

Article history: Received 12 February 2016; accepted 10 May 2016

## SURVEY-DATA:

# Do remittances differ depending on migration pathway and length of stay?

Anita Pugliese  
Julie Ray  
Neli Esipova <sup>¥</sup>

### Abstract

This paper reports the results from Gallup's global analysis of the likelihood of first-generation migrants, second-generation migrants and the native-born to send financial help in the form of money or goods to others inside or outside their respective country of residence. The findings in this paper are based on more than 450,000 interviews conducted through Gallup's World Poll in 157 countries in 2012, 2013 and 2014. The sample includes more than 26,000 first-generation migrants and more than 20,000 second-generation migrants. The large sample enables Gallup to analyze first-generation migrants by the duration of their stay in their adopted country and compare their remittance behaviors with second-generation migrants and the native-born.

**Keywords:** first generation migrants; remittances; World Poll; duration of stay.

### Introduction

The inclusion of migration and remittances in the recently adopted Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Addis Ababa Action Program Agenda on Financing and Development signals a seismic shift in global policy toward migrants, who - even though they account for one in seven people on the planet - were conspicuously absent from previous global development agendas.

The recent policy shift makes it more imperative than ever to learn more about the lives and conditions of migrants worldwide -- which Gallup has actively been trying to do through its World Poll for much of the past decade. This paper draws from the data Gallup collected worldwide between 2012 and 2014 on migrants' inclination to send financial help to others -- which directly benefits the households that receive them, and can also positively influence development

---

<sup>¥</sup> All authors are affiliated with Gallup, 502 Carnegie Center, Suite 300, Princeton, NJ 08540, USA. Corresponding author: N. Esipova. E-mail: neli\_esipova@gallup.com.



because these remittances are used to meet education and healthcare needs.

Rather than focusing on how much financial help migrants are sending in remittances -- the analysis quantifies how many migrants claim to be sending these remittances and profiles their characteristics. It also delves deeper into whether their inclination to send remittances differs depending on where they have moved from or to, whether this inclination changes depending on how long they have lived in their country of residence and what role household income may play in sending remittances.

## **Methodology**

The Gallup World Poll is the largest globally comparable data set in the world, featuring data from surveys in more than 160 countries that are home to more than 99% of the world's population. Gallup has conducted World Poll surveys annually or more frequently in most countries since 2005, in more than 150 languages, employing the same rigorous methodology standards in each country. Gallup's global data set now includes more than 1.5 million interviews with adults aged 15 and older.

All samples are probability based and nationally representative of the resident population aged 15 and older. The coverage area is the entire country including rural areas, and the sampling frame represents the entire civilian, non-institutionalized adult population of the country. Exceptions include areas where the safety of the interviewing staff is threatened and scarcely populated islands in some countries.

Gallup uses telephone surveys in countries where telephone coverage represents at least 80% of the population or is the customary survey methodology. In countries where telephone interviewing is employed, Gallup uses a random-digit-dial (RDD) method or a nationally representative list of phone numbers. In almost all countries both landline and mobile phone numbers are included. Telephone methodology is used in the US, Canada, Western Europe, developed Asia and Gulf Cooperation Council countries.

Gallup conducts face-to-face interviewing in: Latin America, the former Soviet Union countries and Eastern Europe, developing Asia, the Middle East and Africa. An area frame design is used for face-to-face interviewing.

The findings in this paper are based on Gallup World Poll interviews with 26,260 first-generation migrants, 20,998 second-generation migrants and 425,115 native-born residents in 157 countries in 2012,



2013 and 2014. Each country sample is projected to the total population aged 15 and older to aggregate data across countries.

The large sample enables us to divide first-generation migrants into two categories -- newcomers (who have been living in their destination countries for less than five years) and long-timers (who have been living in their current countries for at least five years) -- and compare their experiences with second-generation migrants and the native-born.

The sample of migrants are respondents in the World Poll who have self-identified themselves as having been born in a different country. We also do not attempt to identify or exclude any specific migrant groups, such as irregular migrants, refugees, or circular migrants. Some types of migrants groups may be underrepresented as 1) this research excludes group living arrangements (e.g. refugee camps, work camps) and 2) the survey instrument is provided in the primary languages of the country.

Although Gallup's World Poll surveys are not primarily designed to study migrants, the comprehensiveness of this global data set makes it possible to identify first-generation migrants and to study their lives and experiences in their destination countries.<sup>1</sup>

The World Poll uses four survey questions to determine migrant categories:

1) "Were you born in this country, or not?"

