment opportunities in the home and host country may also have an effect on remittances. Greater potential return to assets in the host country (as opposed to the home country) may encourage migrants to invest in the host country and reduce remittances for investment purposes (IMF, 2005).

While most empirical papers that test altruism theory do so at the microeconomic level, Bouhga-Hagbe (2006) uses macroeconomic determinants to test altruism as a motive to remit. They use a measure of "hardship" to test altruistic motives in Egypt, Jordan, Morocco, Pakistan and Tunisia and find that as hardship increases so do remittances. Some macroeconomic papers also look at the investment motive of remitters by looking at the macroeconomic conditions for investment in both the home and host countries (Akkoyunlu & Kholodilin, 2006 and Schiopu & Siegried, 2006).

2.2 Microeconomic empirical determinants of remittances

This section discusses the literature on the microeconomic determinants of remittances, both from a receiving and sending perspective.

The estimations of the determinants of remittances are either based on household surveys that include remittance receiving households, e.g. Gubert (2002), or specific surveys of the migrants themselves either in the home country, e.g. Amuedo-Dorantes & Pozo (2006) or the destination country, e.g. Holst & Schrooten (2006). The type of survey sometimes limits the nature of the analysis that can be done, for example, household surveys often do not have much information on the migrant.

The existing papers on the determinants of remittances have used very different methodologies. While most papers use some kind of econometric

analysis, they use everything from OLS to CLAD. Although earlier papers used OLS (for example Lucas & Stark, 1985) to model the remittance decision, using such a method leads to biased and inconsistent estimates, since a substantial fraction of the migrants does not remit.

As predicted theoretically most papers find a positive relationship for the effect of the migrant's income on remittances and a negative relationship for the effect of the household's income on remittances.

Length of stay is often related to the altruism motive. The longer a migrant has been abroad, and the less frequently the migrant has visited the home country, the weaker the ties to the home country and household are and the lower the importance of altruism is. Many papers do not find evidence for "remittance decay", which shows that generally migrants keep links to their home country.

The size of households left behind is another motive for altruistic remitter to send more remittances and would send greater sums of remittances to larger households or households with a greater dependency ratio, as they are in greater need. This relationship generally does not hold for the probability of remittances, but is found by most authors for the level of remittances and the simultaneous estimation of the probability and level of remittances.

Married migrants whose spouses are left behind in the home country should also be more likely to send remittances and send greater sums of remittances due to altruistic feelings. All papers that included the marriage variable and found a significant relationship, found a positive effect on the level of remittances and the simultaneous estimation of the probability and level of remittances. All papers find a lower probability of remittances and a drop in the amount of remittances, if the spouse has joined the migrant. This means that for certain family relationships, namely marriage, altruism does play an important role.

Migrants that intend to return home send more remittances, for example as investment in their assets at home. De la Briere et al (1997) also find that young males in the Dominican Sierra, who have the intent to return home, do not adjust their remittance streams as a reaction to shocks their parents experience. The authors thus conclude that their remittances are more self-interested.

Whether remittances are sent as part of a co-insurance contract between migrant's and households can be measured by analyzing the effect of household shocks and migrant (income, employment and living) risk on remittances. According to most studies that included household shocks, shocks of the household (e.g. illness) lead to a higher probability of remittances and larger sums of remittances.

The variable length of stay can also be used to measure the risk level of the migrant as after a longer stay the migrant generally knows the destination country better, has a steadier job, etc. As mentioned before length of stay generally has a positive effect on remittances. This means that lower risk is accompanied with more remittances (so more insurance), which is some evidence against remittances as insurance. On the other hand, while few papers found a significant relationship for other measures of the migrant risk level

(e.g. legal employment), almost all of those that did, found a positive relationship.

In these cases, migrants sent home more remittances when they faced greater risks in order to insure themselves against deportation, loss of job etc. Amuedo-Dorantes & Pozo (2006) go further in measuring the insurance motive by distinguishing between self and family insurance and at the same time altruism. They do so by looking at what remittances are used for.

If remittances respond to income risks in the host economy and are used for consumption they are sent to the family as part of a co-insurance agreement. If they are used for asset accumulation instead, the family acts as an investor for the migrant, so it is self-insurance (like saving). The authors' findings show that those migrants with greater income risk remit more and that different types of migrants use different insurance methods. For example, young male migrants who have low levels of education and large families at home are more likely to use co-insurance (Amuedo-Dorantes & Pozo (2006)).

Loan repayment can be measured by looking at migration costs and the education level of the migrant. It is possible that those migrants that received help from their family in financing migration send more remittances as a loan repayment. This is confirmed by all empirical studies that find a significant relationship.

Until recently there has been only limited data on which to conduct further investigation, beyond simple extrapolations based on unreliable, secondary time series data and other evidence of a more anecdotal nature. Remarkably little is known about in most of these studies in terms of demography, education and occupation levels, socio-economic status, and their remittance behaviour and its correlates. Since remittances can take many forms, including informal transfers in cash or in-kind, and can pass through many different channels and networks, there are clear obstacles to making definitive assessments of remittance behaviour. This is not to deny the importance of other work that has been attempted in recent years. Unfortunately, the available data remain fragmentary and often inadequate for statistical analysis. Most existing studies were undertaken on small sample surveys among particular pockets of migrants, where the sample size was constrained by limited budgets. Consequently, previous studies have failed to produce data sets large enough for rigorous statistical analysis. Nonetheless Vete MF, 1995, found that, the level of remittances increased during the first few years of migration, up to around seven years, but then began to decline, although migrants who had been in host countries for more than 18 years still sent remittances (Tongamo T, 1987). On the other hand, Loomis found little evidence of remittance decay among Cook Islanders in New Zealand (Loomis T, 1990). All of these studies were both based on small samples which cannot be considered statistically reliable, and relied on cross-tabulations which did not isolate the effects of other variables from the effect of the migrant's duration of absence.

Finally, of utmost relevance for the remittance is the relationship between the migrant legal status and remittances. Little evidence exists proving the relationship between irregularity of the migrant status and remittance flows. From a pilot study on Tunisian undocumented workers in Bologna, it emerged

that undocumented migrants tend to remit a much higher percentage of their income compare to regular migrant workers (Gallina, 2005b). The attention paid by both the Mexican and the US authorities on this issue introducing measures such as the matricula consular, should provide an important lesson for the governments of European Union in the field of migrants' social and financial inclusion.

