

MOROCCAN EMIGRATION: DOES IT HELP TO BREAK HOUSEHOLDS' POVERTY CYCLE? EMIGRATION POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Audrey Dumas, CAEPEM, University of Perpignan Via Domitia

Yehudith Kahn, Tel Hai Academic College¹

Yovav Eshet, University of Haifa

Contact:

Audrey Dumas: audrey.dumas@univ-perp.fr;

Yehudith Kahn: yehuditk@telhai.ac.il;

Yovav Eshet: yeshet@poli.haifa.ac.il

Abstract

Migration has traditionally been used as a survival strategy in times of financial crisis, however, a debate exists as to whether migration influences poverty on the individual level. Beyond mere short-term survival, migration can be seen as a deliberate choice to improve livelihoods (Bebbington, 1999) through accumulation of both financial and human capital. Furthermore, migration can be a means of acquiring a wider range of assets to insure against future shocks and stresses (De Haan, 2000).

The current study investigates the link between migration and poverty in household survey data collected in Morocco. This country is among the biggest receivers of remittances worldwide (15th) and is among the top emigration countries of MENA region (Nassar, 2009; World Bank, 2008). While remittances have been shown to contribute to developing economies, little research has examined their impact on the micro-level. Our objectives are to analyze the determinants of migration, to determine the impact of migration on current subjective poverty perception and to formulate some emigration policy recommendations.

The data were collected from the Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute (NIDI) database, which was commissioned by the EU Commission's Statistical Bureau,

¹ This research was sponsored by Tel Hai Academic College. We would like to express our gratitude to Vicki Myers and Keren Grinautski for research assistance.

Eurostat and which includes household surveys conducted in Morocco among 10,018 Moroccans between May-October 1997. Since income data were not available, our analysis was based on a measure of subjective financial poverty. We used probit model and a seemingly unrelated bivariate probit model for migration choice and current poverty.

Our findings were that it is essentially the poorer and unemployed individuals that increase their probability of migration and that migration has a positive effect on reducing poverty for current and for return migrants. In conclusion, since return migration benefits the whole community in the home country, it would be preferable to promote temporary migration instead of permanent migration. Consequently, EU countries should encourage local firms to conclude short term working contracts for economic migrants from low GDP neighbouring countries, as Morocco. This policy benefits both sending and receiving countries, enabling EU countries to better manage migration flows and at the same time reducing poverty in sending countries.

Keywords: Migration, poverty, brain drain, Morocco, selection bias,

Résumé

La migration a traditionnellement été utilisée comme une stratégie de survie en temps de crise financière, toutefois, il existe un débat, à savoir si la migration influe sur la pauvreté au niveau individuel. Au-delà du besoin de survie économique à court terme, la migration peut être considérée comme un choix délibéré d'améliorer le niveau de vie par l'accumulation de capital financier et humain . (Bebbington, 1999) De plus, la migration peut être le moyen d'acquies un plus large éventail d'actifs permettant à l'individu de s'assurer contre de futurs chocs (De Haan, 2000).

La présente étude examine le lien entre la migration et la pauvreté , à partir d'enquêtes de ménages effectuées au Maroc. Le Maroc figure parmi les plus gros récepteurs de transferts de fonds du monde (15ème) et est l'un des principal pays d'emigration de la région MENA.(Nassar, 2009; World Bank, 2008). Alors que beaucoup d'etudes ont montré que les transferts de fonds contribuent aux économies en développement, peu de recherches ont examiné leurs incidences au niveau micro economique. Nos objectives sont d'analyser les déterminants de la migration, de déterminer l'impact de la migration sur la perception subjective de la pauvreté actuelle et de formuler quelques recommandation politique en terme d'émigration.

Les données ont été recueillies par l'Institut Démographique Interdisciplinaire des Pays-Bas (NIDI), sur la demande du Bureau de statistique de la Commission Européenne, Eurostat et qui comprend les enquêtes ménages menées auprès de 10,018 Marocains entre mai et octobre 1997. Comme les données de revenu n'étaient pas disponibles, notre analyse a été fondée sur une mesure de la pauvreté subjective. Nous avons utilisé un modèle probit et un modèle *seemingly unrelated bivariate probit* sur le choix de migrer et la pauvreté actuelle.

