

Remittances and poverty: who benefits in the household?

Philippe De Vreyer (Université Paris-Dauphine and IRD-DIAL),

Sylvie Lambert (Paris-School of Economics (INRA))

and

Abla Safir (OECD, CREST-INSEE and Paris School of Economics (INRA))

(Preliminary version: do not quote)

May 2009

Abstract:

We use data from a newly designed household survey in Senegal to study intrahousehold allocation of remittances income. In this survey, households are split between sub-groups of individuals, in a way that is natural to households and that corresponds to the internal budgetary arrangements found in the extended families of Senegal. We find that remittances accruing to specific individuals in the household are not completely fungible with other sources of income. In particular the school enrolment of children aged 7 to 13 is found to depend on remittances income accruing to the sub-group he/she belongs to and not on the remittances accruing to other sub-groups. Looking at total expenditures, we also find that transfers received by a sub-group are a significant determinant of its own consumption, contrarily to transfers received by other groups. This is not true for food consumption, suggesting that households tend to satisfy the basic needs of all their members.

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank the IDRC for generous financial support to conduct the survey. The timely financial contribution of the CEPREMAP is also gratefully acknowledged. The data used in this work were collected with the collaboration of ANSD, Dakar, Sénégal. The authors are grateful to ANSD for the making this project possible. We also want to thank Alexia Pretari and Momar Sylla for helping us with the difficult task of preparing the data.

The opinions expressed and arguments employed in this document are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the OECD or of the governments of its member countries.

Introduction

For many poor households in developing countries, remittances are assumed to contribute in an important way to living standards. In fact, in these countries, a significant share of households often receives private transfers either from relatives residing elsewhere or from a migrant member who either joined an urban centre or moved abroad.

Private transfers that do not originate from migrant members are rarely discussed, except through the angle of insurance (Townsend (1994) launched a seminal work, reviewed in Morduch (1999) and Dercon (2002)). On the other hand, international migrants' transfers have been extensively studied. An abundant literature tries to assess the aggregate impact of international remittances on poverty (Adams and Page 2003), investment (Chami, Fullenkamp et al. (2003)), or on inequality (Stark et al. 1988, Taylor et al. 2005). From the microeconomic point of view, there is now a wide literature on the impact of migrants' remittances on the well-being of the origin household, linked to the literature on migration decisions. In fact, migration of one family member has been analysed since the late 1980's as a family decision aiming at generating a new source of income, of which a part is sent to the members who stayed in the original location either to alleviate credit constraints for an investment, to compensate for a shock or to preventively diversify sources of income. These three motives for migration, investment, ex-post income smoothing or ex-ante insurance, have been widely discussed (Stark and Lucas 1988, Rosenzweig 1988, Paulson, 2000, Yang and Choi 2007). A number of papers examine how migration flows responded to household characteristics or life events to try to assess from this analysis what were the motivations to remit but also to migrate (de la Brière et al. 2002). The question of whether remittances are used mainly for consumption or might have a long term impact on well-being through their contribution to investment has also been studied (Azam and Gubert 2006, Mesnard 2004, Yang 2008).

In this literature, migration is viewed as a decision that involves two actors: the migrant, who will or not remit some of his migration earnings, and the staying household, or household of origin. The household of origin is considered as a whole, with no regards for intra-household resource allocation, assumed, by default, to be egalitarian. Remittance flows are perceived as an extra income, assumed to be perfectly fungible with other sources of household income (unless the remittances are in fact the migrant's own savings – Yang (2006)). If it were the case, any flow of income similar in amount and timing to the remittances flow, whether generated by household members or from public transfers, should be spent in the same way. This would hold true if household's decisions were Pareto optimal, an assumption that appears to be violated in the two

African cases where it has been tested, that of Burkina Faso households (Udry 1996), and that of Ivorian ones (Duflo and Udry 2004). Duflo and Udry's paper shows that in Ivorian households, the budget has several components that are not controlled by the same household members and that are earmarked for certain consumption goods. The segmentation is strong enough to prevent the household from achieving consumption smoothing even when shocks are perfectly observable.

If, indeed, all sources of income are not fungible and if, furthermore, members of the household do not all have a similar access to household's resources, two new questions arise about the impact of remittances on the standards of living: who in the household benefits from remittances and what are they spent on?

First, the staying household is in general composed of several members who might not have the same access to resources, whether earned or unearned income. In particular, they might not all have equal access to remittances. If all the sources of income are pooled to form the household total budget and if the allocation of this budget among household members disregards the contribution of each one, as the unitary household model would suggest, then the origin of income doesn't matter. If, however, intra-household sharing of resources is affected by individual contribution to total income, then remittances and earned income alike would affect an individual's share of total consumption insofar as it affects his bargaining power within the household. Within this framework, it might be the case that earned and unearned incomes affect individual bargaining power differently. The impact of remittances and that of labour income on intra-household resource allocation would then be different. Finally, a third possible case is that private transfers and labour income are not fungible. If it implies, for example, that remittances are not pooled within the household even if earned incomes are, the extra income that transfers represent for their designated beneficiaries might not be fully compensated for by changes in the intra-household allocation of other resources.

Whether remittances are fully shared within the household or not, and whether they are fungible with other income source, matters for the evaluation of their impact on household well-being. In the case where they are mostly kept by an individual or a group, they might be spent for personal use without providing any improvement to the lot of other household members.