Chapter 3

Methodology and Data Collection

3.1 The survey

The study is descriptive and exploratory in its nature. It is planned to explore the determinant of remittance in relation with socio-economic conditions of Nigerian migrants living in the Netherlands which no study has ever been done so far. Different types of methods have been used by different authors to undertake this type of study. Methods ranging from quantitative to qualitative have been used in different studies. This study is the descriptive analysis of

motivation for remittances based on an administered questionnaire of the migrants themselves in the host country, the Netherlands.

According to Holst & Schrooten (2006), the type of survey sometimes limits the nature of the analysis that can be done; this is because surveys often do not have much information on the migrant. A structured questionnaire is used to interview the respondents in this study; this allowed face to face discussion and makes it easy to probe into the views of the respondents. I used closed questions in order to motivate my respondents to participate in the survey and for easy coding.

Due to the nature of the study and its sensitivity the trust and confidence of the respondent must be sought. Gaining the confidence of respondents helps me to guide and motivate the respondent to think more seriously and develop a concrete consensus about the subject. I gathered more relevant information during the interviewing process through observation and personal discussion.

I conducted 5-10 pre-testing before finalization. Some questions were dropped while some were fine-tuned. After which the interview was conducted.

The survey was conducted at the Nigerian embassy, African churches and African markets in Den Haag for a period of two weeks. A total of 38 individual responded to a 10-pages questionnaire in English. It takes between 15-20 minutes to complete a questionnaire.

The questionnaire is structured in such a way to answer my research questions, the determinants and motives of sending remittances, the associated networks and mechanisms among Nigerian living in the Netherlands. Their opinion and living situation are part of this study. Facts on Nigerian conditions related to housing, education, employment and income, to health and networking in relation to remittance were collected.

In this study there is no universe or targeted population where random selection could be drawn. There is no place to collect list of addresses from which sample could be drawn. The precise population size of Nigerian migrants in the Netherlands is unknown (in part because of the significant proportion of illegal migrants and some Nigerian asylum seekers who claimed to have come from other countries). The targeted Population consist of everybody that comes from Nigeria, living and working in The Hague (except Nigerians' professionals being posted to The Netherlands by their companies). The best way to select my sample for data collection is therefore to go to where I could get as many Nigerian as possible in order to interview them with sets of questionnaires. The first sets of questions asked by me are: Are you a Nigerian? Are you living in The Hague? I asked if they would be willing to participate in the survey after explaining and trying to gain their confidence. Many refused to participate, claiming that, it is like probing to their personal life. Only respondents who are ready to participate were interviewed.

Respondent were not asked to mention their name or any identification at any point of interview. They were given confidence as to their confidentiality and anonymity of their responses. All respondents were in embassy, church or market on their own therefore, this is not a random survey but one designed to generate the maximum number of observations of Nigerian migrants who lived

and worked in Den Haag. The result in this study can not be generalised because it is not a representative of Nigerian Migrants in the Netherlands as a result of sampling technique used.

The questionnaire was structured in English because all Nigerian speak English. I gave the questionnaire out to some of the respondents to be filled by them under my watch so that I could be called upon if there is any problem with understanding of a question. Many respondents leave some questions unanswered especially those that have something to do with how much they spend and save. This might be due to lack of consistent record rather than refusal to answer. The question of legality of the respondent was not asked directly but indirectly.

Table 3.1: Survey result

Variables	Total respondents	Mean
Age (Yrs.)	38	39.6
Income (€)	38	1,292.78
Remittance (€)	36*	277.5
Share of income Remitted (%)	36*	21.47
Length of stay (Yrs.)	38	9.9
Rents (€)	38	338.42
Savings (€)	8	300
Household size in Nigeria	12	3
Household size in Holland	26	3
Investment /Assets in Nigeria	17 (44.74)	
Investment /Assets in Holland	6 (15.78)	
One / Both parent still living	34	
Immediate family located in Nigeria	11	
<u>Gender</u>		
Male	27	
Female	11	
<u>Status of the migrants</u>		
Documented /Legal	25	
Undocumented /Illegal	13	

Source: Author's computation based on survey's result
 * 2 respondents do not send remittances

Chapter 4

FINDINGS AND DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter tries to elaborate the kind of data used in this research, the methodologies followed to analyse the problem and the estimation techniques used to come up with the results of the analysis.

4.1 Data and Variables

The data used in this analysis is obtained from the survey' results. The important variables to suggest hypothesis are obtained also from the survey. The analysis in this study would be based on this hypothesis: Nigerians' undocumented migrants send more remittances for insurance motives. The important questions to deal with my analysis are given by the respondents. In the survey (see the appendix for questionnaire) respondents answered a broad range of questions concerning their socio-economic status and demographic characteristics. Since my focus is on motivation for remittances, which is defined in this study as sending of money to home country. Questions such as, do you send money home? Why do you send money home? To whom do you send money to? Etc. In this study acquisition of legal status is interpreted as an indicator for integration and personal attachment to the host society. I therefore try to observe the differences in remittance behaviour of legal and illegal migrants.

A range of characteristics can be expected to affect a migrant's remittance behaviour. Unfortunately, as Lucas and Stark noted almost two decades ago, it largely remains true that, 'there is surprisingly little statistical evidence on the motives for remitting, and the few studies that have appeared are not couched in terms of testable hypotheses derived from a theoretical framework.' Lucas, (1985). It is therefore necessary to rely on a limited amount of empirical and theoretical work.

In my analysis I would disaggregate my respondents into two groups: Documented (those with legal status) and Undocumented (those who were living illegally) migrants. This is one of the integration indicators that I would be discussing in this study. Is remittance behaviour of legal and illegal migrants the same? I would try to examine the relationship between income of these two categories of migrants and their remittances behaviour; I would calculate the shares of their income remitted (remittances as a percentage of migrants' income) whether it is same across these two groups (legal and illegal). I would also try to analyze how length of stay would affect remittance behaviour of each group. Finally, the location of immediate family and the relation with remittance behaviour would be estimated.

4.2 Analysis

From Table 4.1 it can be seen that both documented and undocumented remit almost equally with documented migrants remitted €290.91 on the average and undocumented remitted €270.83 on the average per month. However, it is also noteworthy that the mean value of documented migrants' average share of income remitted is same as undocumented migrants 23.56% and 23.83% respectively. That is, despite accessibility to social security in case of job loss, documented migrants remit the same proportion of their incomes.