Nos résultats sont que ce sont essentiellement les plus pauvres et les individus sans emploi qui migrent et que la migration a un effet positif sur la réduction de la pauvreté pour les migrants actuels ainsi que pour les migrants de retour. En conclusion, étant donné que la migration de retour avantage l'ensemble de la communauté du pays d'origine, il serait préférable de promouvoir la migration temporaire au lieu de la migration permanente. Par conséquent, les pays de l'Union européenne devraient encourager les entreprises locales à conclure des contrats de travail de court terme pour les migrants économiques provenant de pays voisins en développement, tel le Maroc. Cette politique profiterait à la fois aux pays émetteurs et récepteurs de migration, permettant aux pays de l'UE de mieux gérer les flux migratoires et, en même temps de réduire la pauvreté au sein des pays d'envoi.

Mots clés: Migration, pauvreté, fuite des cerveaux, Maroc, biais de sélection

INTRODUCTION

According to the World Bank there are currently 200 million people living outside their country of birth (Ratha & Xu, 2008). Concerning MENA (Middle East and North Africa) countries, migration issues are particularly acute for the EU for several reasons: first, because the EU faces a large number of migrants originating from MENA countries (about 3 million migrants); second, because migration flows go on rising at significant rates (180,000 new migrants from MENA countries were registered in the EU in 2002); third, because there is a huge geographical concentration of migrants: 80% in France, Italy and Spain and 50% of the overall number of migrants originating from MENA countries come from Morocco alone; fourth, because 75% of migrants are unskilled. These facts raise significant problems, since EU countries face high unemployment rates, especially for unskilled workers. These recent trends in migration flows have multiple policy implications. Hence, the question of a common EU migration policy has been increasingly considered, especially since the issue of the Green Paper for an EU migration policy (Commission of the European Communities, 2005; Zimmerman, 2004).

Migration has traditionally been used as a survival strategy in times of high unemployment and financial crisis. Beyond mere short-term survival, migration can be seen as a deliberate choice to improve livelihoods (Bebbington, 1999) through accumulation of both financial and human capital. In addition to the direct benefits for individual migrant, migration may be of benefit to the whole community. Several studies have shown that migrant households are more likely to invest than non-migrant households, and that consumption and investments in housing, small businesses and education can have positive income multiplier effects enabling remittances and other benefits to indirectly reach non-migrant households (De Haas, 2009b; Taylor, Rozelle & de Brauw, 2003). Taylor et al. (2003) found that migration increased household income by between 16-43% for non-migrants left behind. However the effects of migration on sending countries, excluding remittances, are enhanced when return migration occurs. This is the reason why we decided to distinguish in our research between current migrants and return migrants.

Remittances sent back to migrant-sending regions have been shown to play a vital role in alleviating poverty and improving livelihoods (Adams, Cuecuecha & Page, 2008) and often exceed amounts received in foreign aid (Ratha, 2005). Remittances comprise a higher percentage of GDP in lower income countries (Ratha, 2005) compared to more affluent countries, indicating that migration is a strategy used by the poor. However, according to the OECD (1992), development stimulates migration in the short term, giving more people the

resources to move. Consequently, while chronic poverty is transferred from one generation to the next, migration may provide a way out of the poverty cycle (Kothari, 2002). Considering the issues of migration, it seems important to better understand the migration determinants and effects in order to manage and make more efficient migration flows.