The second question, related to that of the fungibility of various sources of income, regards the specific use of the remitted income: can the receiving household or receiving member really spend it as they wish, or is the money remitted earmarked for specific expenditures? The adverts of various international money transfer companies are usually suggestive of the fact that remittances are used for the education of offspring or younger siblings, or for the support of aging parents etc. If remittances are fungible with other income sources, then the actual impact of the remittances, for example on educational spending, will not be different from that of any other source of income. If,

however, earmarking by the remitter is taken into account by the receiving household, then the marginal spending of different incomes will differ by type of expenditures. In a context where resources are scarce, earmarking might be an efficient way to avoid dilution in routine consumption and allow investment.

In this paper, we study the allocation of remittances in a country where both migration and household structure are of particular interest, namely Senegal. It is a country characterized by very large household sizes (with an average of slightly more than 8 members, Senegal displays particularly large households, although decreasingly so) and by non nuclear household structures as we will describe later. Field interviews we conducted made clear that budgetary arrangements within the household do not entail income pooling. In fact, members generating income have a specific control over the spending made with it. Furthermore, Senegal, like other countries of the region, has a very mobile population, with both important internal and international migration. Hence, it is likely that a large share of households have close parents in a position to remit some income from outside the household. The first objective of this paper is to see whether remittances are captured by a sub-group of household members or pooled with the general household budget. Additionally, we would like to assess whether the extent of pooling depends on the amount remitted (as a share of total expenditures), on the identity of the remitter (in particular his relation to the various household members), on the location of the remitter and on the identity of the receiver. The second objective is to see whether earmarking is effective, i.e. whether remittances aimed at financing a particular expenditure (such as the education of a particular child) are actually spent more than proportionally for this purpose.

Hence, we want to enquire precisely whether the fact that remittances may be received by a particular household member for a particular purpose indeed affects consumption patterns or whether the reallocation of other sources of income is such that an income increase due to remittances, even when they are earmarked, has the same impact as any other extra income. If the earmarking by the migrant is indeed effective, then the impact of remittances on poverty or well being will differ among household members. While we have no reason to expect public transfers to be allocated in a similar manner as private transfers, the study of remittances may still be a source of information on the use of the latter. If the earmaking by a private provider is effective, this may also hint towards non fungibility of public transfers. If this is the case, substitution between private and public transfers is likely to be very imperfect, perhaps avoiding crowding out. Furthermore, it is quite possible that targeted public transfers be particularly effective in reaching the target person in the household, if they are allocated similarly to private transfers, i.e. not fungible.

One of the reasons why these issues have not been tackled so far in the literature is the lack of adequate data. We use original Senegalese household survey data that are exceptionally suitable for this work. These data emanate from a survey, entitled “Pauvreté et Structure Familiale” (henceforth PSF) that we designed in co-operation with the Senegalese Statistical Agency (ANSD). Information on consumption was collected in detail at the level of subgroups of household members. The data also specifies the sources of funding for each type of good. Hence, it offers a unique opportunity to enquire into the details of the spending of remittances, allowing to answer the two questions of whether remittances are dedicated to specific types of spending (such as health or education) or just poured into the general budget and of whether they benefit more some household members than others. The PSF survey also collected rich information on siblings of each household member, allowing to instrument transfers received by sub-groups and circumvent the endogeneity pertaining to the differential receipt of transfers within the household.

The data

The PSF Survey.

The PSF survey results from cooperation between a team of French researchers and the National Statistical Agency of Senegal.¹ We designed the survey specifically to be able to study the issues of households’ well-being in relation to household structure. Long interviews were conducted with households in order to obtain, in addition to the usual information on individual characteristics, a detailed description of households’ structure and budgetary arrangements.

In order to do this, households were divided into subgroups according to the following rule: the head of household and unaccompanied dependent members, such as his widowed parent or children whose mother do not live in the same household, are grouped together. Then, each wife and her children make a separate group. Finally, any other family nucleus such as a married child of any member with his/her spouse and children also form separate groups. This decomposition emerged from field interviews as being the relevant way to split the households in groups.

¹ Momar Sylla and Matar Gueye of the Agence Nationale de la Statistique et de la Démographie of Sénégal (ANSD), on the one hand and Philippe De Vreyer (University of Paris-Dauphine and IRD-DIAL), Sylvie Lambert (Paris School of Economics(INRA)) and Abba Safir (CREST-INSEE and Paris School of Economics (INRA)) designed the survey. The data collection was conducted by the ANSD thanks to the funding of the IDRC (International Development Research Center) and CEPREMAP.

Considering these subgroups allows us to obtain in a simple way a complete description of family relations within the household. For example we know whether an individual who has no blood relation to the household head is his wife's brother or her child from a first marriage. This is a major difference with usual household surveys that only record relation to the household head.

In order to obtain information on intra-household resources allocation and budgetary arrangements, the recording of expenditures was split between those regarding consumption common to the whole household (notably those for some public goods and some staples) and those that benefit to a specific household member or group of members. For each group, we also collected information on who contributed to each particular expense, whether it is another household member or not. As a result, we know whether a given member receives transfers from outside the household, who is the remitter and whether he resides abroad or not. We also interviewed the household's members directly about the private transfers they receive, and what motivated them. This is the source of information we use throughout the paper.

The survey sample was targeted at 1800 households spread over 150 clusters drawn randomly from the census districts so as to insure a geographically representative sample. About 1750 records can be exploited.