Table: 4.1 Share of Income remitted

Respondents	No.	Average income Per month	Average remittance Per month	Share (%)
Documented	25	1281.36	290.91	23.56
Undocumented	13	1229.17	270.83	23.70

Source: Author's computation based on survey's result

There has always been concern that remittances decline over time, in total and from particular households and individuals, due to lower migration rates, recession in host country and a decrease in migrants' willingness to remit. A belief in remittance decay at the level of the individual migrant is perhaps to be expected. The longer the migrant is away, social ties and distant perceptions of needs and wants are likely to decline. Initial savings targets (where they existed) may have been met and investment in the host, rather than home, country seems to be more rational as the probability of return declines. Although migrants face a life cycle of obligations to their home areas, these obligations are likely to lose their immediacy, to compete with new obligations and to be increasingly ignored. Migrants who are seemingly permanent residents overseas are under less pressure to remit as their commitments become less intense and less significant and they acquire financial commitments in their host country.

Table 4.2 disaggregates the sample into 3 cohorts, 0-6 years, 7-12 years and more than 12 years I then split them into documented and undocumented. For each cohort and category the variables are shown: Average remittance per group of migrants and the average income per each group. This table shows the time profile of each group and their remittance levels, also from time profile of income, remittance levels and average shares of income remitted.

Table 4.2 Remittances by length of stay

Cohorts	0-6yrs	7-12yrs	>12yrs
Documented (n=)(% total)	2 (5.26)	17(68)	6(15.79)
Undocumented (n=)(% total)	5(38.46)	6(46.15)	2(5.26)
<u>Remitting Migrants (%)</u>	100	91.67	100
Documented	100	83.34	100
Undocumented			
<u>Average Remittances (€)</u>	250	312.5	291.67
Documented			
Undocumented	283	241.5	350
<u>Average incomes (€)</u>	1050	1266.75	1338.33
Documented			
Undocumented	958.5	1350	1550
<u>Average share of income remitted</u>	23.81	24.84	21.78
Documented	29.43	17.63	23.33
Undocumented			

Source: Author's computation based on survey's result

It is clear from table 4.2 that for all cohorts except those that have stayed for 7-12 years, a higher proportion of illegal migrants than legal migrants remitted larger part of their income. It is also clear that the remittances do not decline with length of stay but share of income remitted at early years is higher than later years then start to increase from 12 years with undocumented migrants. This is not enough evidence for remittance decay, there is tendency that unsuccessful migrants (especially undocumented) might have emigrate into other countries or being deported. These could have more effect on the size of remittance rather than the amount being remitted.

This is consistent with the theory of remittance that migrants remit more at early year and gradually decline and later pick up at later stage if the migrant plans to return back home. It could also be said that illegal migrants are more generous remitter base on the average income of this group. The reason why undocumented migrants remitted high proportion of their income might be connected with insurance motives' theory, the migrant risk level (e.g. legal employment), and almost all previous studies found a positive relationship. In these cases, migrants sent home more remittances when they faced greater risks in order to insure themselves against deportation, loss of job etc.

Amuedo-Dorantes & Pozo (2006) tried to measure the insurance motive by distinguishing between self and family insurance and at the same time altruism. They do so by looking at what remittances are used for. According to them if remittances respond to income risks in the host economy and are used for consumption they are sent to the family as part of a co-insurance agreement. Table 4.3 shows what the remittances sent by respondents are used for. Conventional wisdom suggests that remittances are overwhelmingly used

for consumption objectives and limited amounts are directed towards investment. In this study I tried to analyse what remittances are used for based on migrants' status (documented and undocumented). Both documented and undocumented migrants remitted for family consumption but higher proportion of undocumented migrants remitted for asset accumulation, investment, savings and mortgages than documented migrants. 25% of undocumented migrants have business / small scale companies, 25% have savings and 50% have mortgage back home. This might also connected with level of integration among the documented migrants.

Documented migrants are more integrated into the host country according to many studies. They tend to invest in the host country

Table 4.3 Usage of remittance

Usage	Migrants by status	
	Documented N=24 (% of N)	Undocumented N=12 (% of N)
Family consumption	20 (83.33)	10(83.33)
Investment /Business	1(4.17)	3(25)
Savings	2(8.33)	3(25)
Mortgage	4(33.33)	6(50)
Siblings education	5(20.83)	1(8.33)
Funeral / festival		
Others		

Source: Author's computation based on survey's result

If remittances are used for asset accumulation instead, the family acts as an investor for the migrant, so it is self-insurance (like saving). They concluded that those migrants with greater income risk remit more and that different types of migrants use different insurance methods. I asked respondents do you have investment back home or not? Table 4.4, it can be seen that a larger proportion of undocumented migrants have investment back home. Some 77% of undocumented hold assets in their home country, in comparison with 28% for documented migrants. This is consistent with other studies, migrants with greater risks in host country remit for asset accumulation. That is ownership of assets in home country has positive impact on remittance levels.

Table 4.4 Do you have investment back home?

Response	Migrants status		Total
	Documented	Undocumented	
Yes	7(28)*	10(76.92)	17
No	18(72)	3(23.08)	21
Total	25	13	38

Source: Author's computation based on survey's result

*% of total

From Table 4.5 it can be seen higher proportion of documented migrants have their immediate family with them in the Netherlands and also have mortgages at the same time in the Netherlands. This may be in line with other studies: Having spouse in home country or having at least one parent or in-law still living in home country increases remittances

Table 4.5: Respondents by location of immediate family

Migrants' status	No immediate family	Immediate family	Immediate family	Total
		In Nigeria	In The Netherlands	
Documented	4	4	14	13
Undocumented	5	7	4	25
Total	9	11	18	38

Source: Author's computation based on survey's result

It would be incorrect to conclude that undocumented migrants are more generous than documented migrants. There is a steep decline in remittance propensity after a 7-9 year of stay for illegal migrants. Legal migrants' propensity to remit starts to decline from 10-12 years. Illegal migrants' average propensity to remit starts to decline from 7-9 years, 31.07% to 15.25% and later pick up.

These findings suggest that while remittance levels appear to be higher among illegal or undocumented migrants, and decrease significantly with length of stay, when their income levels are taken into account, undocumented migrants' propensity to remit declines faster than legal counterpart with length of stay. However, these tentative findings should be treated with caution as they are based on a comparison of sample means.

