**INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON INTERNATIONAL
MIGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT**
Population Division
Department of Economic and Social Affairs
United Nations Secretariat
Turin, Italy, 28-30 June 2006

GENDER AND INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION: EVIDENCE FROM THE NIDI-EUROSTAT STUDY*

Richard E. Bilsborrow, UNC-CH, and Jeannette Schoorl, NIDI

_____

I. Introduction and Purpose of Report

The purpose of this study is to explore differences in the migration experiences of men and women international migrants from developing countries. There have been many studies of international migration, most looking at the processes of adjustment and assimilation in countries of destination, and the whole range of associated social and economic problems, benefits, and costs, and there have been a much smaller set of studies based on actual data that have examined the experiences of men or women international migrants, many looking at only one sex, and the vast majority based on only one country of destination, usually the United States or a country of the European Union. There have thus been very few studies on the migration experiences of international migrants from developing countries based on data collected in those countries rather than in countries of destination. While collecting data in destination countries has some advantages, notably since the data can usually be collected directly from the migrants themselves, the information provided about the experience of international migrants is evidently limited to that single destination country alone, which may well not be typical of the experiences of those leaving any country of origin, since emigrants may go to many destinations. It is therefore of particular interest from the *point of view of countries of emigration* to collect data in those countries about the experience of their emigrants and their households, to gain a broader picture of the process.

Nevertheless, there are two important limitations of such studies. First, they usually require collecting data about the out-migrant from a proxy respondent in the origin household (for further details, see Bilsborrow *et al.*, 1997). This may limit the quality of data collected or its detail (such as on earnings, social relationships in the country of destination), or whether it can even be meaningfully collected at all, such as on attitudinal topics, motives for migration, etc.[1] The second limitation is that when entire households leave the country of origin, there is clearly no one left behind to provide reliable data on either the antecedents of migration or the current situation of the migrants. To the extent that (a) most migrants leaving the country leave as entire households, and (b) the motives and characteristics of those leaving as members of entire households differ from those who leave as individuals from households that remain behind, then data collected in the origin country will be biased in its intention of providing a more comprehensive picture of emigration experiences than data collected in one or more destination countries. Unfortunately, data are not readily available to shed light on the extent to which migrants depart as individuals or households in the countries included in the study here. On the first issue, the best that can be done is to carefully search out the member of the origin household who is *most* knowledgeable about the emigrant of interest, rather than blindly collect data from the household head or whichever other adult is handy at the time of interview, which is what is almost always done in migration surveys. The project which underlies the sources of data used in this report emphasized the importance to interviewers of identifying the best proxy respondent prior to undertaking the survey, ensuring that the data from proxy respondents are as reliable as can be expected.

The data drawn upon for this report are from specialized surveys on international migration carried out in three countries of origin of migrants in Africa in 1997-98, under a research program funded by the European Union (Eurostat) and managed by the Netherlands

---

[1]   In many if not most cases, persons in the origin household who provide information as proxy respondents about the (absent) migrant are not likely to know about the precise occupation, income, etc., of the migrant, especially in such cases where social stigma is an issue; and when they do know, they are less likely to report that information to an interviewer.

Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute (NIDI). The three countries are Egypt, Ghana and Senegal. NIDI developed the methodology for data collection and provided technical assistance to government statistical offices and local research organizations who collected the data and shared it with NIDI, making possible comparable cross-country analyses. Data were collected in the principal regions of international out-migration using scientific probability sampling to select households for interview. Detailed data were collected from samples of both migrant and non-migrant households, permitting the examination of a number of topics regarding gender and international migration, and doing so in a comparative fashion.

Based on these data for three countries, in this study we examine the similarities and differences in the backgrounds, characteristics, processes, and individual and household consequences of international migration *according to the gender of the migrant*. We do not compare migrants and non-migrants or statis

migrated do indicate large differences by gender), but rather similarities and differences in the *characteristics of those men and women who did migrate*.

Thus, regarding pre-migration individual characteristics of migrants, in most of the NIDI origin countries (see section III below), cultural and religious factors constrain women's activities outside the home (Morocco, Senegal, Egypt and to some extent Turkey). The exception is Ghana, where the population is split between Islam and Christianity, the majority of both women and men have completed primary school and have some secondary education, and women are very active in the economy, especially in selling in the market. Thus, except for Ghana, the few women who do engage in international migration (especially as autonomous or main decision-makers of the migration move), may tend to be *positively selected*, compared to not only non-migrant women but also male migrants. They may thus be a bit older, more educated, and with previous significant work experience. Nevertheless, apart from this group, from all countries there are also likely to be some women and girls who engage in international migration, impelled by poverty and/or found by labor recruiters, including many duped into thinking they will have jobs in restaurants, offices, as domestic servants, or elsewhere in the legitimate service sector but find themselves being trafficked into the commercial sex industry.[2] To the extent these females are from the lower end of the socio-economic spectrum, women international migrants may have a bi-modal distribution in us01ect4.e -11lo1 c re fropo(r)-T2 1 .9(x)6(h) 156.8(g)-3.6(4s bei(o)aT2 1 l(t4.e gra 0 0 7.7.6( )refl11lo1(nd10. fr

international than internal migration, given the larger distances often involved in terms of physical space, language, culture, gender roles and opportunities, and other socio-economic conditions. These factors imply that networks should be more important for women who migrate than for men, though again to the extent the women migrants were involved in sexual trafficking, family networks would seem less likely to play a role. A related issue is whether the migrant had a visa or legal papers required for the migration before leaving. Those who did would likely have more positive experiences in the destination country. If women migrants are more conservative and less risk-taking, they might be more likely to have obtained such documents prior to migration.