Descriptive statistics

As mentioned previously, the average household size in the survey is very high, in line with what was found in previous household surveys in Senegal. We find slightly more than 8 members on average, with a maximum that reaches 45. This is partly explained by the prevalence of polygamy: 24% of the married men are engaged in a polygamous union, the proportion being 37% among married women. Nevertheless, on average 36% of households' members are neither the household head, nor one of his wives or children. This testifies for the importance of the extended family: 66% of the households include such extended family members.

Such structures fairly naturally give rise to arrangements that differ from those observed in nuclear families. In this paper, we will examine three sets of expenditure. We examine food expenditures, as the very basic and necessary household expenditure. We also examine non food expenditures for which disparities within the household may be greater, as they span a larger set of goods, less necessary. Lastly, we examine education, a long-term investment. As for food expenditures, we find that, in 17% of the households, meals are not shared by all members: subgroups emerge that take

some or all of their meals separately, widening the possibility for differences in nutritional intake among household members. Indeed, it can be observed that the ratio of the per capita food expenditures in different groups of the same household can vary from 1 to 7.8. The inequality is fairly limited though as the ratio is lower than 1.5 in 95% of the households.

When looking at total expenditures, inequalities within the household are more striking: the ratio between the expenditures of the richest group and the poorest group of a household can be as high as 18 and is still equal to 4.4 after trimming off the 5% most unequal households.

There are also important variations in the educational achievement of the various children of the households. Households who include children in the age range 7 to 13, corresponding approximately to the primary school age group, have on average 2.2 such children, of whom only 1.3 are currently enrolled in a formal school and 0.4 never went to school.

When we turn to transfers, we see that 57 % of the households benefit from some. These transfers represent on average 10.4% of the household expenditures. For households who receive at least one transfer from someone in Senegal, the average amount is slightly above 14% and it reaches 30% for households who receive at least one transfer from abroad. Transfers generally accrue to one particular member, this member being the household head in the case of 40% of transfers only. When considering household heads, the amount received, relatively to the group expenses, are higher, sometimes even greater than the total consumption of the group. This is likely due to the fact that household heads receive transfers that they redistribute. For this reason, in the results presented below we concentrate on the groups that do not include the household head. Lastly, examining earmarking, 25% of the transfers are mentioned as catering for the expenditures of a specific household member.

Transfers received come mainly from family members (76 %).

The partition of remittances by motives is given in table 1. 37% of the transfers from close relatives are meant to help facing financial difficulties. Gift are observed with the same frequency. If transfers for other reasons are added to the former two motives, in total, transfers that are not meant to be used for specific purpose represent more than 80% of the total. Out the other fifth, the two main motives for transfers are ceremonies (accounting for half of them) and education. Table 2 shows that the largest amounts are observed for transfers received because of financial problem or to finance the education of a child: they are on average 1.8 times larger than transfers received to pay for health expenditures and 6 times bigger than those aimed at ceremonial purposes (table 2).

Focusing on the geographic origin of remittances, for transfers sent by the parents, spouse or children (hereafter referred to as close relatives) of a household member, they come from abroad 27% of the time. These transfers from abroad account on average for 25% of the amounts received from these relatives, but this share becomes more important as household income increase, becoming greater than what is received from relatives in Senegal only for the top decile of the distribution of household expenditures. We do not display the motives for transfers along the geographic location of senders because, among transfers sent by close relatives, there are no differences depending on whether they live in Senegal or abroad

Table 1: Transfers motivations

Source of transfer Motive (within source)	Close Relatives	Other (relatives and non relatives)
Education	4.16	1.43
Financial problems	37.09	16.03
Health	1.80	1.53
Pilgrimage to Mecca	0.19	0.40
Other pilgrimage	0.19	0.10
Travel	0.47	0.64
Marriage	0.85	6.63
Baptism	1.51	13.71
Bride price	0.19	0.45
Funerals	0.38	2.18
Other ceremony	6.43	8.76
Gift for other reason	38.88	42.11
Religious Contribution (Aadiya)	0.57	1.98
Other	7.28	4.06
N Observations	1057	2021

Table 2 – Amount remitted according to the motive for transfers

	Yearly amount in CFA francs	Yearly amount in Euros	Number of observations
Education	387555	589	73
Financial problems	374504	569	716
Health	216348	328	49
Ceremonies	61722	93	815
Other	159745	242	1417

The bottom decile in terms of household total expenditures receives transfers strikingly less often than the rest of the sample (44.7% of them receive at least one transfer vs about 58% for the other 9 deciles). However, among those households who receive at least one transfer, the share of the expenditures it represents decreases with income, from 25.7% for the bottom decile to 11.5% for the top one.

The question we raise here is whether the pattern of remittances describe in this section can be related to intra-household inequality in food consumption, total consumption and education.

Theoretical discussion

If the household decision process were such that it could be represented by the classical unitary model of a single decision maker, maximizing a household utility function given a single budget constraint, the source of income would not affect consumption decisions.

If transfers received by a particular individual affect differently his group well-being and that of other household members, it can be because this canonical model fails to hold for different reasons.

First, the household decision making process may be such that members negotiate over the sharing of total resources, as represented in the collective household model. In such a case, increasing the household's resources increases one's negotiating power and hence increases the share of total consumption one can capture. In such a case, the source of income should not matter: whether one controls a large share of the household total resources because his labour income is high or because he receives large transfers does not make any difference to the way his negotiating power is affected. Note that it could also happen that even if household decisions are accurately represented by the collective household model, because of their different nature, remittances and labour income affect the bargaining power of individual household members differently. If for example, receiving remittances is a sign of greater social connection, it may bring more negotiating power than labour income.

