



WORKING PAPER SERIES

2005/09

Labor Supply in Response to Remittance Income: The
Case of Mexico

Jim Airola

The growth in the flow of international remittance income in many developing countries has increased attention towards remittances as a development mechanism. I find that household labor supply in response to remittance income is consistent with findings which measure labor supply behavior in the presence of other forms of unearned income in different settings. That is, remittance receipts are associated with fewer hours of work and income elasticities are estimated in the range of $-.006$ to $-.03$. This finding attenuates to some degree the measure of the impact of remittances in the receiving country's aggregate output.

Defense Resources Management Institute
School of International Graduate Studies
Naval Postgraduate School
Building 234
699 Dyer Road
Monterey, CA 93943-5138
831-656-2306
www.nps.navy.mil/drmi

The views herein expressed reflect the views of the author and are not the policy of DRMI, the Naval Postgraduate School, or the U.S. Government.



Defense Resources Management Institute Naval Postgraduate School

The Defense Resources Management Institute (DRMI) is an educational institution sponsored and supervised by the Secretary of Defense and located at the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, California. Since 1965 the Institute has conducted professional education programs in analytical decision making and resources management for military officers of all services and for senior civilian officials of the United States and 149 other countries.

The mission of the Defense Resources Management Institute is to educate civilian and military government officials in the principles and concepts of defense resources management.

The unique course offerings create an interdisciplinary, interactive learning environment that facilitates the exchange of ideas among U.S. and international participants in Monterey, California, and locations worldwide. These programs are presented on a regularly scheduled basis at DRMI in Monterey and by specific arrangement at other locations in the United States and in other countries.

The success of DRMI reflects the breadth and depth of the in-house technical expertise that DRMI can draw upon. The DRMI Faculty, a community of scholars and practitioners, are experts in defense resources management and has published in major academic and technical journals. The faculty has extensive experience in providing technical assistance and educational programs worldwide over the past 40 years. Our educational strategy is one of collaboration, tailored to the specific environment of the participant.

The Defense Resources Management Institute specializes in four broad educational areas:

- Economic analysis of the public sector
- Operations research of public sector decision problems
- Public budgeting and fiscal management
- Defense organizations and management methods

For more information about our educational and technical assistance activities, please visit our website at <http://www.nps.navy.mil/drmi> or email us at drmiadmin@nps.edu.

Labor Supply in Response to Remittance Income: The Case of Mexico

Jim Airola
Naval Postgraduate School
699 Dyer Road, Room M-5
Monterey CA. 93943
jsairola@nps.edu

August 2005

Abstract

Abstract: The growth in the flow of international remittance income in many developing countries has increased attention towards remittances as a development mechanism. This study attempts to understand to what degree labor patterns are affected by the receipt of remittances. Using nationally representative household income and expenditure data for Mexico, I analyze the effect of remittance income on labor supply decisions. I find that household labor supply in response to remittance income is consistent with findings which measure labor supply behavior in the presence of other forms of unearned income in different settings. That is, remittance receipts are associated with fewer hours of work and income elasticities are estimated in the range of $-.006$ to $-.03$. This finding attenuates to some degree the measure of the impact of remittances in the receiving country's aggregate output.

JEL Classification: J22, O12, O15

Keywords: Remittances, Mexico, Labor Supply

Introduction

International remittances, partly because of their rapid growth in measured flows, have begun to be an important focus of development strategists. Recent studies highlight the importance of remittances both at the aggregate and household levels and most studies anticipate that remittances will persist as important factors in the development of low and middle-income countries. Of importance in understanding their effect in the development process is the way in which remittance income is utilized at the household level. In this context, the present study investigates the effects of migrant-remitted transfers on labor supply decisions within remittance-receiving households in Mexico.