The next set of hypotheses corresponds to the factors in the box relating to conditions of *initial arrival* in the D. Following the discussion above, we expect those women who migrate to receive more assistance than men, and therefore to obtain housing quicker, though whether this carries over to employment and quality of first job is to be empirically ascertained.

Of course, the bottom line is how do women and men international migrants differ in their *current conditions*, in education, employment status, earnings, having a written work contract, housing quality, etc. We expect them to continue to differ from men in marital status, to be more likely to be single, and to have fewer children than their male counterparts. If single, or if married and not with their spouse, it is possible that they will be more likely to return to the O, and more likely for non-economic reasons than men. There is a widespread hypothesis in the literature that women migrants (including international) are more likely than men to send remittances back to their origin household, but there has been little empirical evidence. We hoped to examine this here, but unfortunately data on remittances sent were only obtained from the household head rather than from all migrants in the individual questionnaires; thus there is insufficient data on remittances by gender. In this context, it would be important to take into account the person's employment status and earnings, as those earning little have little opportunity to remit. It would also be desirable to control for the apparent *need* of the O household--its size and composition, assets, and income.

Another set of considerations regarding the current situation of current migrants in D is whether they have close relative or friends with them in the D or left behind in the O. We hypothesize that women migrants are more likely to depend on relatives or friends in the D than their male counterparts, and would have been more likely to have moved with someone else from the origin country in the first place than is the case for men. It seems an open question, on the other hand, whether male or female migrants will be more likely to function in the main language of the D at the time of survey, or interact socially mostly with people from their country of origin or the local population, which could be but is not currently examined here. We expect women migrants to have more access to help if needed, but it is not clear what the differences are likely to be in terms of desires for citizenship in the D.

A final important factor is the extent to which men vs. women international migrants have accumulated human capital following migration, and up to the present time. Trtm25(o)-107-7.5(ai)6.5(o5(o

country. It is again an empirical question as to whether this has been the case more for male vs. female migrants from these countries of origin. The issue of the increase in human capital is critical in the assessment of the gains from migration to the individual.

Finally, we are interested in the degree and ways in which men and women international *return* migrants differ, first, from each other, and second, from current migrants who continue to live abroad. Return migrants are evidently a subset of the all the persons who emigrated from the O country, which includes the current migrants remaining in the D (migrants who later died in the ten-year interval are evidently excluded, but this will be few given the young age distribution of migrants, seen below). It is beyond the scope of this paper to examine the

cluster sample comprising households with and without migrants, in which the former were over-sampled.

A short characterization of the study regions in the three countries is as follows: Of the two regions included in Senegal, Dakar is the more developed and also has significant recent emigration, in contrast to the older emigration flows from the Senegal River area), and receives many return migrants (Robin *et al.,* 2000). Touba, the second city in Senegal and located in the rural Diourbel region, was the other research site; it has recent migrants but a lower level of economic development than Dakar. In Ghana, the Greater Accra region, with a long-established migration history, and the Ashanti region, with more recent emigration, were selected as the two more economically advanced areas. Ghana's Eastern region (with long-established emigration patterns) and Brong Ahafo (with recent emigration) are the other regions selected, both less developed. In Egypt the administrative division into rural and urban regions served as the basis for selecting two regions of each type. The urban governorate region with Cairo and Alexandria has the .1(h)-5Tm0 wi 〔 h)-5. type. The urban

Table A.　Number of households in the sample and numbers of households and individuals interviewed, by household and individual migration status and gender

Country:	Egypt	Ghana	Senegal
Fieldwork period:	April - May 1997	Aug-Sept 1997	Nov '97 - Feb '98
Households in the sample	2.588	1.980	1.971
Households interviewed:	1.943	1.567	1.740
Current migrant households [a]:	607	466	708
Recent migrant households [e]:	561	458	545
With MMA	551	453	533

current migrants in each case, that is, for each indicator variable and for each table. Finally, the last subsection in IV will compare the situation of male and female migrants prior to migration with their current situation following migration, to the extent permitted by the data.

The discussion in section III above indicates that even though the data are very rich and offer interesting bases for cross-country (cross-cultural) and cross-gender comparisons, this should be considered only a preliminary empirical study. This is discussed in the concluding section V below. Whenever possible, we present data for all migrants, including both Main Migration Actors (see III above) and other recent migrants together. The tables thus usually include other adult migrants who accompanied the MMA or followed them or migrated elsewhere during the 10-year interval. The reason for this inclusion is that it provides higher numbers of observations, which is especially important for women migrants from both Egypt and Senegal. Differences in the characteristics of the MMAs and other recent migrants are in any case minor, so even in the occasional situation of comparing data from, say, MMAs pre-migration and all migrants post-migration, the comparison is valid.