Second, the collective household model may not hold either, because of the absence of fungibility of all income, a necessary condition for Pareto optimality to hold. As discussed below, non-fungibility can emerge from separate budgets among various household members or from different use of different income sources, according to their nature.

If various groups have separate budgets and manage them independently from each other, the household decision making process cannot be represented either by the unitary or the collective household model. Each household member has the possibility to decide over the spending of the income he generates and the transfers he receives. S/he could altruistically share the transfers received with the whole household or restrict the benefits to his or her group. This model and the collective household model give rise to the same empirical prediction that who controls the transfer or the income affects who benefits from it.

The other possibility is the existence of social norms such that, according to the source of income (labour or transfers), the non-sharing of it may be more or less acceptable. For example, remittances received from a parent abroad may be perceived as an occasional present that does not need to be shared with the rest of the household. It would be somewhat analogous to the situation described by Duflo and Udry in Côte d'Ivoire. In such a case, the elasticity of own expenditures relative to own transfers will be different from both the elasticity of own expenditures to own labour income and to transfers received by other groups. Hence, the difference in the impact of resources controlled by an individual on the consumption of his group and the consumption of other groups may not be the same according to whether these resources arise from transfers or from labour income. In this case, it could be expected that the social norms apply differently for different types of expenditures. For example, it might not be acceptable to keep transfers to increase one's food consumption without sharing with the rest of the household, while it might well be deemed acceptable to spend the same transfers on the education of one's own children without contributing to the education of other children in the household. Note that if social norms apply in the same way for all expenditures, then it will be empirically impossible to distinguish the predictions of this model from that of a collective model in which the bargaining power is affected differently by remittances and labour income. The conclusions that can be drawn regarding the fungibility of the various sources of income will hence rely crucially on the comparison between the differential effects of remittances and earned income on various consumption expenditures.

Finally, the use of transfers might be controlled by the sender. It could for example be the case that the remitter earmarks the use of the funds he sends for some type of investment: children's education, housing improvement etc.. The receiving individual has only partial control over the use of the funds and the impact of those resources can then be different from the impact of other resources if the amount earmarked is not infra-marginal and pushes the household to a corner solution. In this case, as in the previous one, various sources of incomes are not completely fungible.

Empirical strategy

Given the objective of this paper, we look separately at the various subgroups in the household and for each of them we separate the impact of transfers received by a member of this group and those received by a member of another group within the same household. In keeping with the above discussion, we also want to examine two aspects. First, we want to see whether receiving transfers has a similar effect on group expenditures than earning the same amount from labour. Second, we wish to explore the fact that things might differ according to the types of expenditures; in which case, a potential impact of transfers on group well-being might be of short or long term relevance according to the expenses it affects. We will focus for the time being on food consumption, total expenditures (except lodging), and education outcomes. We have in mind that if transfers generate a difference in educational investment, this difference will perpetuate in the long run, which might be less the case for the other two variables.

Hence, in a first step, we simply look at the way transfers affect group outcomes in terms of food consumption, of total consumption or education according to the identity of the beneficiary, controlling for a number of characteristics, among which earned income of different groups.

The basic specification is linear and relates the consumption of a particular set of goods by group n to the transfers received by the group, T_n , and its income from other sources, Y_n , the transfers received by the other groups in the household and their other income ($T_{n'}$ and $Y_{n'}$) and a set of household and group characteristics Z_n (notably demographics):

$$C_n = \alpha T_n + \beta T_{n'} + \gamma Y_n + \delta Y_{n'} + Z_n' \zeta + u_n \quad (1)$$

The first result of interest will be the comparison between (α, β) and (γ, δ) . If they differ, it will show that transfers and earned income do not affect consumption patterns in the same way, which might be compatible with both the case of a collective model in which bargaining powers are affected differently by different sources of income and with the case of non fungibility between transfers and other incomes. The comparison of these coefficients across estimations of equation (1) for different sets of consumption good will allow to distinguish the two.

The second comparison of interest is that of α and β . If they are different, it will indicate that income is not pooled within the household. A polar case would be $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 0$. It would indicate that remittances are entirely kept by the designated beneficiary. The same is true of the

comparison of γ and δ . Also, if α and β are very different while γ and δ are equal, this may indicate that transfers are not fungible while other sources of income are.

We first examine the allocation of food consumption. It is not obvious that we should expect the identity of the beneficiary of the transfer to have an impact on the allocation of food consumption, if only because transfers in cash are never earmarked for food. Furthermore, it seems easier for a household to share food than other consumption goods, such as durables or, naturally, education, as such goods cannot be easily divided. Thus even if a particular member benefits from a transfer, it might not increase his own food consumption more than that of other household members. Finally, it is likely that negotiations over the use of resources do not bear on food, for which it can be expected that social norms and altruism combine to make sure that everyone is fed at least according to their needs, when resources are sufficient for that. To study this issue, we construct a measure of per capita food expenditures that has two components. First, the amount of common expenditures dedicated to food is simply divided by household size in order to get a per capita amount of this common consumption. Second, food expenditures at the group level are measured by dividing the amount spent daily on the preparation of meals for the group by the size of the group. This daily spending is commonly called DQ in Senegal, which stands for “*dépense quotidienne*”. In households with married couples, the DQ is usually given by the husband to his wife who has to purchase ingredients (other than staples) and prepare the meal. In polygamous households, each wife takes turn to receive the DQ and to take charge of the meal preparations. The DQ provided by the husband to each of his wives is in general equitably determined according to the size of her group. In large extended families though, several groups might eat separately and the DQ for each group might be calculated by different persons and need not be equal.