International remittances may be seen as a stable source of external finance as well as a type of social insurance. Particularly in an environment of skepticism toward the effectiveness of private capital flows for development, remittance inflows have become increasingly popular in the eyes of developmentalists. In 2004, remittances at the aggregate level in Mexico totaled in excess of 16.6 billion US dollars (*Banco de Mexico*), or close to 2% of GDP. Often multiplier effects are cited to credit remittances with as much as 10% of GDP (Durand, et al, 1996). In response, policies have aimed to decrease transaction costs associated with remittances in hopes of positive effects on development. For example, government sponsored programs, such as matching contributions on behalf of local governments or remittance-backed home mortgages, have sprung up in Mexico to augment or encourage the sending of remittances.

In spite of its current popularity, some controversy continues to exist regarding the efficacy of remittances as a resource flow to developing nations. To the extent that households use remittance income only for consumption, the growth in remittances could

lead to a culture of dependency and possibly idleness (Kapur, 2003). In fact, much of the early literature was notably pessimistic concerning the economic effects of labor migration and remittance sending. Durand and Massey(1992) review thirty-seven community studies finding that investigators were “remarkably unanimous in condemning international migration as a palliative that improves the well-being of particular families but does not lead to sustained economic growth within sending communities.” Studies relating to Mexico at the community level by Dinerman(1982), Lopez(1986) and others find the vast majority of remittance income spent on consumption. Given that households use remittance income for consumption, some investigators conclude that migration perpetuates a culture of economic dependency which undermines the prospects for development.

An opposing view, however, is that remittance income is used by households to insure against negative income shocks, particularly at the macro level. It also plays an important role in gaining access to capital, especially among lower-income households. While studied less frequently than other forms of capital flows such as foreign direct investment or foreign aid, remittance income plays an important role in the provision of social insurance and has a significant impact on both poverty and equity. While the sum of the effects of remittances on household decisions is not well understood, the growth in remittance flows appears to have large long-term implications for development.

One central question regarding the growth of remittances received by households in Mexico has centered on their use and the ways in which household decision-making is affected. The present analysis attempts to understand the association of remittance income and labor supply decisions at the household level after controlling for various

characteristics such as education, age, and number of family members. Primarily, I hope to determine whether remittances exhibit an effect on household labor supply decisions allowing a better understanding of the role of remittances in household decision-making. I find that, as might be expected, the receipt of remittances is associated with a small but significant negative response in hours worked, implying income elasticities in the range of those estimated elsewhere.

Remittances to Mexico: The Data

While a number of studies have investigated both the motivations for and, to some extent, the use of remittances in Mexico, many of them have been limited by the data source. For example, studies used to evaluate the expenditures of remittance data have usually relied either upon recipients' explicit reporting of how remittance income was spent, or senders' reporting of the intent of the use of the remitted funds. To the extent that income received in the form of remittances is fungible, offsetting increases or decreases in expenditures of other funds could bias expenditure levels reported by family members. The difficulty of determining the effect of remittance income on household decisions lies in the fungibility of income at the household level. While households have detailed records of both incomes and expenditures, the direct observation of the allocation of the marginal peso is impossible. Nevertheless, household survey data can be used to make some inferences about the allocation of additional income. This study utilizes a large household income and expenditure survey that provides detailed information on the labor force participation of all household members.

I use data from the Household Income and Expenditure Survey (ENIGH) for the years 1992, 1994, 1996, 1998, and 2000. While there exist alternative data sources to analyze

income, the ENIGH is the only nationally representative survey and contains observations across a relatively long time period. The ENIGH is based on a stratified random sample and conducted by the Instituto Nacional de Estadística, Geografía e Informática (INEGI) in Mexico. The income and demographics supplements of ENIGH contain individual level information on demographic characteristics, employment, and earnings. Depending on the year, the survey details as many as thirty-six various categories of income for the individual including regular earnings, overtime, bonus, transfers, sale of durables goods, etc. Included in income is money received from abroad in the form of remittances.