An important consideration in migration and poverty research is the selection of poverty measurement. Poverty is multi-dimensional and can be subjective, objective, relative or absolute. It can be measured according to income, assets, consumption, expenditure or possessions. Some research suggests that broad measures of poverty may be more useful than measures of income, and subjective poverty measurements have become widely used, incorporating financial, social and cultural aspects of poverty. Goedhart, Halberstadt, Kapteyn & Van Praag (1977) were among the first to employ a subjective poverty measure, asking individuals to define the minimum income sufficient for their family. They discovered that this value varied greatly, depending on numerous variables, making an objectively defined poverty line irrelevant. Ravallion and Lokshin (1999) found that a subjective economic measure correlated well with objective measures in a Russian sample. According to these researchers, subjective economic status provides more information and may also be related to health, education and unemployment. Furthermore, it explains the individual's perception of his financial status.

According to a review of subjective poverty by Van Praag and Ferrer-i-Carbonell (2005), poverty is an individual feeling and not an objective status and should, therefore, be measured by level of satisfaction. Subjective poverty questionnaires, consisting of questions about satisfaction or sufficiency, have been validated with individuals in similar circumstances providing similar responses (Van Praag & Ferrer-i-Carbonell, 2005). To summarize, all definitions of poverty fit into one of the following categories: I. having less than an objectively defined amount; II. having less than others in society; and III. feeling not having enough to get along (Hagenaars & de Vas, 1988).

The present study will investigate the link between migration and poverty, using household survey data from Morocco. This country is among the biggest receivers of remittances worldwide (15th) and is the top two emigration countries in the MENA (Middle East and North Africa) region (Nassar, 2009; World Bank, 2008a). While remittances have been shown to contribute to developing economies, little research has examined their impact on a micro-level.

COUNTRY BACKGROUND

Morocco saw a wave of migration beginning in the 1960's, when the French government recruited large numbers of unskilled Moroccan workers, a trend which lasted well into the 1970's (De Haas, 2009b). This mass emigration provided a way of coping with high unemployment and a source of migrants' remittances, which were greatly needed to reduce the trade deficit and have helped strengthen Morocco's external position (Bouhga-Hagbe, 2004).

Migration from Morocco tripled between 1984 and 2004 (Schramm, 2005). Receiving over 5.4 billion USD in official remittances in 2006, Morocco is the second largest remittance receiver in the MENA region, with remittances representing 10% of Morocco's GDP (Ratha & Xu, 2008). The relatively stable remittance flow is five times higher than official development aid and also exceeds revenues from tourism and the export of agricultural produce. Evidence suggests that remittances from international migration have improved living standards in Morocco (De Haas, 2007). Motivation for migration is largely economic, with 80% of return migrants citing income or employment reasons for having migrated abroad (Van der Erf & Heering, 2002). In 2006, emigrants accounted for 8.6% of Morocco's 30 million population and approximately 25% of the labour force (World Bank, 2008a).

Many Moroccan migrants have settled in Europe, with political instability and economic downturn at home leading to family reunification abroad and to large communities of Moroccans living permanently in Western Europe (De Haas, 2009a).

The current study investigates whether migration in Morocco is related to the subjective judgment of individuals in regard to their financial situation, and aims to determine whether migrant status has a significant impact on subjective poverty. Consequently, our objectives are to analyze the influence of past individual and job characteristics on migration choice, to determine the impact of migration on current subjective poverty perception and to formulate some emigration policy recommendations.

METHODS

Data were collected from the Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute (NIDI) database. Household surveys were conducted in Morocco in 1997 to capture individual, household, and contextual factors that influence people's decisions to migrate. According to Taylor et al. (2003), migration is a household decision with ramifications extending beyond the individual migrant, therefore, household surveys are ideally suited to data gathering in this field.

At the time of data collection in 1997, there were approximately 1.6 million Moroccan migrants (*Migration Policy Institute: Data Hub*, 2008). In 1997, remittances received from abroad amounted to 2 billion USD in Morocco (DiBartolomeo et al., 2010; *Migration Policy Institute: Data Hub*, 2008).

DEFINITIONS

Migrants were defined as individuals living abroad at the time of the interview and those who had migrated for at least a year in the past, as defined by the UN Statistics Division (Ratha & Xu, 2008). Only one migrant, aged 18 to 65 years old, in each household was selected for a long interview.

Migrant household was any household with at least one member who had lived abroad for at least a year or was currently living abroad. Non-migrant households were those in which no member had ever migrated.