A. Antecedents to Migration: Pre-migration Characteristics of Migrants and Their Households

In this section we examine the individual characteristics and household context of male and female international migrants from the three study countries to the extent permitted by data in the Push-Pulls project described in III above. This section examines these for current migrants, that is, for those migrants who are currently (at the time of the survey in 1997-98) living outside their country of origin, and for their households. In the next section we provide comparable data for return migrants, who have returned not only to their origin country but to their origin household. We begin with data on personal characteristics other than economic aspects of migrants, then consider their economic antecedents (mainly work and employment experience), and conclude with the circumstances of their households of origin.

Age distribution

Among the personal characteristics of migrants that are important in migration and which may differ between male and female international migrants are age, education, and marital status at the time of migrating. Table 1 provides data on the age distribution of migrants at the time of departure. (Recall that all tables show the data for both current migrants and return migrants, with the latter discussed in the following subsection.) First, regarding age at emigration, it is clear that the international migrants from these three countries are usually young adults, as observed in virtually all studies of migration around the world, for both internal and international migrants. Most are in their twenties or thirties, with women migrating at slightly younger ages than men. The small number of women migrants in both Egypt and Senegal is significantly younger than their far more numerous male counterparts, with almost half in the 15-24 age group compared to only 21 and 31 percent, respectively, for males.

Education

Table 2 shows the education level of male and female migrants. It is intriguing how different gender differences are among the countries. In Egypt where less than 10% of the migrants are female, those women migrants are highly selected by education, with the education distribution far higher than for men: As noted in III above, most men who emigrate from

Egypt go to the Gulf States, where family reunification is not usually allowed. Therefore those Egyptian women who emigrate either are following husbands to Western destinations or migrating independently, for work or education. Over half the female migrants have superior or university-level education compared to less than a quarter of the men, and virtually all women migrants had secondary or higher education. In Senegal, where again autonomous migration of women is equally rare, with again fewer than 10% of the international migrants in the 10-year period before the survey being women, there is no evident overall difference in the education of female and male migrants. Some of this is due to the lower overall levels of education of both males and women in Senegal compared to Egypt, as this leaves fewer people at risk of migration with secondary or tertiary education. Finally, Ghana presents a very different situation, with women far more active in the economy and hence also in international migration, constituting nearly a third of the migrants who continue to live in the destination country at the time of interview, and with an educational distribution of women differing only slightly from that of men, with about 60% of the men with secondary or higher education compared to about 50% of the women. However, there are more men with tertiary education and women with none.

Marital status

Marital status has been found to have very different implications for male and female migration, both internally and internationally, with married women rarely migrating by themselves or autonomously in contrast to married men, especially in developing countries. Thus it appears anomalous (see Table 3) that in both Egypt and Senegal, those (relatively few) women who migrate internationally are slightly *more* likely to be married than male migrants. This is also the case in Ghana, however, where the numbers of male and female migrants are not so disparate. It should be noted that this does not mean that being single does not increase the chances of migration of women, since the denominators, the total numbers of men and women at risk of international migration in the relevant marital status groups (including non-migrants) is not considered in the study here.

Work experience and status

We now move on to consider economic aspects of the individual migrants, notably their work experience prior to migration. In Table 4 we see that in both Egypt and Senegal, where female migrants are highly selective, it is more likely for women than men migrants to have had *foeace.5.(ts,)-5.8 G.1(nects of)53(e stu)0.8(gra)5.3(nh)7.4(rn)ects ofollow,(Th0.2(em)11.8( )-13(ws)5.3(nh)7*

were much lower than those of females, varying from about 10 percent in Senegal to 15 in Egypt and much higher at about 30 per cent in Ghana (and not linked to a younger age distribution in Ghana, but likely to much higher school enrollments). At the same time, the proportions of both male and female migrants who were unemployed prior to migration were under 7 per cent in all three countries, so unemployment was not an important factor in emigration.   Only Ghana has a large number of female international migrants, whose economic classification prior to migration warrants a fuller consideration. Only there is the category "employed" the largest for both women and men migrants. While self-employed is second, it is a distant second for males but equal to employed for women, likely reflecting the well-known dominant role of women in commerce in Ghana, the famous "market women" selling food, etc. Overall, in Ghana, women international migrants are more likely to have been employers, self-employed, and unemployed, and less likely to be employees or not in the labor force than men migrants prior to migration.

Sector of economic activity

Finally, Table 6 shows the broad sector of economic activity of those actually working prior to migration, which reflects differences in the overall levels of development and sectoral distribution of economic activities across coun

Household size

Table 8 provides data on mean household size prior to migration, to address the question of whether larger households facilitate (through more members permitting more diversification of economic roles to spread risks) or stimulate (higher consumption needs, more crowded living conditions) greater out-migration, and whether there are differences between the households of women vs. men migrants. While data are not presented here on the general issue, there is only one of the countries where there is a gender difference: In Egypt women international migrants come from much smaller households than male migrants.