Table 1 presents remittance income as a share of household income for the years analyzed as well as the years 1984 and 1989. While the incidence of remittance income at the household level has been rising, from 1.3% of households reporting the receipt of some remittance income in 1984 to 4.3% of households in 2000, the importance of remittances within those households receiving remittances remained relatively stable from 1994 through the end of the decade. For those households receiving remittances, remittance income accounts for over half of all income, on average, in most years. In Mexico, as in most countries, remittances are typically reported by the national bank estimated from the balance of payments accounts. The final two columns of Table 1 compare the estimated level of remittances, measured in current U.S. dollars, with the total remittances claimed by the households in the ENIGH survey, using the sample weights to represent the entire nation. In each year, the Bank of Mexico's estimate is larger than that calculated using the ENIGH survey, suggesting that the Bank's estimates may slightly overstate the actual amount of remittances received by households.

Table 2 combines all years to demonstrate the differences between households that receive remittance income and all households. Combining all years results in observations on 58,440 households, 2,377 of which report positive remittance income. As can be seen from the table, the average monthly income in 1994 pesos is 2,198 pesos for all households and only 881 pesos for households that receive some remittance income during the month. However, including the remittance income increases the total mean household income to 1,912 pesos, or 87% of the average income for all households. Households receiving remittances are also somewhat more likely to have young children. Table 2 also highlights the differences in characteristics of the household head between all households and only those households that report positive remittance income in the month of the survey. The typical household head of a household receiving remittance income is more likely to be female, older, less educated, works fewer hours, and has a lower average wage than the typical household head within Mexico as a whole. It remains the case however, that the majority of remittance-receiving households are headed by working-age males, suggesting that remitters are likely to be adult children or relatives of the head rather than the household head himself.

Remittances and Economic Impact

A number of studies have analyzed the flow of remittance income, its persistence, the motivations for remitting (Lucas and Stark, 1985), and the impact of remittances on national income. Woodruff and Zenteno(2001) analyze whether remittances are relied on for small firms to access capital. Using a survey of small urban firms, they estimate that

remittances are responsible for almost 20% of the capital invested in microenterprises in urban Mexico. Thus they conclude that remittances play an important role in mitigating capital constraints in small business development in the Mexican context. However, Amuedo-Durantes and Pozo(2003), in the case of the Dominican Republic where remittance income accounts for an even larger share of GDP than in Mexico, find no evidence that remittances promote small business ownership.

Very little analyses have investigated the use of remittances at the household level. One exception is Cox-Edwards and Ureta(2003) who examine the effect of remittance income on schooling choices. Assuming remittances to be exogenous to the household, the authors argue that remittances, playing the role of a randomly assigned transfer, provide a clean estimate of the impact of marginal income on school retention rates. They find that children of remittance receiving households are more likely to stay in school. While more a study of the effect of additional income on schooling decisions, the study does shed some light on the expenditure patterns of households receiving remittance income.

Quinn(2005) uses data related to Mexican immigrants in the U.S. gathered from the Mexican Migration Project to test a model of consumption and saving decisions as a function of relative rates of return on saving in the resident and sending countries. While primarily a model concerned with the motivation of remittances, he finds that remittances are sensitive to the relative rate of returns and substitute for savings, implying that remittances are to some degree a saving mechanism on the part of the migrant.

Of particular importance in the context of this paper is the study by Durand, et al (1996) which claims that the direct effect of remittances is “overshadowed by the indirect effects of consumer spending.” They argue that associated with the remittance effects are large

multiplier effects. Using community level surveys, they estimate that a US\$2 billion in remittances generates US\$6.5 billion in additional production in Mexico. These multiplier effects are, of course, sensitive to the ways in which households respond to remittance income, particularly as they affect labor supply decisions. The degree to which household labor supply decisions are affected is the focus of this paper.

Remittances and labor supply

One weakness of the data is that the source of the remittance income is not observed. In some cases, the household head is reported to be absent from the household, in which case it may be that the income is remitted by the head, temporarily working outside of Mexico. But the majority of the heads are present in the household, suggesting that the remitters are likely to be children or other relatives of household members.

All income in the ENIGH is self-reported and individual-specific, whereas expenditures are reported at the household level. Each member of the household identifies themselves relative to the household head. Table 3 depicts the contribution to household labor income (not including remittances) by relationship to household head. As can be seen, over two thirds of total labor income is reported by household heads. Spouses account for little more than 10% of labor income reported. Since it is well known that spousal and child labor force participation is complicated by a host of confounding variables within the joint labor supply decision, I will restrict the present analysis to household heads and use measures of remittance income at both the individual and household level.