MEASURES

Migration status is a dummy variable equal to 1 for migrant, and 0 for non-migrant (Migrant). However, we distinguish between two types of migrants, current and return migrants. Thus our analysis is based on two different samples: the first one is composed of non migrants and current migrants and the second one is composed of non migrants and return migrants.

In addition, the analysis was based on a measure of subjective financial poverty: 'Is the financial situation of the household sufficient to buy all the basic needs?'. For current poverty we considered a dummy variable equal to 1 if individuals declare their financial situation as barely sufficient or insufficient, and 0 otherwise (Current poverty).

To analyze the determinants of migration, a probit model evaluated the impact of individual and job characteristics (pre-migration or 5 years ago for non-migrants) on migration status. We considered the following variables: sex, age, marital status, education, unemployment, occupational status (employer or employee), sector of activity, number of persons and families in the household and household's region of residence.

To evaluate the impact of migration on current poverty, we estimated a probit model of current poverty. Several methodological problems highlighted by Sabates-Wheeler, Sabates & Castaldo (2008) have been taken into consideration. Selection bias may exist when estimating the effects of migration on current poverty, since the migration strategy is not a

random phenomenon among individuals. Firstly, we introduced various invariant observable characteristics before migration that may determine migration choice and poverty status and considered the variables previously introduced in the migration determinants equation. However, if individual characteristics changed during the migration period, then the migration effect may be confused with these changes. Thus, secondly, we considered variant observable characteristics, that control whether individual characteristics changed before and after migration. Thirdly, as poverty status can also be associated to remittances, we added receiving remittances as control variables. Fourthly, we applied a seemingly unrelated bivariate probit model for migration choice and current poverty, that take into account the correlation between the error terms of the two equations.

RESULTS

Descriptive statistics:

The sample consisted of 1,433 individuals, with 34.05% non-migrants and 65.94% migrants, and more precisely 60.85% of current migrants and 5.09% of return migrants.

Insert Table 1

Considering current poverty, the migrants' financial situation is better than that of non-migrants, especially for current migrants. These statistics point out that migration can reduce poverty. However, we must estimate this effect *ceteris paribus*, since migrants and non-migrants may have different poverty status before migration. Indeed, if migrants were initially wealthier compared to non-migrants before migration, then the migration effects are smaller than expected. On the contrary, if migrants were poorer than non-migrants before migration, then migration effects are higher. These results underline the importance of taking into consideration the selection bias while estimating migration effects.

Insert Table 2

The comparison of individual characteristics highlights differences between migrants and non migrants. Compared to non-migrants, migrants are younger, more often single and there are more women among current migrants. In addition, migrants are more educated but are also more likely to be unemployed, especially for current migrants. Among individuals that have a job, migrants tend to be employers rather than employees and belong to the primary sector. We also noticed that migrants compared to non migrants find a job, change occupational status and sector of activity more often since migration. This points out that migration is highly linked to employment issues. Furthermore, migrants are more likely to change their marital status and as expected, remittances are more often reported in migrant household, especially among current migrants. Finally, migrants belong to household which are composed of more persons and family member than non migrants, which is usually a source of poverty.

Determinants of migration choice:

Firstly, the probability of migration is very high. The control variables included in our model explain well the decision to migrate, and limit the selection bias. Secondly, for current and return migrants, we noticed that being unemployed have a strong positive effect on migration, whereas education doesn't have any effects. Moreover, among individuals that have a job, being a non administrative worker and especially from the primary sector increase the probability of migration as well. Thirdly, we identified other determinants of migration: marital status and regional localisation. Fourthly, for current migrants only, we found other determinants of migration. Indeed, being a women, an employer, a younger person and having a large household increase the probability of migration. In conclusion, it seems that it is rather poor people that decide to migrate. However, these result suggest that there are two types of migrants: the first ones includes unemployed individuals which may migrate in order to find a job. They either stay abroad or to come back home later with working experiences and savings. The second category includes poor individuals, working as employer in the primary sector, that do not earn enough money and hope to find better living conditions abroad.