Respondents who answered, "no," are classified as first-generation migrants. Those who answered, "yes," are classified as native-born.

2) "Did you move to this country within the last five years?"

Migrants who answered, "yes," are classified as newcomers. All other migrants are classified as long-timers.

3) "In which country were you born?"

Migrants are classified as being from the "North" or "South" based on their self-reported country of birth. "North" countries are high-income countries as classified by the World Bank. "South" countries are low-to middle-income countries as classified by the World Bank.

4) "Were either of your parents born in another country, or were both of your parents born in this country?"

---

<sup>1</sup> For other examples, using the World Poll data in exploring migration, see: Esipova et al., (2012) and Sirkeci & Esipova (2013).

This question was asked to all native-born respondents. If either parent was born in another country, respondents are classified as second-generation migrants. The following question was asked to determine whether respondents sent remittances to individuals inside or outside the countries in which they are living: "In the past 12 months, did this household send help in the form of money or goods to another individual living inside this country, living in another country, both, or neither?" If respondents said they sent money to individuals living inside the country, living in another country, or both, they are considered to have sent remittances.

### **The Profile of Migrants in the World Poll**

For the purposes of this analysis, "North" represents high-income economies, based on World Bank classifications, and the "South" represents low- and middle-income economies. Gallup's estimates compare relatively well with the estimated distribution of global migrant stocks derived using UN DESA, World Bank and UNDP definitions: 47% of migrants included in Gallup's sample moved from South to North, 21% from South to South, 25% moved from North to North, and 7% moved from North to South.

Gallup's World Poll data allow us to profile migrants on the basis of country of origin, duration of stay in the destination country and key demographics (age, educational attainment, employment status, income and others) for each of the four pathways of migration.

#### ***Country of birth***

Gallup categorizes migrants as "from the North" or "from the South" based on their reported country of birth. The migrants surveyed were born in 192 countries and areas (63 of which were in the North and 129 in the South).

#### ***Duration of stay***

Migrants are divided into two categories: newcomers and long-timers. The two groups mirror how migrants are commonly classified in census data. Of all first-generation migrants in the sample, more than one in five (21%) are newcomers and 79% are long-timers.

#### ***Age***

Newcomer migrants in both the North and South tend to be younger than long-timer migrants, the native-born and second-generation migrants. The majority of newcomer migrants are younger than age 35, while the majority of long-timer migrants are older than age 35. The age profiles of second-generation migrants and the native-born are similar.



**Table 1.** Age: First-generation Migrants

	South to South	South to North	North to North
<b>First-Generation Migrants: Newcomers</b>			
15-34	64%	62%	59%
35-54	25%	33%	31%
55+	11%	5%	10%
<b>First-Generation Migrants: Long-timers</b>			
15-34	41%	37%	22%
35-54	28%	42%	41%
55+	32%	22%	37%

Data not available for North-South migrant group due to smaller sample sizes

**Table 2.** Age: Second-Generation Migrants and Native-Born

	South	North
<b>Second-Generation Migrants</b>		
15-34	47%	33%
35-54	32%	35%
55+	20%	32%
<b>Native-Born</b>		
15-34	47%	31%
35-54	35%	35%
55+	18%	34%

### **Education**

Among migrants, educational attainment is lowest among newcomers and long-timers who have moved from South to South. About six in 10 in each group have completed elementary education or less, which is similar to percentages among the native-born in the South.

Migrants who have moved from South to North and North to North are not only more educated than those who have moved from South to South, but they are also slightly more educated than the native-born in the North. At least three in 10 newcomer migrants in the North have university degrees, as do at least one in four long-timer migrants. One in five (21%) native-born residents have university degrees.

Second-generation migrants in both the North and the South are more educated than the native-born. In the North, as many as 27% of second-generation migrants have university degrees. But importantly, second-generation migrants in the North are at least as highly educated as first-generation migrants, which means they maintain this higher level of education. Second-generation migrants in the

South, on the other hand, are more educated than the first-generation -- which means they are more educated than their migrant parents.