Adequacy of household income

A key issue is the economic situation of migrant households at the time of migration—do migrants tend to come from households that are well off or poor, or from those that perceive themselves as better off than their neighbors or not (relative income)? Since these data are subjective, they were considered reliable only when obtained directly from the migrant, rather than from any proxy respondent, so the numbers of cases is quite small for current international migrants in contrast to return migrants (discussed later in subsection B). Table 9 presents available data for the three countries on the perceived adequacy of household income for meeting family needs by gender. The data suggest that these international migrants tend to come from mainly poorer households, in Ghana and Senegal, and from average ones in Egypt. Unfortunately there are not enough data from women Main Migration Actors to say anything about them, although all of the women responding come from households perceived as not having sufficient resources or average situations.

Household income compared to neighbors

The other data available on the economic situ

larger in Ghana. Could it be that Ghanaian migrants with larger families feel more pressure to remain abroad to send remittances to support their origin household?

Economic situation of origin household

Do return migrants come initially from origin households that are well-off? Do they return to them more than to poorer households? Because the data are attitudinal, they are generally available only for those MMAs who can be interviewed directly, which means only rarely for current migrants, but almost always for return migrants, since they were back in their origin households when the interviews were conducted. Thus in Table 9, we see the patterns of return migration according to the origin household's situation prior to migration in the three countries. In each of the countries, women migrants who return come from somewhat better off households than male return migrants, though both genders report themselves as coming generally from economically poor or marginal households. This is especially true of migrants in Senegal, and marginally so in Egypt. Overall, migrants from Egypt came from households with adequate economic situation before the migrant left, in contrast to the other two countries. There is little difference in the distribution of return migrants and current migrants by adequacy of economic situation before migration, for either gender. Data in Table 10 show little difference by gender in the perceived situation of the household of return migrants prior to migration compared to that of neighbors. The distributions by economic condition are also similar for current and return migrants.

Reasons for leaving country of origin

As seen in Table 11, reasons given by return migrants for leaving their country of origin, to which they have now returned, were overwhelmingly economic for men in Egypt and Ghana, and predominantly economic for men in Senegal and migrants in Ghana. They are primarily for familial reasons, in contrast, for women migrants in Egypt and Senegal. These findings are very similar to those for current migrants, with the minor exception of male return migrants in Senegal, who are more likely to have left for "other" reasons (24 per cent vs. under 5 per cent, for current migrants), and the lower per cent of women migrants returning to Ghana who had left for familial reasons (24 vs. 36 per cent for current migrants, remaining in the destination country).

Who made the migration decision?

In the case of return migrants, data on who made the migration decision come directly from the migrant. It is thus interesting that the distribution of the responses for return migrants for both sexes is very similar to that of the responses provided by proxy respondents for current migrants, in the left columns of Table 12. This provides *prima facie* support for the quality of data of proxy respondents being generally fairly reliable in the three countries. As with

C. Migration Networks and Arrival Conditions of Current Migrants

Drawing on Figure 1 above, there are several items in the NIDI data that may reflect on the relative advantages of men and women for engaging in international migration, apart from (but not unrelated to) their pre-migration individual and household circumstances, discussed above. This includes whether they had migration networks, previous visits abroad, the main reason for choosing the destination country, who they migrated with, whether they received assistance initially in their country of destination, and how long it took them to get their first

differences are evident both across country and by gender. Only in Egypt and only for males did the majority of migrants receive aid, with 61 per cent receiving aid, mostly from relatives (recall that the majority are married men going to the Gulf States to work for a fixed period of a few years on a labor contract), but some also got help from friends, a loan, and even their local community. In Ghana, almost half of the men received aid, almost all from relatives, while in Senegal only a third of the men got help from the origin, again nearly 90 per cent from relatives. In general, women migrants were less likely to receive assistance, except in Senegal where 40 per cent of the small number of women migrants received some help. In Egypt only 4 of 14 got help, while in Ghana a third of the women got help, but still well below the half figure for men. The figures in Table 15 should be considered upper bounds as they are mainly provided by a proxy respondent in the origin household (not by the migrant himself or herself, who will tend to have the opposite bias) who may often want to save face by claiming that assistance was provided when it was not.

Migration alone or with other family members?

Whether migrants move with other family members can be an indicator of autonomy in migration, but it also reflects the marital status and family situation of the migrant, whether he/she desires to migrate with them, and whether he/she is able to (e.g., Egyptian men migrating to the Gulf States as contract workers cannot bring families with them). Table 16 provides the data. In Egypt and Senegal, over half of the men who migrate are married and leave their spouse behind, but there are also many unmarried men who emigrate, almost half of male emigrants from Senegal and 42 percent from Egypt. In Ghana, unmarried men comprise the majority, about 60 per cent of the total. With respect to women, apart from the small number in Egypt, the most common mode of migration was as unmarried women, followed by the category, "married, spouse already there"; in other words, women often migrated to join a spouse, though in Ghana some left their spouse behind. Indeed, if "unmarried" and "married left spouse" are combined, this accounts for nearly half of the (small number of) cases of women migrating from Egypt and about 60 per cent from both

Egypt and Senegal who got jobs got them in the first month (54 and 70 per cent, respectively) or within the first three months (85 and 97 per cent), but that Ghanaian men had less success, with less than half getting a job in the first month and more than 2 of 5 did not have a job even after three months. In contrast, most of the tiny numbers of women reporting in Ghana and Senegal got work in the first month.