To analyze the labor supply decision, I use a simple functional form derived from the indirect utility function (Stern, 1986) of the household head. The semi-log labor supply equation is as follows:

$$H_i = a + \beta_1 \ln W_i + \beta_2 \ln R_i + \beta \mathbf{Z}_i + u_i \quad (1)$$

where H_i represents total weekly hours worked by the household head, W_i is the real hourly wage calculated as the total monthly labor income ¹ divided by 4.33 x hours worked per week, R is average of total monthly international remittances received by the household, and \mathbf{Z} is a vector of personal and household characteristics including number of children under the age of 5, number of children between the ages of 6 and 15, total number of persons in the household, age and education of the household head, etc.

Within this framework, the chief parameter of interest is β_2 , the degree to which changes in hours worked by the household head is associated with the receipt of foreign remittances.

Since some household heads report zero hours worked, particularly households headed by women, a selection model (Heckman, 1979) is utilized whereby the probability of being in the workforce is determined by the age, education, whether the household is in a rural or urban setting, and the number of children in the household, as well as a dummy variable indicating whether or not the household received remittance income in the period considered. The inverse mills ratio, or nonselection hazard, is then entered as an explanatory variable in the weighted maximum likelihood estimation of total hours on wages, the remittance variable of concern, dummy variables to control for fixed year effects, and other controls as mentioned below.

¹ Earnings are deflated using the national consumer price index published by the Bank of Mexico with 1994 as the base year.

In thinking about the effect of remittance income on household labor supply, a number of endogeneity concerns arise. The most obvious concern is the endogeneity of remittances to the number of hours worked, since it is not the case that remittances arrive at random. To the extent that remitters send money to households *in order* that they participate less in the workforce, say, spend more time in child rearing or other household production activities, the error term will be correlated with the remittance variable. Likewise, if the remitter sends money *in response to* a certain observable characteristic, such as the presence of children in the household, the remittance income will be endogenous to the labor supply decision. However, this is of less importance in the context of this study, since I am interested primarily in the average effect of remittance income on labor supply decisions and particularly the contribution of remittances to output at the aggregate level. Put another way, the total impact of remittance income on the output of the Mexican economy in any given year is the total observed output less the (counterfactual) output in the absence of remittance income. The predicted counterfactual labor supply is robust to these endogeneity concerns².

Tables 4 through 6 present the results of the regression of hours worked by the working-age household head on a variety of control variables, by sex. In each table, the estimated coefficients for the wage variable and unearned income variables are presented. From the estimating equation, the uncompensated wage elasticity is calculated as

$$\frac{\partial \ln H_i}{\partial \ln W_i} = \beta_1 / H_i, \text{ and the elasticity of remittance income is } \frac{\partial \ln R_i}{\partial \ln H_i} = \beta_2 / H_i.$$

² For example, the household head elicits the sending of remittances from a migrant friend or relative in order to participate less in the formal labor market. Clearly the labor supply decision was not in *response* to the remittance, but in fact *elicited* the remittance. However, from the standpoint of total economic output, the effect is equivalent.

In table 4, for men the estimated coefficients imply uncompensated wage elasticity at the sample mean of .085 and an elasticity of remittance income of -.009. These results suggest that at the sample mean, an additional 100 pesos of remittance income lowers the expected number of hours worked by approximately 1.7 hours/week. Considering that the average weekly remittance income is approximately 250 pesos, the receipt of remittances is associated, on average, with a small but significant decrease in labor force participation by household heads.

Looking at table 5, I perform the same regression, this time only using households located in rural communities. The results are similar for men with a significantly lower response for women. The most likely explanation being that women have less flexibility in the workforce in small towns relative to large employment centers. Because data collection is problematic among the self-employed, especially self-reported income, Table 6 reports estimated coefficients excluding all self-employed workers. The results presented here are consistent with the full sample results, all implied elasticities of remittance income range between -.006 and -.010 for men and -.018 and -.030 for women. In all specifications, the estimate of lambda indicates that I am unable to reject the hypothesis of no selection.