**Table 3.** Educational Attainment: First-Generation Migrants

	South to South	South to North	North to North
<b>First-Generation Migrants: Newcomers</b>			
Completed Primary or Less	59%	15%	9%
Some Secondary – Some Tertiary	33%	54%	54%
University Degree	6%	30%	33%
<b>First-Generation Migrants: Long-timers</b>			
Completed Primary or Less	60%	19%	13%
Some Secondary – Some Tertiary	34%	55%	58%
University Degree	6%	24%	27%

Data not available for North-South migrant group due to smaller sample sizes

**Table 4.** Educational Attainment: Second-generation Migrants and Native-born

	South	North
<b>Second-Generation Migrants</b>		
Completed Primary or Less	30%	13%
Some Secondary – Some Tertiary	54%	60%
University Degree	16%	27%
<b>Native-Born</b>		
Completed Primary or Less	56%	16%
Some Secondary – Some Tertiary	37%	62%
University Degree	6%	21%

## Employment

Respondents' employment status is determined based on their answers to a battery of employment questions modeled from International Labour Organization (ILO) standards. Those who work *full time for an employer* work at least 30 hours a week for an employer. The *unemployed* are not currently working and are actively looking for and available to work. The *underemployed* are either 1) unemployed or 2) working part-time but desire full-time work.

Newcomer migrants who have moved South to North and North to North are more likely to be in the labor force than the native-born in the North, which may in part reflect the younger age skew among migrants. Roughly three in four newcomer migrants are participating in the workforce, compared with nearly six in 10 of the native-born.



**Table 5.** Employment Status: First-generation Migrants

	South to South	South to North	North to North
<b>First-Generation Migrants: Newcomers</b>			
Labor Force Participation	58%	76%	75%
Employed Full Time for Employer	18%	45%	52%
Underemployed (% of labor force)	27%	29%	21%
Unemployed (% of labor force)	11%	17%	11%
<b>First-Generation Migrants: Long-timers</b>			
Labor Force Participation	54%	76%	75%
Employed Full Time for Employer	17%	43%	39%
Underemployed (% of labor force)	22%	21%	16%
Unemployed (% of labor force)	11%	14%	8%

Data not available for North-South migrant group due to smaller sample sizes.

**Table 6.** Employment Status: Second-generation Migrants and Native-born

	South	North
<b>Second-Generation Migrants</b>		
Labor Force Participation	62%	64%
Employed Full Time for Employer	26%	41%
Underemployed (% of labor force)	23%	16%
Unemployed (% of labor force)	12%	9%
<b>Native-Born</b>		
Labor Force Participation	63%	62%
Employed Full Time for Employer	22%	37%
Underemployed (% of labor force)	18%	17%
Unemployed (% of labor force)	8%	8%

Newcomers in the North are also more likely to be employed full time for an employer than the native-born (about half of migrants vs. more than one-third of the native-born). Full-time employment drops off slightly among long-timers, but it still remains higher than among the native-born.

South to North and North to North newcomers, however, are also more likely than the native-born to be underemployed or unemployed. The situation is worst for South to North newcomers; 29% are underemployed and 17% are unemployed, compared with underemployment and unemployment rates of 17% and 8%, respectively, among the native-born. This situation for these migrants gets better with time, but unemployment rates for long-timers remain nearly double (14%) those of the native-born (8%).

Second-generation migrants in both the North and the South are more likely than the native-born to be employed full time for an employer, and in the South, these migrants are more likely to be employed full time than first-generation migrants.

### **Income**

The World Poll collects self-reported household income figures from each respondent and assigns each respondent to one of the five income categories, based on the respondent's position in the income distribution of the country. Each country sample is divided into quintiles by annual household income. This measure of income indicates how well a person is doing financially in comparison with other people in the country where he or she currently lives.

**Table 7.** Income Quintile: First-generation Migrants

	<b>South to South</b>	<b>South to North</b>	<b>North to North</b>
<b>First-Generation Migrants: Newcomers</b>			
Poorest 20%	23%	29%	24%
Second 20%	20%	22%	17%
Middle 20%	16%	19%	18%
Fourth 20%	20%	16%	18%
Richest 20%	20%	14%	23%
<b>First-Generation Migrants: Long-timers</b>			
Poorest 20%	19%	30%	21%
Second 20%	14%	22%	19%
Middle 20%	22%	17%	20%
Fourth 20%	22%	16%	20%
Richest 20%	23%	15%	21%

Data not available for North-South migrant group due to smaller sample sizes.

This is particularly interesting to track among newcomers and long-timers, many of whom were likely to have been motivated to move by the prospect of higher incomes.<sup>2</sup> South to North migrants skew lower income than the native-born in the North. The pattern is similar for newcomers and long-timers, which suggests that their income levels in their new countries do not change significantly after five years. Migrants who moved from South to South or North to North have similar income distribution to native-born in their adopted country.