D. Migration Networks and Arrival Conditions of Return Migrants

Presence of migration networks

The data on return migrants, as before, are in the same tables as the data for current migrants.

Migration alone or with other family members?

The data in Table 16 show higher proportions of women than men in the categories unmarried and married, spouse already there, for Ghana, and for the latter in Senegal. The proportion of men who return in the category, "married, left spouse", is as expected higher in Egypt than the proportion who do not return among current migrants. In Ghana, most men who migrated with their family or brought them later returned to Ghana, which is a bit surprising, since the majority in the other categories had not yet returned.

Whether sought or received assistance in country of destination

The data in Table 17 for return migrants are much more revelatory than those for the small numbers of current migrants, discussed in C above. Thus the vast majority of both male and female return migrants expected help. For males, this varied from just over half in Ghana to about two-thirds in Egypt and Senegal. Of those who expected help, around 80 per cent received it in each country. For women, almost all migrants expected assistance in the destination country and virtually all of them did receive it, likely because they were married. It is intriguing that a quarter to a half of those *not* expecting aid received some help anyway. Overall, the picture painted by these data is one of migrants usually seeking and receiving assistance. This may be because most already had someone from their family or community or ethnic group living in the destination country who could assist them, or even encourage them to come in the first place. The migrants studied in the push-pulls project are not generally the first international migrants from their origin extended family or community, but seen as a recent piece of a long-standing process.

Duration of job search in destination country

The last relevant table in the section, Table 18, provides data on the duration of job search of those who got a job. The differences across country for male migrants are considerable, varying from 72 per cent of those from Senegal obtaining employment in the first month and virtually all by three months, to 60 per cent and 85 per cent at the two times for Egyptians and only 45 and 78 per cent for Ghanaian male migrants. In contrast, virtually all of the women migrants reporting obtained work in the first month, or if not shortly thereafter (viz., 7 out of 8 in Ghana by three months). What the data cannot tell us, however, is whether some women may have had trouble getting work and just dropped out of the labor market, becoming what is called "discouraged workers". Comparing the data with those for current migrants, there is a tendency for return migrants to have had less trouble obtaining employment. This could indicate, though this is very speculative, that return migrants were more successful and therefore achieved their goals (e.g., accumulating a nest egg) and hence returned to their origin country and household. However, the tendency is weak, and data are not available for most of the current migrants since they could not be interviewed directly.

E. Differences in the Situation of Current Migrants by Gender

Following the chains of reasoning in the preceding subsections, we now present data on the *current* situations of male and female international migrants for the three countries, combining when possible data for both the Main Migration Actors (MMAs) and other recent migrants to increase the sample sizes for female migrants. As in section A above, we consider first personal characteristics, such as age, educational attainment, employment, and

dependent children, and then indicators of current (origin country) household characteristics, including household size, wealth, and income. Data on return migrants are presented again in the same tables, and are discussed in the next subsection F below. We begin with personal characteristics.

Age distribution

Table 19 shows the current age distribution of male and female international migrants who currently live abroad, as reported by proxy respondents usually. The data in five-year age groups are combined into four age categories to facilitate data interpretation. The fact that

Number of languages known

Language skills are crucial to the success, assimilation, feeling of belonging, and being able to cope in a new country. Table 22 provides data on the extent to which international migrants from the different countries of origin knew (at the time of interview, after migration) one or more additional languages. About six out of ten male international migrants from Egypt know no language besides Arabic; but given that most emigrate to work in the Gulf countries, they have little need to know an additional language. Among the Egyptian women migrants, in contrast, three out of four speak at least one other language, which may again reflect their being positively selected from the population of women in Egypt. As family reunification in Gulf countries is rare, for most migrants wives stay home, so most of these women migrants probably migrate to other destinations, such as Western Europe or the United States, either with their husbands or autonomously.

In Ghana and Senegal, the origin country context is different in that there are many different tribal languages, as well as wide use of the colonial language-- English in Ghana and French in Senegal--which functions as a *lingua franca*, so many people speak at least two languages. In Ghana, over 90 per cent of both male and female migrants know two languages, and many speak three or more. The difference between men and women is small, but 42 per cent of male migrants know three or more languages vs. 35 per cent of women migrants. In Senegal, while those who speak more than one constitute smaller percentages of the migrants than in Ghana, their percentages are still considerable, being 79 for male migrants and 75 for females, with a higher percent of women than men speaking three languages.

Participation in organizations

Respondents were asked if they were currently active in various types of local organizations, as an indicator of community ties and involvement, which it is thought contributes to a feeling of belonging and perhaps happiness. It should be noted that the questions pertaining to current migrants refer to their situation in their country of residence abroad, as provided by proxy respondents, who may well not know. They should therefore be considered lower bounds. In contrast, for return migrants the questions refer to their current involvement in organizations back in their home town and country. The types of organizations asked about are recreational, political, and religious organizations, along with special interest groups (such as trade unions, women's groups, migrant organizations).