Summary and Conclusion

Remittances are one of the larger ways in which Mexican immigrants in the United States affect the people and communities within Mexico. Unlike foreign aid, remittance flows impose no burden on taxpayers. Remittance flows are a steady and predictable source of foreign funds, especially compared to either foreign direct investment or portfolio flows. Remittances require no bureaucracy, simply going directly to households as cash

transfers. As immigration, both legal and illegal, continues to be an important policy issue in the U.S., little is known about the effects of remittances sent by those immigrants to households in their country of origin. Fundamental to our understanding of migration policy is our understanding of how sending communities are affected. One important effect is that of remittances on household labor supply decisions.

In this study I utilize a nationally representative household survey to analyze the impact of remittances on decisions within the household. I find that remittance income is associated with reduced work hours for the average household head, particularly for women. I estimate elasticities in the range of $-.006$ to $-.03$, well within the range of estimates found in labor supply studies elsewhere (Blundell and MaCurdy(1999)).

While remittance income to Mexico is a large and growing contributor to total output, this provides some evidence that estimates of the contribution of remittances to aggregate output in Mexico may be overstated, to the extent that some of its effect may be offset by lower labor force participation.

Appendix

Amuedo-Durantes, Catalina, and Pozo, Susan(2003) “Workers’ Remittances and Business Ownership in the Dominican Republic” working paper.

Blundell, Richard and MaCurdy, Thomas,(1999) ”Labor Supply: A Review of Alternative Approaches”, in *Handbook of Labor Economics, Vol 3A*.

Dinerman, I.R.(1982) Migrants and Stay-at-Homes:A comparative study of rural migration from Michoacan, Mexico. Monographs in US_Mexican Studies, NO 5 U.C. San Diego.

Durand, Jose and Massey,Douglas (1992),”Mexican Migration to the U.S.: A critical Review,” *Latin American Research Review*,27:3-43.

Durand, Jose; Massey, Douglas; and Parrado, Emilio(1996) “Migradollars and Development: A Reconsideration of the Mexican Case”, *International Migration Review* 30(2) pg423-444.

Edwards, Alejandra Cox and Ureta, Manuelita(2003) "International Migration, Remittances, and Schooling: Evidence from El Salvador,” *Journal of Development Economics*, 72(2)

Heckman, James (1979) “Sample Selection bias as a Specification Error” ,*Econometrica* 47:153-161

Kapur, Devesh (2003) Mimeo, Center for Global Development

López, G.(1986) *La Casa Dividida: Un Estudio de Caso Sobre Migación a Estados Unidos en un Pueblo Michoacano*, Zamoro, Michoacán: El Colegio de Michoacán.

Lucas, Robert, and Stark,Oded (1985), ”Motivations to Remit:Lessons from Botwana”, *Journal of Political Economy*,93:901-18.

Quinn, Michael A.(2005),Remittances, Savings, and Relative Rates of Return, *The Journal of Developing Areas*, Vol.38, No.2, pp. 1-23.

Stern,Nicholas (1986)”On the Specification of Labor Supply Functions”, in: R.W. Blundell and I. Walker,eds.,*Unemployment, Search and Labour Supply*(Cambridge University Press,Cambridge,UK)pp121-142.

Woodruff Christopher and Zenteno, Rene(2001) “Remittances and Microenterprises in Mexico”, working paper.