<sup>2</sup> Bartram, D. (2011). Economic migration and happiness: comparing immigrants' and natives' happiness gains from income. *Social Indicators Research*, 103(1):57–76.



**Table 8.** Income Quintile: Second-generation Migrants and Native-born

	South	North
<b>Second-Generation Migrants</b>		
Poorest 20%	16%	18%
Second 20%	16%	18%
Middle 20%	18%	19%
Fourth 20%	22%	22%
Richest 20%	29%	24%
<b>Native-Born</b>		
Poorest 20%	20%	19%
Second 20%	20%	20%
Middle 20%	20%	21%
Fourth 20%	19%	20%
Richest 20%	20%	20%

## International and Internal Remittances

First-generation migrants are not only sending financial help to others outside their adopted country, but they are also aiding people within their country of residence. Measuring international remittances and the financial help that households receive from individuals in their own countries is vital, not only because these remittances represent lifelines for millions worldwide, but also because of their strong links to development. While the World Poll data do not quantify the amount or total value of such remittances, they do quantify the percentage of migrants sending financial help within their adopted country, or to another country. The data looks more at the proclivity to send financial help to others, rather than the act of transferring funds.

This study of first- and second-generation migrants and the native-born provide a closer look at those who are sending this financial help to others. Overall, the native-born in the North and South are more likely to send financial help within their own country than to another country – as might be expected. Migrants in the North and the South, on the other hand, are more likely than the native-born to send financial help to another country.

Overall, nearly one in three (32%) first-generation migrants say they've sent financial help in the form of money or goods in the past year to another individual. Thirteen percent send help outside of the country they are living in, 12% send help within the country and 7% do both. The total percentage of second-generation migrants sending any remittances (31%) is comparable to that of first-generation migrants, but second-generation migrants are more likely to be sending

financial help to someone inside their country (25%) than outside of it (9%).

Native-born residents are also providing some financial help to others -- although not to the same degree as first- and second-generation migrants -- but more provide financial help to those within their own country (19%) than to those to outside of it (3%).

First-generation migrants (20%) are the most likely of the three groups to be sending financial help outside of the country, followed by second-generation migrants (9%) and the native-born (3%). The percentage of first-generation migrants who are sending financial help within their country of residence is similar to the native-born. Second-generation migrants, on the other hand, are the most likely of the three groups to be sending financial help within the country (25%).

**Table 9.** In the past 12 months, did this household send help in the form of money or goods to another individual living inside this country, living in another country, both, or neither?

	<b>First-generation Migrants</b>	<b>Second-generation Migrants</b>	<b>Native-born</b>
Living inside country	12%	22%	17%
Living in another country	13%	5%	2%
Both	7%	3%	2%
Neither	66%	67%	77%
(No answer)	3%	3%	3%
<hr/>			
Percentage sending money or goods to another country	20%	9%	3%
Percentage sending money or goods within country	19%	25%	19%
Total (within or to another country)	32%	31%	20%

Those living in high-income countries (North) are more likely than those in low- and middle-income countries (South) to send remittances outside their countries -- regardless of their migrant status. First-generation migrants living in the North are more likely to send financial help to another country (24%) than first-generation migrants living in the South (9%). This is also the case for second-generation migrants (13% vs. 4%) and native-born residents (7% vs. 2%).



**Table 10.** In the past 12 months, did this household send help in the form of money or goods to another individual living inside this country, living in another country, both, or neither?

	<b>First-generation Migrants</b>	<b>Second-generation Migrants</b>	<b>Native-born</b>
<b>NORTH</b>			
Percentage sending money or goods to another country	24%	13%	7%
Percentage sending money or goods within country	19%	25%	20%
<b>SOUTH</b>			
Percentage sending money or goods to another country	9%	4%	2%
Percentage sending money or goods within country	20%	26%	19%

Those living in low- to middle-income countries (South) are more likely to send remittances within their countries than outside their countries. While similar percentages of the native-born and first-generation migrants in the South are sending help within the country, first-generation migrants (9%) are more than four times as likely to send help outside the country as the native-born (2%).