We look at the impact of the identity of the beneficiary group on each group's access to food consumption and we test whether differential access to transfers has the same effect as different labour income.

The same exercise is conducted on non food and total expenditures (except lodging). As we saw earlier, there is more within household inequality when looking at total expenditures than just at food expenditures. It is therefore of interest to see whether this inequality is driven by transfers or more generally by a difference in the control over resources.

Finally, we consider the case of education. All models mentioned above, apart from the unitary model, would suggest that transfers received by the group are more than proportionally spent on the education of children belonging to this group than on other children of the same household.

Furthermore, as discussed, education is clearly a domain where the wish of the remitter, if it is expressed, cannot easily be overlooked: if transfers received are earmarked for the education of one particular child, it might be difficult for the household as a whole to pool this income with other sources and share its benefit. Hence, in such a case we would expect that children belonging to groups who directly receive a transfer might get more schooling than if the transfer reaches another group in the same household.

We will look at the impact of transfers on a child's probability to be enrolled in school, according to who received the transfer.

Transfers received are likely to be endogenous to the consumption decisions (typically if migration is a household decision for example). We attempted to correct for this endogeneity by instrumenting transfers received by a group with the demographic characteristics of the siblings of the adult group members.² However instruments proved to be very weak and instrumentation appears to add more noise to the estimation than to correct for a possible endogeneity bias. Thus we resolved not to instrument the model. However we use the particular structure of our data to remove household fixed effects, which limits the issues arising from household level unobserved heterogeneity.

Finally, it is worth noting that we exclude the groups that include household heads. In fact, as mentioned in the descriptive statistics section, those groups often receive transfers that are aimed at the whole household (as a result, the ratio of their transfer to their consumption is often greater than one) and are therefore different from the rest of the household with respect to their use of the transfer. In order to stick to meaningful comparisons, we, therefore, concentrate on the subsample of groups who belong to households composed of at least 3 groups and that do not include the household head. We are left with 1621 observations. It is to be noted that those households are poorer than average, with an average per capita consumption of about 338000 FCFA as compared to 520000 FCFA for the whole sample. They also receive three times less transfers on a per capita basis than average (16000 vs. 46800). When studying educational outcomes we further restrict the sample to group that include at least one child of school age (between 7 and 17 years old). We then consider 1721 children in 821 groups.

²We use the number of siblings of all adult members who are neither sibling of the group head, nor his children or grand-children. We also use the number of brothers and the number of sisters of the group head. Similar variables are constructed to instrument for transfers received by the other group within the households.

Preliminary Results

Results are presented in tables 3 to 5. Expenditure regressions are shown in tables 3 and 4. Tables 3a and 4a show the results obtained with our basis specification, where the dependent and the explanatory variables are in levels. Tables 3b and 4b show the results obtained with a log-log specification. Finally table 5 show the results obtained for school enrolment.

Food expenditures

As mentioned, we can measure food expenditures in two sets: the expenditures for which the household head is in charge on behalf of the whole household and the food expenditures managed separately by each group, even if some of those are paid by the household head as well. We try to assess here whether transfers received by the group itself have a larger impact on its own food consumption than transfer received by other groups, where we distinguish separately the Household Head's group.

The sample is restricted to households with at least three groups, excluding the group of the household head. In this sample, yearly average per capita food expenditure is about 185000 CFA for the household as a whole. As already mentioned, for 95% of the households there is not that much variation between sub groups.

When using OLS to regress per capita food expenditures on per capita transfers, results show that the only determinants of per capita food expenditure in the group are the level of transfers received by the household head and the income per capita of that group (table 3a, column 1). Neither the transfers received by the group itself, nor its labour income have a significant effect.

Table 3a: Variables in levels

VARIABLES	(1) Food exp.	(2) Non food exp.	(3) Total exp.
Transfers rec. by group per cap.	0.000 (0.137)	1.676*** (0.474)	1.676*** (0.499)
Transfers rec. by o. groups per cap.	0.043 (0.192)	-0.150 (0.663)	-0.107 (0.698)
Transfers rec. by hh group per cap.	0.387*** (0.049)	-0.075 (0.168)	0.313* (0.177)
Group labour inc. per cap.	-0.021 (0.024)	0.090 (0.082)	0.069 (0.086)
O. groups labour inc. per cap.	-0.051 (0.032)	0.350*** (0.109)	0.299*** (0.115)
HH group inc. per cap.	0.017*** (0.006)	0.012 (0.021)	0.029 (0.023)
Group size	-6,722.4 (14,839.1)	-55,996.9 (51,148.0)	-62,719.3 (53,897.3)
Group size squared	-202.4 (1,485.3)	1,995.5 (5,119.7)	1,793.1 (5,394.9)
Household size	69.7 (1,468.1)	-4,577.4 (5,060.2)	-4,507.7 (5,332.2)
Group head educated	5,136.3 (24,498.8)	127,997.6 (84,443.1)	133,133.9 (88,982.1)
Household head educated	70,687.4*** (21,134.0)	40,157.5 (72,845.1)	110,844.9 (76,760.8)
Group head's age	-1,213.4* (659.6)	505.1 (2,273.6)	-708.3 (2,395.8)
Household head's age	980.9 (688.9)	-1,426.0 (2,374.5)	-445.0 (2,502.2)
Group head is female	32,612.8 (22,691.3)	65,048.6 (78,213.0)	97,661.5 (82,417.2)
Household head is female	44,941.1 (34,188.5)	128,633.2 (117,841.9)	173,574.3 (124,176.2)
Urban	19,840.5 (21,622.3)	177,395.2** (74,528.2)	197,235.7** (78,534.3)
Constant	87,194.8 (55,252.5)	249,170.1 (190,446.0)	336,364.9* (200,683.0)
Observations	1620	1620	1620
R-squared	0.068	0.044	0.053

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

This result holds in the log-log specification (table 3b, column 1), though the impact of transfers received by the household head appear less significantly determined and the household head's group income per capita has no more effect.

