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Open questions about remittances

- How do remittances affect recipient households?
  - Do remittances “make people lazy”?
  - Or do remittance recipients use the resources to make longer-term investments?
    - E.g., in schooling, health, small enterprises?

- Do remittances help households cope with risk?

- What factors affect migrants’ remittance-sending decisions?
  - In particular, how are remittance decisions affected by migrants’ lack of control over how remittances are used?
What we know so far

- The Philippines has provided a natural laboratory for learning about the role of international migration in development

- Resources sent by migrants have a number of positive effects on households
  - Lower poverty
  - More investment in child human capital (lower child labor, more schooling)
  - More entrepreneurship
  - Insurance against negative income shocks
  - In contrast to common (paternalistic) view that remittances are wasted, or “make people lazy”

- Lessons learned from the Philippine case are getting wide attention
  - Widely cited in the World Bank’s *Global Development Prospects* 2006 report
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DC-area Salvadorans on control over remittance uses

“I have many uncles and they get drunk, so I just send money when needed, or I send to someone like my sister who I trust.”

Male, 34 years old, 8 months in the U.S., works as a roofer

“The brother of my boss sent around $50,000 to his mother over the years. When he thought he had enough money to build a house, he asked his mom for the money. She said she didn't have it. She had lent it to an uncle. When he asked for the money back, the uncle threatened to kill him if he came back to El Salvador for the money.”

Male, 30 years old, 1 year in the U.S., works as a carpenter
Key questions

• Do migrants and recipients typically agree on the uses to which remittances should be put?

• If not, if migrants were to be given more control over remittance uses...
  – would they remit more?
  – how would they direct them to be used?

• And what would be the impact on development outcomes at the household level?
Remittances and savings

- This research focuses on the control that migrants have over how much of remittances are saved.

- Migrants frequently report wanting household to save some fraction of remittances.
  - Savings can be intended for use of:
    - Remittance recipient
    - Migrant

- Migrants have little or no ability to control or monitor household savings in El Salvador.
  - Can only request that household save a portion of cash received.
Why would migrants save in the home country?

- **Case 1:** If savings intended for regular use of family back home, savings in El Salvador are more **convenient**

- **Case 2:** If savings intended for U.S.-based migrant, many migrants consider El Salvador-based savings more **secure**
  - Undocumented migrants fear they would lose savings in the U.S. if they were deported
The experiment

• We offered Salvadoran migrants in Washington, D.C. the ability to directly channel remittances into savings accounts in El Salvador
  – Facilities developed for project in partnership with a Salvadoran bank, and previously were not widely available

• We randomly varied the degree of migrant control over accounts offered

• Outcomes of interest:
  – For today: Accounts opening (take-up), savings
  – Later: Remittance growth, consumption, schooling, entrepreneurial investment, housing, etc.
The sample

- Migrants recruited in Washington, D.C. area at Salvadoran consulates and Banagricola remittance agencies
  - Must have remitted to someone in El Salvador in last 12 months, and have been in U.S. for no more than 15 years

- Migrant asked to identify “primary remittance recipient” in El Salvador
  - We also follow these individuals over time

- Data collection:
  - For all migrants and recipients:
    - internal bank data
    - follow-up survey in 2009
  - Subsample of migrants and recipient households administered baseline survey
Migrants in Washington, D.C.
Remittance recipient in El Salvador
Revealing preferences for remittance uses

- Goal: Reveal via survey answers whether migrants and households differ in their preferences over how remittances are used

- Our approach: enter respondents into a “remittance raffle”
  - Winning family in El Salvador will receive remittance of $100
  - Migrants specify how they would like the money to be used by recipients
  - Household respondent specifies how they would like the money to be used when received
  - 13 categories of expenditures
  - “Cash” is not an option
Migrant allocation of $100 remittance

- Daily consumption: 42.38%
- Savings: 21.16%
- Clothing: 7.19%
- Housing: 2.43%
- Medical expenditures: 9.40%
- Educational expenses: 5.57%
- Utilities bills: 3.51%
- Phone bills: 1.46%
- Small business expenses: 0.74%
- Other: 1.20%
- Agriculture inputs payments: 0.27%
- Automobile: 0.00%
Migrant vs. recipient remittance allocation (US$)

**Migrant**
- Savings: 21.16%
- Clothing: 7.19%
- Housing: 2.43%
- Medical expenditures: 9.40%
- Educational expenses: 5.57%
- Utilities bills: 3.51%
- Small business expenses: 0.74%
- Phone bills: 1.46%
- Durable goods: 4.68%
- Other: 1.20%
- Daily consumption: 42.38%

**Remittance recipient**
- Savings: 2.55%
- Clothing: 6.31%
- Housing: 1.91%
- Medical expenditures: 7.69%
- Small business expenses: 0.54%
- Utilities bills: 3.84%
- Durable goods: 0.66%
- Agricultural inputs: 0.41%
- Other: 5.05%
- Daily consumption: 64.82%
Treatments

0. Control group
   - Migrants encouraged to remit into a household member’s bank account, but no account-opening assistance provided

1. Account for remittance recipient in El Salvador
   - Migrants encouraged to remit into an individual’s bank account
   - If no such account exists, offer to help household set up account
   - Migrant cannot check balance or withdraw

2. Joint account (for migrant and household)
   - Migrants encouraged to remit into shared account
   - New product: “Cuenta Unidos”
   - Migrant and hh each have ATM cards; migrant can check balance

3. Individual migrant account
   - Migrants encouraged to remit into own account
   - New product: “Ahorro Directo”
   - Only migrant has ATM card
   - Not shared with household
Marketing brochures