Table 23 summarizes the findings, which differ far more across countries than by gender. It is evident that participation in any type of organization is extremely rare among both male and female Egyptian migrants, as well for migrants from Senegal in recreational and political organizations. Participation of Senegalese migrants in interest groups of one kind or another, on the other hand, is significant (30 and 22 per cent, respectively, for men and women migrants), while participation in a religious organization is quite high for men, with 2 of every 3 being active compared to only 2 in 7 women. As with other indicators, Ghanaian migrants differ substantially from those in the other two countries, with about half involved in recreational organizations, two-thirds in religious ones, a quarter in political organizations, and about a sixth in some interest group. In all cases except religious organizations, women are less active than men, but their involvement is far greater than is that of women in the other two, predominantly Moslem countries.

Of course, these findings reflect differences in both countries of origin and destination in the prevalence of various organizations and the extent to which women and men participate in general, not just migrants. In fact, data on the participation in organizations by non-migrants show similar patterns and country differences as seen here for migrants.

Overall, activity in organizations is strongest among Ghanaian migrants: with only one in five men and one in four women reporting no participation at all (Table 24). Thus Egyptians have almost no involvement in organizations of any type, while Ghanaians are quite active, with about 3/4 of involved in one or more, both men and women. The Senegalese are squarely intermediate, but gender differences are quite marked: for seven out of ten current migrant Senegalese women, no activity at all is reported, while this is true for only four out of ten men. Almost no Senegalese women are active in more than one organization, and even among the Ghanaians women are less likely to be active in more than one organization than men. This may well have to do with the many other tasks women face, in combining household activities and child-rearing with work outside the home.
Work and employment status

Moving on to consider employment conditions of current migrants, first we consider the current employment status and second the sector of employment for those employed. Striking differences are observed across countries as well as between men and women, with almost all men working but many women not working. The category "employee" is by far the largest overall, as is to be expected, but in Senegal there are many more men self-employed than in wage work (Table 25). The category self-employed is quite distinct from employer in terms of employment status, often involving working as an individual own-account worker in a low status activity such as street hawking. Casual/family work, also low quality work in general, is rare, being highest for Egyptian males but at barely above one in ten. Unemployment is very low, as is generally observed around the world for migrants, as most move for work, are highly motivated, and are willing to accept a low wage job rather than not work at all (referred to by economists as having a low reservation wage, the wage below which they will not work). The number and proportion of students is, surprisingly, only significant for Ghanaians, where it is about 1 in 8 for male migrants and 1 in 12 for females. Comparing women and men migrants by country, we see that most women migrants in Egypt are not working at all--about two-thirds--which in this case differs from the situation of Senegalese women migrants where a slight majority were working. Not surprisingly, in Ghana, virtually all migrants are working or studying, both men and women..

The sector of employment is observed for migrants by gender in Table 26. The data were also tabulated in eight economic sectors, but the small sample sizes make this 3-fold classification system used here better. Virtually no Egyptian or Senegalese women migrants who work are engaged in the primary or secondary sector, and indeed few female migrants from those countries are working at all in the destination country. In general, women work overwhelmingly in the tertiary sector, including in domestic work, restaurants, etc. Over 90 percent of the few migrant women from Egypt and Senegal who work were employed in this sector, and 70 per cent of those from Ghana. Male work in the primary sector is trivial for both Ghanaians and Senegalese, which certainly reflects the distribution of jobs in the destination country (evidently, in Europe rather than a neighboring African country). However, about 1 in 6 Egyptian male migrants is employed in the primary sector. The percentages of men employed in the secondary sector are almost the same across the countries, varying from 33 to 37. Only in Ghana is this significant for women migrants (27 per cent).

possible, or a combination of them. Data on the first of the three is available from Table 9 above, discussed in section A. Unfortunately, the data are available only for Main Migration Actors, for which the numbers are small, and too tiny for women to make possible any comparisons by gender. (But see also discussion of return migrants, in subsection F below.)

F. Differences in the Situation of Return Migrants

Age distribution, education and marital status

more active in recreational groups but less active in interest groups, perhaps having been members of labor unions in the destination country. The relatively high participation rate in

in Egypt and Ghana, and to the secondary sector in Senegal and Egypt. Women returnees in Egypt and Senegal have the same sectoral distribution of employment as current migrants remaining in the destination countries, but in Ghana they are much less involved in the secondary sector and more in the primary and tertiary sectors. The same difference is observed among male return migrants compared to current migrants in both Egypt and Ghana, whereas in Senegal there are fewer male returnees in the secondary sector and more in the tertiary sector.

Household size, persons per room, and dependent children

Tables 27 and 28 provide data on housing space and fertility. Female return migrants have slightly smaller household sizes than male returnees, in Egypt and Senegal notably. This could be because they experience greater changes in childbearing mores from being in another country where family size norms are likely to be smaller (apart from the case of Egyptian men working in the Gulf States). And those with smaller families may be more able to manage the return migration. Data supporting this are also evident in the comparison of mean household sizes of return migrants and current migrants, with return migrants having substantially smaller household sizes, among both men and women. The difference among women is invariably much larger, however, being about double that for men, *viz.*, 2.1 versus 1.0 for Egypt, 1.2 vs. 1.1 for Ghana, and 2.3 vs. 0.7 in Senegal.