Table 3b: Log-log specification

VARIABLES	(1) Food exp.	(2) Non food exp.	(3) Total exp.
Log Transfers rec. by group per cap.	0.004 (0.005)	0.038*** (0.006)	0.018*** (0.005)
Log Transfers rec. by o. groups per cap.	-0.000 (0.004)	0.023*** (0.006)	0.008* (0.005)
Log Transfers rec. by hh group per cap.	0.006* (0.004)	0.012** (0.005)	0.010*** (0.004)
Log Group labour inc. per cap.	-0.006 (0.004)	0.006 (0.005)	-0.003 (0.004)
Log O. groups labour inc. per cap.	-0.012*** (0.004)	-0.002 (0.005)	-0.009** (0.004)
Log HH group inc. per cap.	-0.005 (0.004)	0.016*** (0.006)	0.005 (0.005)
Group size	-0.053* (0.029)	-0.348*** (0.038)	-0.169*** (0.030)
Group size squared	0.002 (0.003)	0.022*** (0.004)	0.009*** (0.003)
Household size	-0.014*** (0.003)	-0.005 (0.004)	-0.011*** (0.003)
Group head educated	0.157*** (0.048)	0.346*** (0.063)	0.249*** (0.050)
Household head educated	0.144*** (0.042)	0.289*** (0.055)	0.196*** (0.043)
Group head's age	-0.002 (0.001)	0.002 (0.002)	0.000 (0.001)
Household head's age	0.005*** (0.001)	0.002 (0.002)	0.004*** (0.001)
Group head is female	0.045 (0.047)	-0.108* (0.062)	-0.006 (0.048)
Household head is female	0.187*** (0.067)	0.007 (0.089)	0.120* (0.070)
Urban	0.381*** (0.042)	1.131*** (0.056)	0.686*** (0.044)
Constant	11.560*** (0.123)	10.860*** (0.162)	12.066*** (0.127)
Observations	1618	1617	1620
R-squared	0.149	0.426	0.305

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Part of the transfers' endogeneity bias, if any, can be removed by using a household fixed effect model. The results are shown in tables 4a and 4b. Here all the household level variables are dropped and only the group level variables remain. For both specification, estimates in the fixed effect model are very close to what they are in the non differenced regression.

Table 4a: Fixed effects results - variables in levels

VARIABLES	(1) Food exp.	(2) Non food exp.	(3) Total exp.
Transfers rec. by group per cap.	0.089 (0.089)	1.791* (1.041)	1.880* (1.045)
Transfers rec. by o. groups per cap.	0.176 (0.176)	0.574 (2.064)	0.750 (2.071)
Group labour inc. per cap.	0.003 (0.012)	-0.090 (0.143)	-0.087 (0.143)
O. groups labour inc. per cap.	0.013 (0.026)	0.004 (0.305)	0.017 (0.306)
Group size	-11,170.0** (5,391.9)	-58,868.9 (63,296.9)	-70,038.9 (63,527.5)
Group size squared	781.5 (543.0)	4,008.7 (6,374.3)	4,790.2 (6,397.5)
Group head educated	4,295.7 (9,446.0)	266,666.4** (110,888.1)	270,962.1** (111,292.1)
Group head's age	518.9** (237.0)	-552.3 (2,782.1)	-33.4 (2,792.2)
Group head is female	10,119.3 (7,928.6)	-16,964.7 (93,075.7)	-6,845.4 (93,414.8)
Constant	159,151.4*** (16,194.4)	294,135.7 (190,109.2)	453,287.1** (190,801.8)
Observations	1620	1620	1620
R-squared	0.015	0.015	0.016
Number of idmen	597	597	597

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 4b: Fixed effects results - Log-log specification

VARIABLES	(1) Food exp.	(2) Non food exp.	(3) Total exp.
Log Transfers rec. by group per cap.	0.004 (0.003)	0.020* (0.011)	0.014** (0.006)
Log Transfers rec. by o. groups per cap.	0.002 (0.004)	0.004 (0.014)	0.006 (0.008)
Log Group labour inc. per cap.	-0.001 (0.002)	0.009 (0.007)	0.001 (0.004)
Log O. groups labour inc. per cap.	-0.001 (0.003)	-0.000 (0.009)	-0.002 (0.005)
Group size	-0.010 (0.010)	-0.238*** (0.032)	-0.105*** (0.018)
Group size squared	0.000 (0.001)	0.014*** (0.003)	0.006*** (0.002)
Group head educated	0.003 (0.017)	0.104* (0.056)	0.062* (0.033)
Group head's age	0.001*** (0.000)	0.000 (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)
Group head is female	0.004 (0.015)	-0.151*** (0.050)	-0.062** (0.029)
Constant	11.535*** (0.050)	11.645*** (0.160)	12.425*** (0.093)
Observations	1618	1617	1620
R-squared	0.018	0.140	0.097
Number of idmen	596	597	597

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

These results are in line with what is suggested by the descriptive statistics of our sample: in 95% of the households, there is not much inequality in the food consumption of various groups. Regression estimates show only a positive impact of transfers received by the household head, which should be expected, given that heads very often have responsibility in carrying for the staple consumptions.