Insert Table 3

Migration effects on poverty:

Migration significantly reduces the chance of being poor for current migrants, but does not have any significant effects for return migrants. We also found, as was expected, that less educated individuals have more chance to be poor and that there are large effects of regional localisation on current poverty. For current migrants, the poverty is reduced for women and older individuals.

When controlling the variables that changed since migration, these results remain unchanged. There is a small significant effect of migration on current poverty for return migrants as well.

Finally, migration effect can also be measured via remittances received by household. The probability of being poor is not influenced by receiving remittances.

Insert Table 4

Insert Table 5

Applying seemingly unrelated bivariate probit models, the correlation term is significant only for return migrants. Thus, the previous results obtained with the probit models are confirmed for current migrants. In contrast, with this estimation migration reduces the probability to be poor also when migrants come back home. Furthermore, remittances as well have a significant effect in reducing poverty.

Insert Table 6

DISCUSSION

Migrant profiles suggest that poor people, especially unemployed individuals and poor workers, decide to migrate more frequently than wealthier individuals .

A previous study using the same dataset, comparing Egypt with Ghana, showed that migration was not a significant determinant of current poverty status (Sabates-Wheeler et al.,

2008). In the current study this was not the case, since in Morocco migration was associated with less poverty. This finding concurs with the macro-level data published by Adams and Page (2005), according to which an increase in the number of migrants is associated with a decline in the number of people living below the poverty line. The same study further reported that an increase in remittances as a percentage of GDP was related to lower poverty levels, as was found in the current micro-level study, where received remittances influenced subjective poverty, however only for return migrants. An international review of migration found that migration and remittances have a significant, although small, effect on reducing poverty (Adams & Page, 2005), as we find in our study.

Our study indicates that migration has an effect on poverty for current and for return migrants. Thus, according to our results, migration can be a solution for Moroccan people to improve their living conditions. Since return migration benefits the whole community in the home country, it would be preferable to promote temporary migration instead of permanent migration. Consequently, EU countries should encourage local firms to conclude short term working contracts for economic migrants from low GDP neighbouring countries, as Morocco. This policy benefits both sending and receiving countries, enabling EU countries to better manage migration flows and at the same time reducing poverty in sending countries.

REFERENCES

- Adams, R.H.Jr, Cuecuecha, A., & Page, J. (2008). *The Impact of Remittances on Poverty and Inequality in Ghana* (Working Paper No. 4732). World Bank Policy Research
- Adams, R.H., & Page, J. (2005). The impact of international migration and remittances on poverty. In S.M. Maimbo & D. Ratha (Eds.), *Remittances: Development Impact and Future Prospects*. World Bank: Washington.
- Bebbington, A. (1999). Capitals and capabilities: A framework for analysing peasant viability, rural livelihoods and poverty. *World Development*, 27(12), 2021-2044.
- Bouhga-Hagbe, J. (2004). *A Theory of Workers' Remittances with an Application to Morocco*. International Monetary Fund: Middle East and Central Asia Department.
- Burns, A., & Mohapatra, S. (2008). *International Migration and Technological Process*. World Bank: Washington.
- De Haas, H. (2007). *The Impact of International Migration on Social and Economic Development in Moroccan Sending Regions: A Review of the Empirical Literature*. University of Oxford, International Migration Institute