Migrants who have moved from South to South are less likely than those who have moved from South to North to send remittances internationally, but this further draws attention to the fact that many South to South migrants are making lateral moves that are not always beneficial. Migrants who have moved from South to South are less likely to be working in their new country, and according to previous research, may be more likely to be struggling with the basics than if they did not leave their home country.<sup>3</sup>

### **Migrants Keep on Giving**

Migrants' inclination to provide financial help to those in their new country and to those abroad does not change much with time. Overall, first-generation migrants continue to send financial help both inside and outside their country of residence regardless of how long they have lived there. One in five first-generation migrants (20%) who

<sup>3</sup> International Organization for Migration, World Migration Report 2013: Migrant Well-Being and Development.

are newcomers send help outside their country of residence, as do one in five first-generation migrants (19%) who are long-timers.

**Table 11.** Prevalence of Sending Remittances: First-generation Migrants

	South to South	South to North	North to North
<b>Percentage sending money or goods outside country</b>			
Newcomers	16%	30%	16%
Long-timers	8%	27%	15%
<b>Percentage sending money or goods within country</b>			
Newcomers	19%	15%	12%
Long-timers	16%	18%	21%

Data not available for North-South migrant group due to smaller sample sizes

Among migrants living in the North, long-timers who were born in the South (30%) are just as likely as newcomers (27%) to send financial help outside the country. The same is true for long-timers (15%) and newcomers (16%) who were born in the North. However, long-timers who were born in the North are nearly twice as likely (21%) to send financial help within their country of residence as newcomers (12%).

Among migrants living in the South, long-timers who were born in the South (8%) are half as likely as newcomers (16%) to send financial help outside the country. Newcomers and long-timers who were born in the South are roughly as likely to say they sent financial help to someone inside the country they live in.

## Income Affects Likelihood to Send Remittances

Lower incomes generally mean lower likelihood of sending financial help internally and externally, but this is not unilaterally true. Migrants who have moved from South to North skew poorer than the native-born in the countries they live in, but they are also the most likely group to send remittances to others. Further, their inclination to send these remittances is mostly unrelated to their income. Migrants who have moved from South to North are just as likely to send financial help outside the country -- regardless of the income quintile their household falls into.

Migrants who have moved South to South and North to North, on the other hand, are less likely to send financial help outside the country if their household income is lower. The same is true for providing financial help within the country, however, there are fewer



differences by income among those who have moved from South to South.

Among the native-born and second-generation migrant populations, household income affects the likelihood to send financial help to others within their country, but not outside their country.

**Table 12.** Prevalence of Sending Remittances, by Income Quintile

	Poorest 20%	Second 20%	Middle 20%	Fourth 20%	Richest 20%
<b>Percentage sending money or goods to another country</b>					
S to S migrants	7%	7%	10%	14%	14%
S to N migrants	24%	31%	26%	28%	30%
N to N migrants	8%	12%	20%	18%	19%
Native-born	2%	3%	3%	3%	4%
Second-generation migrants	7%	8%	8%	12%	9%
<b>Percentage sending money or goods within country</b>					
S to S migrants	15%	13%	16%	18%	21%
S to N migrants	12%	18%	19%	21%	22%
N to N migrants	11%	18%	19%	22%	28%
Native-born	13%	16%	18%	22%	26%
Second-generation migrants	18%	27%	25%	26%	29%

Data not available for North-South migrant group due to smaller sample sizes.

## Conclusion

These findings suggest that reducing remittance costs and making transfers easier -- which are now targets in the SDG and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda -- can potentially be a real boon for development not only in migrants' countries of origin, but also in their new homes. In the current climate, significant percentages of first-generation migrants are already sending financial help abroad *and* are also providing aid to people in their countries of residence. Further, reducing costs could benefit development not just in the short-term, but for generations to come. Migrants' commitment to sending financial help does not waver much with time. And, even second-generation migrants are sending remittances within their countries and abroad.

## References

Bartram, D. (2011). Economic migration and happiness: comparing immigrants' and natives' happiness gains from income. *Social Indicators Research*, 103(1):57–76.

- Esipova, N., Rheault, M., Pugliese, A., & Kaniitkar, K. (2012). Survey/Data: The European migrant experience. *Migration Letters*, 9(2), 177-191. Retrieved from <http://www.tplondon.com/journal/index.php/ml/article/view/128>.
- International Organization for Migration (2013). *World Migration Report 2013: Migrant Well-Being and Development*. Geneva: IOM.
- Sirkeci, I., & Esipova, N. (2013). Turkish migration in Europe and desire to migrate to and from Turkey. *Border Crossing*, 3(1), 1-13. Retrieved from <http://www.tplondon.com/journal/index.php/bc/article/view/89>.