These striking differences call for further investigation, that is, the difference between current migrants and return migrants, for which two explanations are proffered above regarding female return migrants, and the gender difference, women being lower than men everywhere. Regarding the former, it is possible that the sample of current migrants here was in the destination country for a shorter time on average than the return migrants had been when they left, in which case one interpret-4.4(.u.1(w.000)-128 Tw.2,5(-4.4icwh)-5.6a(t)6.1 cwh)-5.6ei etmi gr antTw.2,5 low er(fam)11.9(i)-4.4(gy)-10.8( )5.3 siz( )5.3no rmtakinTab(le)5.3328belin thammaof o-5.2ow them67.7(i)(ng)-5.4(r)-234(a)7.6(n)-5.4(tth)-5.4(e)2.2(s idicatces th)-5.4(at)6.3s this is s not( )5.3po(,)-5.6

return migrant men. There is no difference in Ghana, where both men and women return

women, only one woman out of 34 increased her education level. The data are similar for return migrants, with only 3 of 161 men advanced, and 1 of 48 women. Combining all the

Table 33 provides the data based on the work status codes used in this paper. Looking at the data first for Egypt as before, male current migrants who were in a diversity of work status groups before migration were mainly working as wage or salary employees at the time of interview, while living in the destination country. However, significant numbers (but a third or less) of those self-employed or in casual/family work continued to be in those categories. There are not enough cases for women to say anything except that most were not working before and continued in that status. For return migrant women, on the other hand, about half were not working before and continued the same, but the other half were working in Egypt as employees and continue in that status after returning. For male return migrants, there is strong evidence of recidivism, as most return to their status before emigrating, viz., most employers to being employers again, employees to being employees, self-employed to being self-employed, etc., as is evident from the large numbers down the main diagonal. The main exceptions are many of those who were in casual/family work, unemployed or not working before working as employees when they return. They evidently acquired a taste for and experience in wage work which assisted them in getting wage work when they returned to Egypt.

In Senegal, the dominant work status category of male current migrants both before and after migration is self-employed, with over 3/5 of those in that group before migration being in the same category later, in their country of destination. The second-most common category before migration is casual/family work, half of whom switch to self-employed in destination while most of the rest become employees. The same switch occurs for most of those not working or unemployed. The overall picture is one of likely considerable upward mobility. For women current migrants, the numbers are too small for grand inferences. Three-fifths of these women were not working prior to migration, about half of which were in the labor

male household member, but in Ghana more households experienced a worsening than an improvement. There seemed to be little consistent evidence in either direction for women migrants. This means that in two of the three countries, Egypt and Senegal, households of male migrants appeared to reap more benefits from migration than those with female migrants.

The final table (Table 35) presents data on the relative economic situation of the migrant's

not include a direct income measure in this paper, we used a composite measure representing household wealth, based on housing quality and household assets.

Concerning the economic situation of households of migrants, we found that in all three

A second methodological issue is the *type of sample*. Samples in the origin countries were purposively designed to collect data from a maximum of four areas selected *a priori* by judgment as areas of high emigration, rather than being selected through probability procedures. While this was usually necessitated by the lack of an adequate sample frame of jud1edures398(i)6.4(.1(n)-0.3n, 2.4(i)1 Tfna 5.h)0(at 5.h)0()a8(NID)-6.I-Eurost6of

first, only the household head was asked what was received (whereas individuals other than the head may be recipients and the head may not know the exact details), and second, the identity and hence the gender of the person sending remittances was not asked.

A further and inherent limitation of this present study is its being based on only three countries. While three is far better than one and makes poi95.1(e)2.5(3a)8.4(n)(3a)8.m

References

Anarfi, J.K., K. Awusabo-Asare en N.N.N. Nsowah-Nuamah (2000),

International Organization for Migration (2005). *World Migration 2005: Costs and Benefits of International Migration.* Geneva, Switz.: IOM.

Itzigsohn, J., and S. Giorguli-Saucedo (2005). Incorporation, Transnationalism, and Gender: Immigrant Incorporation and Transnational Participation as Gendered Processes, *International Migration Review*, vol. 30(4): 895-920,

Lee, E. (1966). A Theory of Migration. *Demography* 3(1): 47 – 57

Kritz, M.M. and H. Zlotnik (1992), Global interactions: Migration systems, processes and policies. In: Kritz, M.M., L.L. Lin and H. Zlotnik (eds.): *International migration systems: A global approach..* Oxford, Clarendon Press, pp. 1-18.

uan -1.15dTw -1.9(ZTD-0.l5.4(TDD-8Jt1.ZZ3()11.D-0.kD-8J Po4H) Tf9.8(nt13 T.0009TJ/TT5(-1.9(.117/G(m]2(100(

United Nations (1998). *World Population Monitoring 1997: International Migration and Development*. New York: UN Population Division.

United Nations (2002). *International Migration Report*. New York: Population Division.