Non Food and Total expenditures

Estimations of the impact of transfers on non food and total expenditures (except lodging) tell a different story. Here again, we do not dwell on the results of instrumented equations since instruments are too weak. The interesting point here is that the straight OLS (tables 1a and 1b, columns 2 and 3) show a strong and very significant effect of the group transfers on the level of per capita expenditures. The log-log specification shows a positive and significant effect of transfers received by other groups (including that of the head) in the household, but this result does not hold in the fixed effects regressions (tables 2a and 2b, columns 2 and 3), whereas the impact of transfers received by the group remain positive and significant. Labour income, on the other hand, is not found significant.

Thus own transfers affect positively group expenditures, while other transfers do not. This result says that a group that receive more transfers than average in his household has a higher level of per capita consumption than other groups.

Clearly, endogeneity might be an issue, and it prevents us from interpreting this result causally. Nevertheless, the difference between this result and what was found in the case of food consumption is telling. A difference in access to transfers is associated with a difference in non food and total per capita expenditures, but not with a difference in per capita food expenditures. It is consistent with a situation in which household share resources when it comes to food consumption, but do not pool all their incomes. Not surprisingly, the unitary household model would therefore be rejected.

To go a bit further in this exploration, the fact that labour income does not appear to impact expenditures per capita in the fixed effect model, while own transfers remain a significant determinant of own expenditures, suggests that transfers and labour income are not perfectly fungible sources of income. If this were to be confirmed, it would tell that the collective model of household behaviour does not either provide an accurate description of Senegalese households' behaviour.

School enrolment

Table 5 gives the results for school enrolment of children ages 7 to 17 years old. The LHS variable is a dummy equal to 1 if the child is currently enrolled, hence the estimates are obtained by a probit. As indicated above, the estimation is again restricted to households containing at least 3 groups and excluding the group of the household head.

In this sample, 51% of the children in the relevant age group are currently enrolled in school. Descriptive statistics for the variables used in these regressions are provided in appendix 1. Only 63% of the children are child of the household head and 5% have been fostered either to the household head or to the group head. Household head is a female in only 5% of the cases, but 82% of the sub groups are headed by females, which can be expected given the definitions of the sub groups in the survey.

Results are very clearly compatible with a situation where transfers can be earmarked or captured by the subgroup who receives them: transfers received by a member of the group affect positively the probability of being enrolled. By contrast, transfers received by another group in the same household (excluding that of the head) have no effect whatsoever on enrolment. Transfers received by the head have a positive effect, but much smaller in size and less significant.

Other controls have the expected impact (urban household, educated parents and age all affect the probability of being enrolled positively). Interestingly we notice that fostered children have a higher probability of being enrolled.

Table 5: Probit on school enrolment

(marginal effects)	
VARIABLES	
Transfers rec. by group per cap.	1.021e-06*** (3.633e-07)
Transfers rec. by o. groups per cap.	-9.897e-08 (1.893e-07)
Transfers rec. by hh group per cap.	5.849e-08* (3.322e-08)
Group labour inc. per cap.	7.416e-10 (1.512e-09)
O. groups labour inc. per cap.	-3.048e-10 (2.957e-09)
HH group inc. per cap.	2.113e-10 (4.731e-10)
Household Head's child	-0.018 (0.035)
Group Head's child	0.058 (0.052)
Fostered child	0.150** (0.071)
Age	0.196*** (0.035)
Age squared	-0.009*** (0.001)
Male child	0.033 (0.026)
Father went to French school	0.255*** (0.031)
Father schooling is missing	0.087** (0.039)
Group size	0.059** (0.024)
Group size squared	-0.003* (0.002)
Household size	-0.002 (0.002)
Group head educated	0.123*** (0.036)
Household head educated	-0.033 (0.029)
Group head's age	0.003*** (0.001)
Household head's age	0.001 (0.001)
Group head is female	-0.012 (0.039)
Household head is female	-0.025 (0.058)
Urban	0.152*** (0.029)
Observations	1721
Pseudo R-squared	0.136
chi2	324.4
Log-Likelihood	-1029
Standard errors in parentheses	
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1	

Conclusion

These preliminary results add to already existing evidences on the absence of income pooling within African households. It nevertheless sketches a more subtle story, whereby the impact of different access to income on consumption and well being depends both on the good considered and on the source of income. As a result, it suggests that not only the unitary household model is likely to be inadequate, but the collective household model is probably hardly more suitable to the description of Senegalese households. The observed pattern of consumption seems consistent with a situation where norms interfere with decisions, so as to ensure that basics needs are covered for everyone and to allow exclusive use of some types of income (remittances) but not others (labour income).

If this is to be interpreted causally, implications in terms of individual welfare are important. In fact, an increase in income will translates into an improvement in the situation of the various household members in a way that depends on who controls the extra income and how it was obtained. It suggests that potential crowding out of private transfers by public transfers might be less of a problem than usually anticipated, if the beneficiary of the public transfers is adequately targeted. Hence, those results underline the need for a careful analysis of intra-household resources allocation that encompasses the analysis of the origin of the household income, if one wants to be able to target efficiently public policies aimed at poverty alleviation.