Ahorro Directo

Cuenta Unidos
DC marketing team
Marketing visit in DC
Marketing visit (2)
Banco Agricola branch, El Salvador
Recipient savings, before and after

- **Treatment 0: Control group**
  - Before (Nov 06): $405.92
  - After (Nov 08): $388.93

- **Treatment 1: Remittance recipient account only**
  - Before (Nov 06): $602.24
  - After (Nov 08): $765.82

- **Treatment 2: Joint account (Cuenta Unidos)**
  - Before (Nov 06): $404.64
  - After (Nov 08): $611.97

- **Treatment 3: Joint account (Cuenta Unidos) + individual account (Ahorro Directo)**
  - Before (Nov 06): $370.68
  - After (Nov 08): $835.26
Savings growth, remittance recipients

- Treatment 0: Control group
- Treatment 1: Remittance recipient account only
- Treatment 2: Joint account (Cuenta Unidos)
- Treatment 3: Joint account (Cuenta Unidos) + individual account (Ahorro Directo)
Savings growth, migrants

Treatment 0: Control group

$35.99

Treatment 1: Remittance recipient account only

$275.48

Treatment 2: Joint account (Cuenta Unidos)

$102.48

Treatment 3: Joint account (Cuenta Unidos) + individual account (Ahorro Directo)

$103.51
Who is the savings for?

- Savings in El Salvador appear to be intended for remittance recipients or for joint recipient/migrant purposes.

- Simply offering account-opening assistance (Treatment 1) appears to have a positive impact on savings in migrants’ own accounts.

- But expanding migrant control leads funds to be reallocated to accounts under recipients’ names.

- Migrants are not accumulating savings in individual migrant accounts offered in Treatment 3 (Ahorro Directo).
In sum

• When migrants are offered greater control and monitoring of bank accounts at home, savings growth is substantially higher

• When migrants are offered the greatest degree of control, savings more than double (>$400 increase) between Nov 2006 and Nov 2008
  – Counterfactual: roughly zero savings growth from baseline of $400 (slight $17 decline in savings over same period)
Lessons for policymakers and private sector

- Migrants value control over savings, and in particular joint accounts with remittance recipients
  - Private sector should offer such savings facilities
  - Public sector may choose to promote/subsidize them as well

- Further research is necessary to determine whether migrants value control over other types of expenditures
  - Housing
  - Human capital (education and health)
  - Durable goods

- If so, public policy can help promote direct payment facilities for expenditures with clear development impacts
  - Education, health, small enterprises
Financial innovations for OFWs

- Ongoing research among overseas Filipino workers in Qatar

- Will involve surveys of OFWs in Qatar, and families in the Philippines

- Objective: test demand for and impact of new financial products for OFWs

- Partnership with BPI, University of the Philippines, Georgetown University, and University of Michigan
Extra slides
## Summary statistics

### Table 1: Summary statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic variables collected for all study participants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment 0 (no savings facility offered)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment 1 (remittance recipient account only)</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment 2 (joint account)</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment 3 (joint + migrant account)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant is female</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant has US bank account</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient is migrant's parent</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient is migrant's spouse</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient is migrant's child</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient is migrant's other relative</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant has been in US 0-5 years</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant has been in US 6-10 years</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant has been in US 11-15 years</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant allocation to savings in raffle</td>
<td>20.92</td>
<td>40.23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary statistics (contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrant's years in the US</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant has US bank account only</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant has El Salvador bank account only</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant has account in both US and El Salvador</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant's annual income (US$)</td>
<td>25,710</td>
<td>58,339</td>
<td>5,779</td>
<td>18,430</td>
<td>41,280</td>
<td>868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant's household's annual income (US$)</td>
<td>38,533</td>
<td>90,200</td>
<td>8,237</td>
<td>26,840</td>
<td>62,300</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant's years of education</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant's age</td>
<td>30.89</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant's annual remittances sent (US$)</td>
<td>4,987</td>
<td>4,120</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant's remittances as share of annual hh inc.</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>2.792</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant's total hh savings balance (US$)</td>
<td>2,845</td>
<td>5,107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant's savings as share of annual hh inc.</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant is US citizen</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant hh size in U.S.</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant is married or partnered</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant is coresident with spouse/partner</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient allocation to savings in raffle</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient's annual hh income (US$)</td>
<td>14,117</td>
<td>177,786</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>3,540</td>
<td>9,680</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient has savings account</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient total hh savings balance (US$)</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient's years of education</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient's age</td>
<td>46.84</td>
<td>14.93</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient's annual remittances received (US$)</td>
<td>3,155</td>
<td>2,809</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient hh size</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes** -- Data collected in 2007-2008 in Washington, D.C. and El Salvador. Indicator for "Migrant is coresident with spouse/partner" is undefined if individual does not have a partner or spouse.
Basic summary statistics

• Demographics
  – 29% female
  – Mean age: 30.9
  – Mean years in US: 5.57

• Employment and income
  – Top employment categories are construction (32%), food services (15%), cleaning services (10%)
  – For migrant, median annual earnings is $18,430 for surveyed individual and $26,840 for household
  – For recipient household, median annual income: $3,540

• Remittances
  – Most common remittance amount sent: $200 (25%)
  – Median annual remittances: $3,900
  – Median remittas share of migrant hh income: 15.5%
Savings

• Migrants
  – 70% have a savings account
    • 53% have one in US only
    • 7% have one in El Salvador only
    • 10% have one in both countries
  – But savings are quite low
    • Median savings: $750
    • Median savings as % of annual hh income: 3.0%

• Remittance recipients
  – Only 20% have a savings account
  – Savings are low
    • Median savings: $0 (mean savings: $381)