- De Haas, H. (2009a). *Focus Migration: Morocco*. Retrieved on April 21, 2010 from: <http://www.focus-migration.de/Morocco.5987.0.html?&L=1>.
- De Haas, H. (2009b). International migration and regional development in Morocco: A review. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35(10), 1571-1593.
- DiBartolomeo, A., et al. (2010). CARIM Migration Profile: Egypt European University Institute.
- El-Saharty, S., Richardson, G., & Chase, S. (2005). *Egypt and the Millenium Development Goals: Challenges and Opportunities*. World Bank: Washington.
- Hagenaars, A., & de Vos, K. (1988). The definition and measurement of poverty. *Journal of Human Resources*, 23, 211-212.
- Goedhart, T., Halberstadt, V., Kapteyn, A., & van Praag, B. (1977). The poverty line: Concept and measurement. *Journal of Human Resources*, 12(4), 503-520.
- Kothari, U. (2002). *Migration and Chronic Poverty*. Chronic Poverty Research Centre, Institute for Development, Policy and Management, University of Manchester.
- Migration Policy Institute: Data Hub. (2008). Retrieved on May 25, 2010 from: www.migrationinformation.org/datahub/remittances/morocco.pdf.
- Nassar, H. (2008). *Temporary and Circular Migration*. European Universty Institute/ CARIM (Euro-Mediterranean Consortium for Applied Research on International Migration): San Domenico de Fiesole.
- Nassar, H. (2009). *Migration and Financial Flows: Egypt in the MENA Region*. European Universty Institute/ CARIM (Euro-Mediterranean Consortium for Applied Research on International Migration): San Domenico de Fiesole.
- OECD. (1992). *Trends in International Migration*. Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development: Paris.
- Ratha, D. (2005). Workers' remittances: An important and stable source of external development finance. In S. M. Maimbo & D. Ratha (Eds.), *Remittances: Development Impact and Future Prospects*. World Bank: Washington.
- Ratha, D., & Xu, Z. (2008). *Migration and Remittances Factbook 2008*. World Bank: Washington.
- Ravallion, M., & Lokshin, M. (1999). *Subjective Economic Welfare* (No. 2106). World Bank Policy Research.
- Sabates-Wheeler, R., Sabates, R., & Castaldo, A. (2008). Tackling poverty-migration linkages: Evidence from Ghana and Egypt. *Social Indicators Research*, 87, 307-328.
- Schramm, C. (2005). *Migration from Egypt, Morocco, and Tunisia: Synthesis of*

Three Case Studies. World Bank: Washington.

Taylor, E.J., Rozelle, S., & de Brauw, A. (2003). Migration and incomes in source communities: A new economics of migration perspective from China. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 52(1), 75-101.

Van der Erf, R., & Heering, L. (2002). *Moroccan Migration Dynamics: Prospects for the Future* (No. 10). International Organization for Migration/ Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute: Geneva.

Van Praag, B., & Ferrer-i-Carbonell, A. (2005). *A Multi-Dimensional Approach to Subjective Poverty*. Paper presented at the Conference on Measurement of Multidimensional Poverty, Theory and Evidence, International Poverty Centre, Brasilia.

Wahba, J. (2007). Returns to overseas work experience – The case of Egypt. In C. Ozden & M. Schiff (Eds.), *International Migration, Economic Development & Policy*. World Bank.

WorldBank. (2008a). *Middle East and North Africa: Migration and Remittance*.

Retrieved on March 10, 2010 from:

<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/COUNTRIES/MENAEXT/0,,contentMDK:21860906~menuPK:2246554~pagePK:2865106~piPK:2865128~theSitePK:256299,00.html>

WorldBank. (2008b). *Migration and Remittances Factbook 2008*. World Bank: Washington.

Zohry, A. (2007). Egyptian irregular migration to Europe. *Migration Letters*, 4: 53-63.

Table 1 *Repartition of non-migrants and migrants according to past poverty, current poverty and the evolution of poverty*

Current poverty	Non migrants	Current Migrants	Return Migrants	Total
More than sufficient	1.84%	7.68%	1.37%	5.37%
Sufficient	27.66%	60.67%	41.10%	48.43%
Barely sufficient	41.19%	26.83%	42.47%	32.52%
Insufficient	29.10%	4.70%	15.07%	13.54%
Number of observations	488	872	73	1,433
Repartition	34.05%	60.85%	5.09%	100%

Table 2 *Repartition of non-migrants, current migrants and return migrants according to individual and job characteristics*