References

- Adams, R.H. and Page, J.(2003)**, «International migration, remittances, and poverty in developing countries», Washington, D.C., World Bank, 37 p., 2003.
- Azam, J.P. and F. Gubert, (2006)**. “Migrants’ Remittances and the Household in Africa: A Review of Evidence” (with Jean-Paul Azam), *Journal of African Economies*, vol. **15**, Supplement 2.
- Chami, R., Fullenkamp, C. and Jahjah, S. (2003)**. “Are Immigrant Remittance Flows a Source of Capital for Development?” International Monetary Fund (IMF) Working Paper 03/189. Washington, DC.
- De La Brière, B., A. de Janvry, S. Lambert and E. Sadoulet, (2002)**. “The Role of Gender, Age, and Family Composition in Explaining Remittances”, *Journal of Development Economics*, 68 (2).
- Dercon, S. (2002)**. “Income Risk, Coping Strategies and Safety Nets”. World Bank Research Observer, 17 (2) December 2002, pp.141-166.
- Duflo, E. and C. Udry, (2004)**. “[Intrahousehold Resource Allocation in Côte D’Ivoire: Social Norms, Separate Accounts and Consumption Choices](#)”, [Working Papers](#) 857, *Economic Growth Center, Yale University*.
- Mesnard, A. (2004)**. “[Temporary migration and capital market imperfections](#)”, *Oxford Economic Papers*, **56**, pp.242-262.
- Morduch A. (1999)**. “[Between the Market and State: Can Informal Insurance Patch the Safety Net?](#)”, *World Bank Research Observer* 14 (2), August 1999, 187 - 207
- Paulson, Anna L. (2000)**. “Insurance and Migration: Evidence from Thailand.” Unpublished manuscript, Department of Economics, University of Chicago.
- Rosenzweig, M. R. (1988)**. “Risk, Implicit Contracts and the Family in Rural Areas of Low-Income Countries” *Economic Journal*, **98**: 1148-1170.
- Stark O. and R.E.B. Lucas, (1988)**. “Migration, Remittances, and the Family”, *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, vol. **36**, n°3, pp. 465-82.
- Stark, Oded & Taylor, J. Edward & Yitzhaki, Shlomo, (1988)**. “[Migration, remittances and inequality : A sensitivity analysis using the extended Gini index](#),” *Journal of Development Economics*, vol. 28(3), pages 309-322, May.
- Taylor, J. Edward Jorge Mora, Richard Adams and Alejandro Lopez-Feldman (2005)**. “[Remittances, Inequality and Poverty: Evidence from Rural Mexico](#)” . July 2005, Working Paper UC Davis.
- Udry, C. (1996)**. “[Gender, Agricultural Productivity and the Theory of the Household](#)”, *Journal of Political Economy*, 104 (5).
- Yang, D. (2006)**, “Why Do Migrants Return to Poor Countries? Evidence from Philippine Migrants’ Responses to Exchange Rate Shocks”, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, November 2006, Vol. 88, No. 4, Pages 715-735

Yang, D. (2008), “International Migration, Remittances and Household Investment: Evidence from Philippine Migrants' Exchange Rate Shocks”, *The Economic Journal*, vol 118, p.591-630.

Yang and Choi (2007), “Are Remittances Insurance? Evidence from Rainfall Shocks in the Philippines”, *World Bank Econ Rev.* 21: 219-248

Appendix 1: Descriptive Statistics on the sample used for the education models

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Currently enrolled in school	0.51	0.50	0.00	1.00
Child of the household head	0.63	0.48	0.00	1.00
Fostered to household head	0.01	0.10	0.00	1.00
Child of group head	0.85	0.35	0.00	1.00
Fostered to group head	0.04	0.21	0.00	1.00
Child's age	11.73	3.19	7.00	17.00
Child's sex (1 = male)	0.50	0.50	0.00	1.00
Father went to french school	0.31	0.46	0.00	1.00
Ln(Transfer per cap. received by group)	2.30	4.02	0.00	13.02
Ln(Transfer per cap. received by other groups exc. HH Head)	2.86	4.40	0.00	12.71
Ln(Transfer per cap. received by group of HH Head)	3.96	5.30	0.00	14.40
Household head is female	0.05	0.21	0.00	1.00
Group head is female	0.82	0.38	0.00	1.00
Size of the group	5.52	2.10	1.00	15.00
Size of the household	14.92	6.12	1.00	36.00
Urban	0.36	0.48	0.00	1.00

Appendix 2: Descriptive Statistics on the sample used for the regression on food expenditures and total expenditures.

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std.	Min	Max
Per capita food exp. (group level)	1471	185363.7	317020	0	4693193
Per capita food exp. (household level)	1471	183962.7	295079.4	0	3808194
Non-food exp. except housing p.c. (group level)	1471	311422.5	443182.2	24348.35	4857936
Non-food exp. except housing p.c. (hh level)	1471	333175.3	474016.7	29693.27	4392875
Total exp. p.c (group level)	1471	316127.8	446505.9	24348.35	4857936
Total exp p.c. (household level)	1471	337736.2	477098	29693.27	4392875
Transfers received (hh level)	1471	206223.2	403382.4	0	1950000
Transfers received p.c. (hh level)	1471	16079.48	33690.94	0	300000
Transfers received p.c. (group level)	1471	10884.49	45641.39	0	600000
Transfers p.c. received by other groups	1470	19719.75	48253.75	0	800000
Household size	1471	13.65602	6.224482	1	36
Urban	1471	.3902107	.4879633	0	1
Household head is a woman	1471	.0883753	.2839364	0	1
Group head is a woman	1471	.743032	.4371102	0	1
Group size	1471	3.793338	2.028567	1	15