It is necessary to isolate three different effects: the size effect, the composition effect, and the time effect. It is possible that the remittance levels of the different time cohorts are influenced by compositional effects. In other words, it cannot be assumed that the compositional structure of each cohort is the same. Differences in average remittance levels between time cohorts cannot necessarily be attributable to differences in the average length of stay between the cohorts. Indeed, the volatility suggests that factors other than length of stay could be important determinants of remittances. To identify the

most important compositional characteristics, and then assess the significance of length of stay while controlling for all other potential determinants of remittances, a multivariate regression analysis must be undertaken which is beyond the scope of this study due to lack of good sampling technique.

4.2.1 Remittances transfer methods (Channels)

There are 3 major channels used by Nigerian migrants in sending remittances. First method is known as formal channel, Money Transfers Networks (MTN) examples are GWK and Western Union. This is the fastest (take 3-15 minutes after sending the money to collect it at the receiving country) method in terms of speed and safest (the money can not get missed in transit) method in terms of reliability. Problems with this transfer method are: the sender must be legitimised before he/she can send money; cost of remitting and the exchange rate used is sometimes lower than official international exchange rate. There is also limit to the amount that can be sent in one time. (This is because of money laundering law)

The second method is informal channel. The operators of these channels were not officially registered as money senders. They are Nigerians who have other businesses such as Nigerian supermarkets (where you can buy Nigerians' food), barbing saloon and other businesses. These operators charged commission of 8-10 per cent on any amount to be remitted. The receiver can either receive either local currency or foreign currency. It takes 24-48 hours after sending before the receiver can receive the money. This channel is based on trust because it is difficult to bring the case to police in case of defrauding. This is mostly used methods by migrants because higher exchange rate or 'black market rate' is used. In this method the senders do not face legitimisation procedure before sending remittances.

The third channel is via a family members or friends travelling home during festival periods or holidays. This is also based on trust because many times this person may spend the money without delivering it to the receiver at home country.

In terms of methods employed in sending remittances to Nigeria, the result of this survey is consistent with what was found in other studies. Majority of the respondents used informal channel in sending remittances. Table 4.6 shows that 83 percent of respondents send money through Nigerians' shop. Furthermore, 12.5 percent of documented and 33.33 percent of undocumented send money via friends and family travelling to Nigeria. It can be seen from the table that only documented migrants send money via MTN. Reasons provided for the choice of sending method apart from a wide difference between official and black market rate are: convenience, recommendation, safety and reputation. Speed, cost or reliability do not play as much of a role in the selection of sending method. Apart from the reasons given it is difficult to detect whether the identification / legitimization process by MTN played any significant role. Both Legal and Illegal respondents sent money via Nigerians' shop but undocumented migrants do not send money via MTN this may be connected with the problems of legitimization.

This findings support what experts have argued: that the amount being remitted through informal channels is probably 4 times the formal channels.

This makes it a lot difficult to calculate the amounts being remitted and its impact on development in developing country like Nigeria.

Table 4.6 Remittance Transfer methods

Remittance channel	Documented N=24	% of N=24	Undocumented N=12	% of N=12
MTN	7	29.17		
Nigerian shops	20	83.33	10	83.33
Banks				
Via friends and family	3	12.5	4	33.33
Self				
Total				

Source: Author's computation based on survey's result

4.3 Results and Discussion

The result obtained from my survey is used in this section to analyse the remittance behaviour of Nigerian migrants and their economic conditions. Majority of the respondents came to Europe on their own without being sent by anyone. They came in order to escape socio-economic hardship and to better their life. Their major aim for coming might also be connected with remittance according to migration theory. Many of the respondents did not come direct to the Netherlands but other European countries. These migrants faced many problems of settling down when they first came to Europe which they tried to solve by seeking for Asylum. 20 respondents (53%) seek for asylum out of which 11 (30%) granted. 13 of the respondents (34%) got married to citizens in order to be integrated. The remaining 11 of the respondents (28.95) were undocumented or illegal migrants.

From the survey it can be concluded that majority of Nigerian migrants have blue collar jobs. The study confirmed that migrants end up with unskilled and undesired positions in the host country (Kuddat A. & Ozakan, 1976). These migrants tend to loose their original skills as there is no opportunity to practice them. Most of them have one time or the other experienced unemployment when those with resident permit resolved to social security. Those without resident permit fall back on borrowing from friends, churches or their savings. There is evidence of trust, networking and solidarity among Nigerian migrants in the Netherlands, evidence of social capital among these migrants.

I find in this study that all the migrants (both old and new) remained connected to their family in Nigeria contrary to migration decay theory. They also have future plans of returning back home either very soon or when they are old.

44.74% of the respondents prefer having an investment / assets in Nigeria to the Netherlands especially undocumented migrants. They invested in Nigeria for security purpose. Undocumented migrants can be picked up at the job sites or can be picked up from the street and be deported back to Nigeria.

Undocumented migrants would have something to fall back on in case of deportation.

All respondent send remittances home, but they lack the records of how much they remit and how often they send it. The largest parts of the remittances by Nigerian migrants were sent for family consumption purposes similar to other migrant groups around the world and the rest were sent for investment purposes (personal and family).

It is clear during the survey that these migrants send remittances because they derived satisfaction when the family left behind are okay. They believed living in the western world make them better than their family which they must help. This motive of remittance is in line with altruistic motives theory.

All respondents send remittances via Nigerian's shop for the reason of security and better exchange rate. They do not bother to verify what happened to money sent whether it is used for the purpose or not. This is another sign of altruistic motives among Nigerian remitters. The Nigerian migrants in this survey are homogenous in terms of remittance behaviour. The result shows that 90% of 38 respondents send remittance to Nigeria on regular basis for different motives. The probability to remit is not dominated by income of the migrants. It can be seen from the survey that as the income level increases the amount remitted also increases.

Majority of the respondent sent remittances for a combination of reasons such as responsibilities; personal consumption and investment. Very few sent money for investment alone. Other reasons included ceremonies such as marriage, naming of a new child. Some of the respondents send remittances for investment motive, for immediate family, for their parents' upkeep and sibling's education. None of the respondent is sending remittance for the payment of coming to Europe.

All the respondents have future plan to return to Nigeria which they see as home.