	Non migrants	Current Migrants	Return Migrants	Total
Women	9.22%	15.14%***	4.11%	12.56%
Age (average)	45.53	32.88***	34.9***	37.3
Not married	17.62%	55.5%***	57.53%***	42.71%
Primary Education	25.20%	24.71%***	21.92%**	24.74%
Secondary	13.73%	26.09%	27.40%	21.94%
Above Secondary/Superior	7.17%	12.76%	5.48%	10.48%
Education dnk	53.89%	36.44%	45.21%	42.84%
Unemployed	17.21%	53.33%***	39.73%***	40.33%
Employer	19.05%	27.83%	36.17%*	27.88%
Primary sector	39.53%	58.21%***	59.57%	56.47%
Secondary sector	30.23%	30.15%	23.40%	29.41%
Tertiary sector	6.98%	6.57%	6.38%	6.59%
Administrative sector	18.60%	2.69%	8.51%	4.94%
Persons in household	6.26	6.83***	7.03**	6.65
Several families in household	0.82%	28.56%***	10.96%***	18.21%
North West	28.69%	12.27%***	38.36%***	19.19%
Center South	21.93%	20.87%	12.33%	20.80%
South	14.14%	20.41%	12.33%	17.86%
Center	18.65%	26.83%	32.88%	24.35%
Oriental	16.60%	19.61%	4.11%	17.79%
Find a job	4.92%	36.93%***	19.18%***	25.12%
Lose their job	7.38%	0.69%***	12.33%	3.56%
Change sector	3.28%	30.05%***	34.25%***	21.14%
Change status	0%	5.67%***	3.13%***	3.23%
Change marital status	14.96%	21.79%***	23.29%*	19.54%
Reception of remittances	1.43%	18.46%***	6.85%***	12.07%

Chi square tests, for current migrants versus non migrants, for return migrants versus non migrants : * P<0.05, ** P<0.01, *** P<0.001,

Table 3 Estimating migration choice – Probit model

	Current and non migrants		Return and non migrants	
	PA	SE	PA	SE
Intercept	-1.252	0.296 ^{***}	-2.224	0.588 ^{***}
Women	0.580	0.155 ^{***}	-0.556	0.379
Not married	0.253	0.126 ^{**}	0.715	0.252 ^{***}
Ref: superior				
Primary	-0.250	0.187	-0.131	0.422
Secondary	-0.046	0.187	0.505	0.405
Education dnk	-0.467	0.185 ^{**}	-0.134	0.401
Ref : less than 25				
Aged 25-45	-0.538	0.168 ^{***}	0.071	0.347
Aged more 45	-1.571	0.205 ^{***}	-0.492	0.408
Unemployed	1.595	0.123 ^{***}	1.296	0.268 ^{***}
Employer	0.543	0.258 ^{**}	0.492	0.354
Ref : administration sector				
Primary sector	2.468	0.208 ^{***}	2.442	0.330 ^{***}
Secondary sector	2.154	0.206 ^{***}	1.975	0.370 ^{***}
Tertiary sector	1.897	0.406 ^{***}	1.716	0.656 ^{***}
Ref : North West				
Center South	0.769	0.171 ^{***}	-0.375	0.316
South	1.314	0.187 ^{***}	0.350	0.318
Center	1.098	0.172 ^{***}	0.449	0.268 [*]
Oriental	0.957	0.177 ^{***}	-1.034	0.414 ^{**}
Several families	1.780	0.246 ^{***}	0.881	0.525 [*]
Ref: less 4				
4 - 7 persons	0.115	0.149	-0.280	0.299
More 7 persons	0.402	0.157 ^{**}	0.099	0.297
Predicted probability	94.2		94.2	