Table 1**Remittances to Mexico, 1984-2000**

year	Share of households receiving positive remittances	Remittances as a share of total household income conditional upon receiving positive remittances	Total estimated international remittances to Mexico(ENIGH) billions US dollars	Total estimated international remittances to Mexico(Banco de Mexico)billions US dollars
1984	1.34%	51.48%		na
1989	2.98%	60.66%		na
1992	2.81%	38.95%	1.67	2.43
1994	2.70%	59.63%	2.78	3.72
1996	4.01%	59.40%	3.65	4.22
1998	4.15%	56.59%	4.26	5.63
2000	4.27%	54.35%	5.85	6.57

Source: Author's calculations based on ENIGH(INEGI), Banco de Mexico

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics, 1992-2000

Characteristic, household	All Households	Households receiving positive remittances
	mean(sd)	mean(sd)
total monthly household income excluding remittance(1994 pesos)	2198 (6824)	881 (1705)
total monthly household income including remittance(1994 pesos)	2198 (6824)	1912 (2328)
number of children under age of 5	0.61	0.67
children between ages of 6 and 10	0.56	0.57
Characteristic, head of household		
Age	45.1(15.4)	49.6(16.1)
% female	16.30%	24.50%
years of education	5.75(4.8)	2.4(3.4)
hourly wage(1994 pesos)	6.75(12.5)	2.92(4.6)
total hours worked per week	41.2(24.5)	20.1(26.1)
N	58,440	2,377

Source: Author's calculations based on ENIGH(INEGI)

Table 3

Income by Position in Household, 1992-2000

Position in Household	Share of Total Household Income	
Head		69.15%
Spouse		10.80%
Son or Daughter of Head		16.10%
Parent or Brother of head		3.60%
All other		0.35%
N		58,440

Source: Author's calculations based on ENIGH(INEGI)

Table 4**Estimates of Remittance Income on Hours Worked by Household Head - Full Sample**

coefficient		Men		Women	
		estimate	s.e.	estimate	s.e.
	ln(wage)	4.36	0.095	4.29	0.263
	ln(remittance income)	-0.436	0.038	-1.22	0.215
	ln(other unearned income)	-0.492	0.038	-0.838	0.079
	inverse mills ratio	-20.23	1.09	-20.96	1.62
	N	44,375		6,982	

Notes: results from weighted maximum likelihood estimation with sample selection; the selection equation includes education, age, number of children under the age of 6, number of children between the ages of 6 and 15, a dummy for married, dummies for year, and a dummy for rural/urban designation. The regression equation includes the selection variables as well as log of real wage, log of remittance and other unearned income. Reported standard errors are heteroskedasticity-robust(White) standard errors.

Source: ENIGH; 1992, 1994, 1996, 1998, 2000(INEGI)

Table 5**Estimates of Remittance Income on Hours Worked by Household Head - Rural Households**

coefficient		Men		Women	
		estimate	s.e.	estimate	s.e.
	ln(wage)	3.8	0.127	4.5	0.539
	ln(remittance income)	-0.537	0.115	-0.758	0.354
	ln(other unearned income)	-0.531	0.049	-1.099	0.183
	inverse mills ratio	-13.67	1.49	-34.24	5.8
	N	20,922		2,380	

Notes: results from weighted maximum likelihood estimation with sample selection; the selection equation includes education, age, number of children under the age of 6, number of children between the ages of 6 and 15, a dummy for married, dummies for year, and a dummy for rural/urban designation. The regression equation includes the selection variables as well as log of real wage, log of remittance and other unearned income. Reported standard errors are heteroskedasticity-robust(White) standard errors.

Source: ENIGH; 1992, 1994, 1996, 1998, 2000(INEGI)

Table 6

Estimates of Remittance Income on Hours Worked by Household Head - Excluding Self-Employed

coefficient		Men		Women	
		estimate	s.e.	estimate	s.e.
	ln(wage)	5.77	0.118	5.3	0.348
	ln(remittance income)	-0.425	0.096	-0.9349	0.242
	ln(other unearned income)	-0.39	0.042	-0.607	0.085
	inverse mills ratio	-13.14	0.629	-11.51	1.07
	N	28,270		5,070	

Notes: results from weighted maximum likelihood estimation with sample selection; the selection equation includes education, age, number of children under the age of 6, number of children between the ages of 6 and 15, a dummy for married, dummies for year, and a dummy for rural/urban designation. The regression equation includes the selection variables as well as log of real wage, log of remittance and other unearned income. Reported standard errors are heteroskedasticity-robust(White) standard errors.

Source: ENIGH; 1992, 1994, 1996, 1998, 2000(INEGI)