4.4 Other Socio-economic Characteristics of Nigerian Migrants affecting remittances

4.4.1 Education

The value of the human capital of the migrant is reflected in years of education. Majority of the respondents are well-educated, 23.7 percent of the respondents have University or related degrees. 58 percent of the respondents completed secondary education. The study confirmed that migrants end up with unskilled and undesired positions in the host country (Kuddat A. & Ozakan, 1976). These migrants tend to loose their original skills as there is no opportunity to practice them. The professions of the respondents range from teachers, economists, bankers, journalist, nurse and engineer. The extent to which respondents' education has affected remittance is not known.

4.4.2 Income

According to the theoretical literature, remittances increase with per capita income – a finding reported in all microeconomic model support this findings. Income itself as well as receiving social assistance or unemployment benefits has no effect on the probability to remit. Migrants with Legal status who can receive social benefit do not remit more than illegal migrants in this study.

4.4.3 Age

According to the theoretical literature, the age of the remitter plays an important role. Years of migration, the amount of remittances seems to increase with age, beyond a certain age a tendency to decline appears. This finding is reported in many empirical studies (such as Merkle/Zimmermann 1992) and often explained by the assumption that personal ties to the recipient become more distant with age. However, the age-remittances relationship in accordance with the theoretical arguments can not be explored in this study due to the nature of data and analytical tool adopted. There exist a significantly positive relationship between the age of the remitter and the amount transferred especially if the remitter is planning to return home.

4.4.4 Gender

Many empirical studies report a significant influence of gender on remittances. While Lucas and Stark (1985) found in their seminal work on remittances that women show a higher propensity to remit, this study has produced the opposite finding. I find that females remit significantly less than males. In this study male income is higher than female income. Male migrants get more wages because they work longer hours and have less leisure.

4.4.5 Household size of the remitter and integration into host society

One important determinant of remittances is the household size of the migrant in the host country. The more members of the household live in host country, the more host country can be considered the locus of family life. It is therefore, in line with the theoretical models assumed that remittances decrease with increasing numbers of members in the migrant's household in host country. Household size affects the remitted amount significantly negatively.

4.4.6 Owning real estate in host country

Another integration indicator is the ownership of real estate in host country. Taking the integration effect into account, it is expected to lower remittances by those migrants owning real estate in host country. Owning a real estate in the host country has a negative impact on the probability to remit. It is opposite effect when migrants owned real estate in the home country; they tend to send more remittances.

Chapter 5

Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1 Conclusion

Remittances are often considered a major factor behind migration. This paper tries to provide empirical evidence on the motivation for remittance among Nigerian migrants living in the Netherlands and their socio-economic conditions. There are many motives of remittances among Nigerian but in this study a particular attention was paid on the migrants' socio-economic conditions and migrants' legal status.

The extent to which socio-economics affect remittance is not known. The study confirmed that migrants end up with unskilled and undesired positions in the host country (Kuddat A. & Ozakan, 1976). These migrants tend to lose their original skills as there is no opportunity to practice them. In this study the attained educational level of migrants has nothing to do with migrants' occupation. I found during the survey that all respondents have blue-collar job.

It is true from this study that actual figure on remittance is under-quoted as a significant proportion of migrants' remittances goes through informal channels. It is found that less than 10% of the respondents used formal or official channels in sending remittances. All respondents claimed that, the differences between official rate and black market rate is the major factor for sending remittances via Nigeria shops or cash with family or friends travelling home. Other reasons provided for the choice of sending method are: convenience, recommendation, safety and reputation. Speed, cost or reliability which makes official channels better does not play any significant role in the selection of sending method by respondents.

The main motives to remit found in the literature are altruism, insurance, loan repayment, bequest and exchange. The results presented do only partly support the standard theoretical arguments of remittances, like altruism, insurance and investment. It is clear that different authors find different

motivations to remit in different countries and at different times. In this study all the respondents who send remittances to Nigeria do not bother to check if the remittances are used for the purpose meant for. Respondents in this study do not keep records of remittances as well, this suggest altruistic nature of Nigerian remitters.

Other keys conclusions of this study are: First, illegal migrants are more likely to be remitters and remit larger amounts of their income than legal migrants. It is beyond the scope of this study to calculate, the extent to which migrants' status affects remittances but there is clear evidence from the remittance behaviour described here that the migrants' status is significant in remittance. The higher share of income remitted by illegal migrants is also consistent with other studies that have concluded that illegal migrants are more likely to remit larger parts of their income because of their security. Moreover, it can be suggested that illegal migrants appear to be more concerned about insurance against unforeseen problems such as deportation. At least in terms of their decisions to secure home in case they are picked up at the job sites or on the street. Hence, there is greater likelihood to remit and the higher absolute levels of remittances.

Second, although illegal migrants remit more per capita, they are not more generous than the legal migrants in terms of the proportion of their income that they remit, this proportion falls steadily as their income level and length of stay increases like any other migrants. Illegal migrants should not be seen as being more altruistically inclined than legal migrants in terms of their remittance behaviour, but simply reflects location of migrants' assets or investments. The fact that illegal migrants are more likely to own real estate and other assets back home suggests that there could be also a significant element of self-interest. Moreover, this study shows that the migrants are not a homogenous group with regard to their remittance behaviour.

The degree of integration into the host country and personal attachment to country of origin are important factors in motivation of remittance. In this study acquisition of legal status is interpreted as an indicator for integration into the host country. Furthermore, the study shows that one important motivation of remittances might be the degree of integration into the society of the hosting country. Consequently, the remittance behaviour of legal migrants differs from illegal migrants due to levels of integration into the host country.

It is difficult to verify remittance decay theory in this study, relationship between remittance and duration of stay. In order to verify this theory I need some econometrics' tools to control for income and other variables. This study shows the share of income remitted decreases as duration of stay increases and income increases. Disaggregating the same data into two sub-groups, legal and illegal migrants, has shown that there is a strong but qualitatively different relationship between remittances and duration of stay. There might other reason other than length of stay, it is possible that migrants has achieved a certain target level of family support, in this case, remittances no longer rise with income. This would explain why remittances as a proportion of income eventually begin to decline at higher income levels. This relationship changes later as self interest or altruistic migrants become older and contemplating returning home. Income does not in general influence the probability to remit.

This is an important finding, since theoretical models based on altruism as well as those on family contracts argue that the income situation is crucial for remittances.