*P<0.05, **P<0.01, ***P<0.001,

PA: parameter; SE: Standard Errors

Table 4 Estimating current poverty – Probit model

	Current and non migrants		Return and non migrants	
	PA	SE	PA	SE
Intercept	0.805	0.217***	0.245	0.409
migrant	-0.938	0.118***	-0.372	0.230
Women	-0.401	0.122***	-0.266	0.228
Not married	0.125	0.093	0.074	0.180
Ref: superior				
Primary	0.435	0.145***	1.220	0.260***
Secondary	0.358	0.142**	0.717	0.267***
Education dnk	0.621	0.142***	1.397	0.251***
Ref : less than 25				
Aged 25-45	-0.187	0.115	-0.218	0.275
Aged more 45	-0.287	0.152*	-0.299	0.295
Unemployed	-0.049	0.112	-0.100	0.172
Employer	-0.081	0.160	0.257	0.351
Ref : administration sector				
Primary sector	0.130	0.147	-0.101	0.269
Secondary sector	-0.169	0.164	0.345	0.354
Tertiary sector	0.328	0.282	0.223	0.601
Ref : North West				
Center South	-0.493	0.123***	-0.364	0.185**
South	-0.789	0.133***	-0.816	0.195***
Center	-0.801	0.118***	-0.763	0.173***
Oriental	-0.411	0.129***	-0.131	0.202
Several families	-0.086	0.106	-0.227	0.414
Ref: less 4				
4 - 7 persons	-0.004	0.119	-0.104	0.196
More 7 persons	-0.087	0.121	-0.337	0.200*
Predicted probability	75.4		73.9	

* P<0.05, ** P<0.01, *** P<0.001,

PA: parameter; SE: Standard Errors

Table 5 *Estimating current poverty with additional control variables – probit models*

	Current and non migrants				Return and non migrants			
	PA	SE	PA	SE	PA	SE	PA	SE
Intercept	0.816	0.219***	0.817	0.219***	0.239	0.411	0.271	0.414
Migrant	-0.931	0.123***	-0.904	0.126***	-0.410	0.237*	-0.374	0.239
Change sector	0.069	0.164	0.074	0.164	0.273	0.388	0.296	0.394
Change status	-0.330	0.175*	-0.332	0.175*	0.023	0.423	-0.025	0.429
Change marital	-0.121	0.110	-0.120	0.110	0.086	0.186	0.090	0.186
Find a job	0.066	0.139	0.071	0.138	-0.089	0.289	-0.102	0.289
Lose a job	0.132	0.252	0.138	0.2531	0.331	0.281	0.303	0.281
Remittances			-0.123	0.119			-0.635	0.429
Proba Predicted	75.8		76		74		74.4	

*P<0.05, **P<0.01, ***P<0.001,

PA: parameter; SE: Standard Errors

Other control variables are the same as in the model of table 4.

Table 6 *Estimating migration choice and current poverty with seemingly unrelated bivariate probit*
Estimates for the poverty equation

	Current and non migrants					
	PA	SE	PA	SE	PA	SE
Intercept	0.829	0.232 ^{***}	0.842	0.233 ^{***}	0.841	0.233 ^{***}
Migrant	-1.030	0.347 ^{***}	-1.028	0.342 ^{***}	-0.993	0.347 ^{***}
Change sector			0.068	0.161	0.073	0.161
Change status			-0.328	0.174 [*]	-0.331	0.174 [*]
Change marital			-0.123	0.109	-0.121	0.109
Find a job			0.066	0.138	0.071	0.138
Lose a job			0.132	0.257	0.138	0.258
Remittances					-0.122	0.117
Rho	0.056	0.199	0.059	0.195	0.054	0.197
	Return and non migrants					
Intercept	0.233	0.403	0.231	0.404	0.259	0.404
Migrant	-1.292	0.410 ^{***}	-1.280	0.425 ^{***}	-1.338	0.418 ^{***}
Change sector			0.174	0.367	0.204	0.367
Change status			0.007	0.400	-0.068	0.403
Change marital			0.091	0.180	0.100	0.179
Find a job			-0.030	0.276	-0.039	0.272
Lose a job			0.266	0.270	0.224	0.269
Remittances					-0.659	0.376 [*]
Rho	0.595	0.234 ^{**}	0.571	0.247 ^{**}	0.637	0.244 ^{***}

*P<0.05, **P<0.01, ***P<0.001,

PA: parameter; SE: Standard Errors

Other control variables are the same as in the model of table 3 for the migration equation and of the table 5 for the poverty equation.