There are other socio-economics remittance-promoting characteristics identified in this study; namely, ownership of land and other assets at home, intention to return home, location of immediate family. It must be noted in particular that marriage, gender and being unemployed all affect motivation to remit among Nigerians' migrants.

5.2 Recommendation

There needs to be further research into understanding the remittance market in Africa. The aim would be to inform policy makers in both the sending and receiving nations on how best to ensure that all remittances are recorded. This would help migrants' sending country to benefit more on remittances coming into the country if the total amounts of remittances are known it can be counted as part of national budget.

There is need for further studies on how the migrants status (legal and illegal) influences remittances. Making all migrants freer via integration into host society would make them feel free to invest in host country. This would benefit both sending and host countries at the same time.

The lesson we can learn form this is that it is important to assess the remittance situation of each country on its own since there are very specific aspects to the motivations to remit in each country and with different types of migrants. It is still important that researchers continue to do this so that we can help to continue and improve the alleviation of poverty and development impact of remittances.

REFERENCES

Adedokun, O.A. (2003) “The right of Migrant Workers and Members of their families: Nigeria “. UNESCO Series of country reports on the Ratification of the UN Convention on Migrants.

Akkoyunlu, S., & Kholodilin, K. A. (2006). What affects the remittances of Turkish Workers: Turkish or German Output? DIW Berlin Discussion Papers 622.

Amuedo-Dorantes, C., & Pozo, S. (2006). Remittances as insurance: evidence from Mexican immigrants. *Journal of Population Economics*, 19(2), 227-254.

Bah, M., Cisse, S., Diyamett, B., Diallo, G., Lerise, F., Okali, D., Okpara, E., Olawoye, J. and Tacoli, C. (2003) “changing Rural –Urban Linkages in Mali, Nigeria and Tanzania”. *Environmental and Urbanization*, vol. 15(1), 13-23.

Banjoko, A, (2005). “Nigerian abroad contribution to Foreign Direct Investment in Nigeria” *Best of Nigeria in African Recruit*.

Bouhga-Hagbe, J. (2006). Altruism and Workers’ Remittances: Evidence from selected Countries in the Middle East and central Asia. IMF Working paper WP/06/130

Cox, D., Eser, Z., & Jimenez, E. (1998). Motives for private transfers over the life cycle: An analytical framework and evidence for Peru. *Journal of Development Economics*, 55(February), 57-80.

Cox, D., & Jimenez, E. (1998). Risk sharing and private transfers: What about urban households? *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 46(3), 621-637.

Cox, D., & Stark, O. (1994). Intergenerational transfers and the demonstration effect. *Boston College Working Papers in Economics* 329.

Dilip R. (2003). Workers' remittances: An important and stable source of external development finance. *Global Development Finance 2003*. Chapter 7 Washington DC: The World Bank 2003.

Docquier, F., & Rapoport, H. (1998). Are migrant minorities strategically self-selected? *Population Economics*, 11, 579-588

Durand, J., Kandel, W., Parrado, E. A., & Massey, D. S. (1996). International migration and development in Mexican communities. *Demography*, 33(2), 249-264

El-Sakka, M. I. T., & McNabb, R. (1999). The Macroeconomic Determinants of Emigrant Remittances. *World Development*, 27(8), 1493.

Freund, C., & Spatafora, N. (2005). Remittances, Transaction Costs, Determinants, and Informal Flows. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*, 3704.

Funkhouser, E. (1995). Remittances from International Migration: A Comparison of El Salvador and Nicaragua. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 77(1), 137.

Gallina, Andrea (2005b). Clandestine migration and remittances from North Africa: proposals for Euro-Mediterranean Co-development strategies. Paper presented at the EADI Conference, Bonn 21-24 September.

Gubert, F. (2002). Do migrants insure those who stay behind? Evidence from the Kayes area (Western Mali). *Oxford Development Studies*, 30(3), 267-287.

Holst, E., & Schrooten, M. (2006). Migration and Money-What determines Remittances? Evidence from Germany. *Institute for Economic Research, Hitotsubashi University Discussion Paper Series*, No. 477.

IMF. (2005). *World Economic Outlook 2005*. Washington: International Monetary Fund.

Kapur, D. (2004) "Remittances: The New Development Mantra?" " G-24 Discussion paper No. 29, UN conference on Trade and Development. Geneva: united Nations

Kudat A. and Ozakan Y. (1976). Internal and External Effects on the Experience of foreign workers in Europe, Wissenschaftszentrum, Berlin.

Loomis T: Cook Island remittances: volumes, determinants and uses. In Migration and Development in the South Pacific. Pacific Research Monograph No. 24. Canberra: National Centre for Development Studies, Australian National University (Edited by: Connell J). 1990, 61-81.

Louis DeSipio, (2001) "Remittances and Unbanked" in Chicago Fed Letter, Chicago, US

Lucas, R. E. B., & Stark, O. (1985). Motivations to Remit: Evidence from Botswana. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 93(5), 901-918.

Maimbo, S.M., Ratha, D. (2005) Remittances: Development Impact and the Future Prospects. Washington DC: the World Bank.

Massey D., Arango, J., Graeme Hugo, Kouaouci, A., Pellegrino, A., & Taylor, E. (1994). Theories of International Migration: A Review and Appraisal. *Population and Development Review*, 19(3)

Mazzicato, V., Kabki, M., Smith L., (2006) "Transnational Migration and the Economy of Funerals: Changing Practices in Ghana" in *Development and Change* 37(5):1047-1072. 2006 Institute of Social Studies 2006.

Merkle, L., & Zimmermann, K. F. (1992). Savings and Remittances in West Germany. In K. F. Zimmermann (Ed.), *Migration and Economic Development*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Nnaemeka C, (2005) "Analysis of Impact of remittance on Poverty and Inequality in Nigeria" Research proposal submitted to poverty and economic policy, PMMA Network.

Orozco M, (2002) "Worker remittance: the Human Face of Globalization". Working Paper commissioned by the Multilateral by the Multilateral Investment Fund of the Inter-American development Bank

Orozco M, (2003) "Worker Remittance: An International Comparison". Project commissioned by the Multilateral Investment Fund of the Inter America Development Bank. February 28

Orozco M, (2003) "Worker Remittances in an International Scope" Inter American Dialogue Research Series Washington DC.

Poirine, B. (1997). A theory of remittances as an implicit family loan arrangement. *World development*, 25(4), 589-611.

Rapoport, H., & Docquier, F. (2005). The Economics of Migrants' Remittances. IZA Discussion Paper Series, No.1531.

Ratha, D. (2005) 'Workers' Remittance: An important and stable source of external development finance' In Maimbo, S.M. and Ratha D. (ed) *Remittance: Development Impact and Future Prospects*. Washington DC: World Bank.

Schiopu, I., & Siegfried, N. (2006). Determinants of Workers' Remittances: Evidence for the European Neighbouring Region. *European Central Bank Working Paper Series* 688.

Schrieder, G., & Knerr, B. (2000). Labour Migration as a Social Security Mechanism for Smallholder Households in Sub-Saharan Africa: The Case of Cameroon. *Oxford Development Studies*, 28(2), 223-236

Schrooten, M. (2005). Bringing Home the Money - What Determines Worker's Remittances to Transition Countries? Institute of Economic Research, Hitotsubashi University,

Schrooten, M. (2006). Workers' remittance in former Soviet States. Institute of Economic Research, Hitotsubashi University, Discussion Paper Series, 476.

Stark, O. (1991). *The Migration of Labour*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Tongamo T: Migration, remittances and development: a Tongan perspective. Unpublished MA Thesis, University of Sydney 1987.

Vete MF: The determinants of remittances amongst Tongans in Auckland. *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* 1995, 4:55-68.

Appendix 1 Questionnaire

REMITTANCE AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF NIGERIAN MIGRANTS IN THE NETHERLANDS

Questionnaire Number.....

Introduction

I am a MA student at ISS and am conducting a survey about the above research topic. The result would only be for research purpose and your name or information would be kept strictly confidential. Your name would not appear in the final presentation.

Would you be willing to participate in the survey?

Yes

No

Respondent name : _____ (just for collation of
questionnaire)

Gender

[1] Male

[2] Female

Age _____ (years)

SECTION 1: **Background information**

Q1: When do you come to Europe? Year _____

Q2: Which country do you first come to in Europe? _____

If your answer in Q2 is not Holland, when did you come to Holland?
Year_____

Q3: Why did you leave Nigeria for Europe?

- [1] To school
- [2] No job
- [3] Insecurity
- [4] Political
- [5] Socio-economic factors (to have a better life)
- [6] Poor working conditions
- [7] Other reasons

If [7] please specify_____

Q4: The decision was by yourself or someone sent you or brought you here

- [1] Yes by myself
- [2] No, someone brought me (please specify_____)

Q5: How did you come to Europe? Finance

- [1] By self- sponsored
- [2] Someone sponsored me (please specify the person_____)
- [3] Partly by self and others
- [99] Can not remember / refused to answer

If [3], how much did your parent/ brothers/ sisters/ friends contribute to your coming here

- [1] Amount_____
- [99] I can not remember

Q6: What is your highest completed education in your life?

- [1]University
- [2]Other higher education (please specify_____)

- [3]Secondary education
- [4]Primary education
- [5]No education

Q7: What is your profession when you were living in Nigeria?
Please specify_____

- Q8: Are you employed or unemployed before leaving Nigeria
- [1] Yes, employed
 - [0] No, unemployed

SECTION 2: **Socio-economic conditions**

Q1: Where is your immediate family (wife / husband / Kid(s)) located?
Holland or Nigeria

[1]Nigeria, wife/ husband / kid(s)
(Specify No. of kid(s) please, _____)

[2] Holland, wife/ husband / kid(s)
(Specify No. of kid(s) please, _____)

[0] No, I do not have immediate family.

Q2: Do you still have father and mother?

[1]Yes (both}

[2]Yes (one of them), which one? Please specify_____

[0] No, none of them is alive

Q3: How many brothers and sisters do you have all together? _____

Q4: How many of them are of school age? _____

Q5: How many dependent do you have in Nigeria? _____

Now I would like to ask you series of questions about your family living here
or back home

Family	Age	Relations hip/ Your responsibi lity	Locati on	Occupat ion
Father				
Mother				
Wife				
Son(s) 1 2 3 4 5				
Daughter (s) 1 2 3 4 5				
Brother(s)) 1 2 3 4 5				
Sister(s) 1 2 3 4 5				
Other relatives 1 2 3				

Q6: What type of house do you live here?

- [1] Rented room
- [2] Rented flat
- [3] Flat from city council (gemeente or corporation)
- [4] Self-owned house

Q7: Do you live alone in your room / flat?

- [1] Yes
- [0] No

If No, with how many people? Please specify_____

Q8: Do you have a job now?

- [1] Yes
- [0] No

Q9: What kind of job do you do and where do you work?

- [1] Professional job
- [2] Menial job
- [3] Self-employed

Q10: Which sector of the economy do you work?

- [1] Commerce
- [2] Industries
- [3] Government
- [4] Service
- [5] Others_____

Q11: How long have you been working there?

- [1] Less than 1 year
- [2] More than 1 year but less than 2 years
- [3] More than 2 years

Q12: Do you work direct or via job-agency? Permanent or temporary job

- [1] Direct and permanent
- [2] Direct but temporary / contract
- [3] Via job-agency on contract

Q13: On average how much do you receive per month.

- [1] € _____
- [99] Refused to answer

Q14: On average how much do you spend on your rent per month € _____

Q15: On average how much do you spend on other expenses

[1] € _____

[99] I can't remember / refuse to answer

Q16: How much do you save per month?

[1] € _____

[99] I don't know / refuse to answer

Q17: Apart from your salary do you have other source of income?

[1] Yes

[0] No

[99] Refuse to answer

Q18: Have you ever experience unemployment since you had started working in Holland?

[1] Yes

[0] No

Q19: If yes, how did you cope during this unemployment period?

[1] Borrow from friends

[2] Borrow from my church (my church or other organisation gave me money)

[3] I rely on social security

[4] I got assistance from home

[5] Other coping strategies (please specify _____)

Q20: Should in case you lost your present job, do you have access to social security?

[1] Yes

[0] No

Q21: Do you receive any assistance from Nigeria that helps you to cope during unemployment?

[1] Yes

[0] No

If yes, what type of assistance is it?

[1] Food

[2] Money

[3] Others form of assistance, (please specify _____)

SECTION 3: **Remittance**

Q1: Do you send money home?

- [1] Yes
- [0] No

Q2: If yes, how regularly do you send money home?

- [1] Every month
- [2] Every quarter
- [3] During festival
- [4] During ceremonies
- [5] Others (please specify_____)

If answer is [4], please specify

- [1] Burial
- [2] Marriage
- [3] Naming ceremonies
- [4] Others (please specify_____)

Q3: Why do you send money home?

- [1] For business or investment
- [2] Payment for my coming to Europe
- [3] For my siblings educations
- [4] For my parent up-keepings
- [5] For the up-keeping of my immediate family (wife / children)
- [6] For other reasons, please specify_____

Q4: I would like to ask a series of questions about the uses of money you sent home

1 Personal investments	2 Family consumptions	3 Family investments	4 Unidentified purposes [99]
[1] Purchasing of assets	[1] Feedings	[1] Family businesses	
[2] Mortgage	[2] Payment of rent	[2] Siblings Businesses	
[3] Savings	[3] Maintenance of	[3] Kid(s)	

	family's house, vehicles	educations	
[4] Other businesses (specify)	[4] Funerals, weddings, naming ceremonies	[4] Siblings' education	
	[5] Others (specify)	[5] Other (specify)	

Q5: Which one of the above (in the table) takes lion share of the money sent home?

- [1] Personal investments
- [2] Family consumptions
- [3] Family investments
- [99] Unidentified purposes

Q6: On average how much do you send a month or per time?

Please specify in (€_____)

- [99] I can not remember / refused to answer

Q7: What are your motives/ aims/ objectives when sending money home?
What do you intend to achieve by sending money home?

- [1] Part of my responsibility for my family
- [2] Am better than those at home, so I must help them
- [3] Am obligatory to do so
- [4] I have to do it for security purpose
- [5] My people can not survive without being assisted by me
- [6] Other reasons (please specify_____)

Q8: Do you know that there are many investments opportunities here in Holland?

- [1] Yes
- [0] No

If your answer is [1], why sending the money home instead of investment here?

- [1] The case at home is more demanding
- [2] I would later go back home
- [3] No security here
- [4] It is more difficult to pursue those opportunities here than home.
- [5] Other reasons (please specify_____)

Q9: What investment would you consider if you are to invest here in Holland?

- [1] Mortgage
- [2] School
- [3] Savings account or Funds
- [4] Other investment (please specify_____)

Q10: Do you bother to check if the money sent home were used for the purpose meant for?

- [1] Yes
- [0] No

Q11: Do you see the money you are sending as a source of problem in whatever forms? Does the money you are sending home affect your financial status here?

- [1] Yes
- [0] No

If your answer is [1], (could you please state how? _____)

Q12: Through what methods or channels do you send your money?

- [1] MTN (Western Union, GWK)
- [2] Via Nigerians' shops (semi-official channels)
- [3] Banks
- [4] Via friends and family when going home
- [5] By other means, please specify_____

Q13: Why do you choose this method?

- [1] Cost
- [2] Legitimization procedures
- [3] Black market rates
- [4] I can send any amount.
- [5] Trust and more convenient.
- [6] Other reasons, please specify_____

SECTION 4: **Migrants' Life**

Q1: Do you seek for asylum?

- [1] Yes
- [0] No

Q2: If yes were you granted?

[1] Yes

[0] No

Q3: Do you married to citizen (Nederlands, whites or blacks)?

[1] Yes

[0] No

Q4: Do you have family / relative(s) or friend(s) who assisted you when you first came to Holland

[1] Family/ Relative(s)

[2] Friend(s)

[0] No

Q5: What was your first problem when you came to Holland?

[1] Housing

[2] Employment

[3] Legal status

[4] Finance

[5] Home-sickness

[6] Networking

[7] Coping strategies

[8] Others (please specify_____)

Q6: How did you overcome this/these problem(s?)

[1] Seek for asylum

[2] Family and friends

[3] Church / different organization

[4] Other means (please specify_____)

Q7: Do you have health insurance?

[1] Yes

[0] No

Q8: If No, what would you do should in case you are sick
(Open answer)

SECTION 5: Future plans of migrants

Q1: Would you now or in the future consider going back to Nigeria?

[1] Yes

[0] No

Q2: If yes, when?

[1] When am old

[2] 0-5 years

[3] 6-10 years

[4] 11+ years

Q3: Why would like to go back to Nigeria?

[1] Because of my family

[2] I do not like life here

[3] I missed my country

[4] I have my investment at home (house and other businesses)

[5] Other reasons, please specify_____

Q4: Do you have investment back home?

[1] Yes

[0] No

Q5: If yes, what type of investment (please specify_____)

Q6: what are the problems you come across here being a migrant?

[1] Discrimination

[2] Not working in a right position

[3] Risk

Appendix 2

Survey Result

Age distribution of respondents

Age (years)	No	%
< 30		
30-34	8	21.55
35-39	11	28.95
40-44	12	31.58
45-49	6	15.79
50+	1	2.63
n= 38		100

Gender distribution of respondents

<u>Gender</u>	No	%
Male	27	71.05
Female	11	28.95
N=38		100

Education of respondents

Attained educational level	No	%
No education		
Primary	1	2.63
Secondary	22	57.89
Other higher education	6	15.79
University	9	23.68
N=38		100

Length of stay of respondents

Duration (years)	N	%
0-5	6	15.79
6-10	17	44.74
11-15	14	36.84
>15	1	2.63
N=	38	100

Status of Respondents

Migrants by status	N	%
Asylum seekers	11	28.95
Married to citizen	14	36.84
Undocumented	13	34.21
N=	38	100

Distribution of respondents by remittances

Do you Send money home?	Number	%
Yes	36	94.74
No	2	5.26
Total	38	100

Respondents by income size

Income level (€)	Number	%
<1000	11	30.56
1001-1500	21	58.33
1501-2000	1	2.78
2000+	3	8.33
Total (=100%)	36	100

Channel of remittances by respondents

	No (36)	%
MTN	6	16.67
Bank		
Nigerians' shop	29	80.56
Via friends and family	8	22.22

Investment and Location by respondents

Do you have investment

	Location	
	Nigeria	Holland
Yes	11	2
No	25	
	N=38	

Migrants' immediate family by location

Migrants	No immediate Family	Nigeria	Holland	Total
Illegal	5	4	4	13
Legal	4	7	14	25
Total	9	11	18	38