United Nations (2004). *World Economic and Social Survey 2004: International Migration*. New York: Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

United Nations (2004). *Trends in Total Migrant Stock: The 2003 Revision*. New York: Population Division, Diskette form.
. 52ernaon a

Table 1. Distribution of current migrants and return migrants by age at last emigration from country of origin

Country	Age group*	Current migrants		Return migrants	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
Egypt	15-24	139	24	115	18
	25-39	422	20	213	21
	40-59	70	5	63	7
	60+	4	1	2	0
Ghana	15-24	98	38	57	23
	25-39	208	93	107	35
	40-59	51	22	30	9
	60+	2	0	3	4
Senegal	15-24	214	22	42	19
	25-39	417	19	63	12
	40-59	54	2	14	4
	60+	3	1	0	0

Table 3.   Marital status of migrants* and mean number of dependent children[#] prior to international migration.

Country	Marital status	Current migrants		Return migrants		Mean dependent children	Current migrants		Return migrants	
		Male	Female	Male	Female		Male	Female	Male	Female
Egypt	Never married	243	2	140	3	Mean dependent children	2.43	0.86	2.40	1.63
	Married	288	12	190	12					
	Other	4	0	4	1					
Ghana	Never married	156	39	86	21	NA[#]				
	Married	146	67	95	24					
	Other	14	15	3	6					
Senegal	Never married	274	10	52	3	Mean dependent children	1.88	1.33	1.95	1.65
	Married	223	14	44	18					
	Other	9	1	0	2					

* Only available for Main Migration Actors.
# Not available for Ghana. Refers to persons ever married prior to migration.

Table 4.   Work experience (ever work) prior to migration (MMAs)

Country	Work experience	Current migrants		Return migrants	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
Egypt	Yes	460	8	295	8
	No	75	6	39	8
Ghana	Yes	235	97	158	45
	No	64	21	23	6
Senegal	Yes	455	11	88	9
	No	46	14	8	13

Table 5.   Work status prior to migration (MMAs)

Country	Work status	Current migrants		Return migrants	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
Egypt	Employer	22	1	27	0
	Employee	202	3	152	8
	Self-employed	43	1	34	0
	Casual/family labor	153	0	62	0
	Unemployed	37	0	23	0
	Not working [#]	78	9	34	8
Ghana	Employer	6	7	4	1
	Employee	126	35	62	12
	Self-employed	46	35	47	20
	Casual/family labor	26	10	30	9
	Unemployed	18	8	12	1
	Not working [#]	94	26	26	7
Senegal	Employer	5	0	1	0
	Employee	43	3	21	2
	Self-employed	301	5	41	4
	Casual/family labor	86	0	19	0
	Unemployed	20	2	5	2
	Not working [#]	48	15	8	15

Includes student, military service, intending to migrate, housework, disabled, and other, generally
     in that order.

Table 6.   Sector of economic activity prior to migration (MMAs)

Country	Sector of activity	Current migrants		Return migrants	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
Egypt	Primary	164	2	90	0
	Secondary	102	0	67	0
	Tertiary	154	3	119	8
Ghana	Primary	35	10	32	9
	Secondary	25	12	26	5
	Tertiary	143	65	85	28
Senegal	Primary	46	0	5	0
	Secondary	88	1	22	2
	Tertiary	302	7	55	4

Table 9.   Adequacy of economic situation of household prior to migration (MMAs)

Country	Economic Situation	Current Migrants		Return Migrants	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
Egypt	More than adequate	1	0	10	2
	Adequate	27	0	178	12
	Less than adequate[#]	11	0	146	2

Table 11.   Main motive to leave country of origin (MMAs)

Country	Emigration 'push' motives	Current migrants		Return migrants	
		Male	Female	Male	Female

Country	Network Status	Current migrants		Return migrants	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
Egypt	Had network	286	12	175	10
	No network	244	2	159	6
Ghana	Had network	159	92	103	34
	No network	143	25	81	17
Senegal	Had network	400	20	66	22
	No network	88	4	30	1

Table 14.   Main motive for choosing country of destination (MMAs)

Country	Emigration 'pull' motives	Current migrants		Return migrants	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
Egypt	Economic	334	3	171	3
	Familial	99	11	38	10
	Other [#]	102	0	125	3
Ghana	Economic	165	44	101	18
	Familial	63	58	32	24
	Other [#]	74	13	50	9
Senegal	Economic	350	3	49	2
	Familial	74	18	15	19
	Other [#]	78	4	31	2

[#]   'Other' motives include education, medical treatment, search for adventure, etc.

Table 15.   Financial assistance received from someone in country of origin to help pay for
migration (MMAs)

Country	Assistance provider	Current migrants		Return migrants	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
Egypt	None	209	10	172	12
	Relatives	270	3	115	0
	Community	6	0	7	1
	Friends	34	0	21	0
	Bank / Money lender	10	0	3	0
	Other	6	1	16	3
Ghana	None	152	80	123	31
	Relatives	123	31	31	14
	Community	0	0	0	0
	Friends	6	4	8	2
	Bank / Money lender	3	0	2	1
	Other	17	5	18	2
Senegal	None	334	15	56	14
	Relatives	148	6	23	7
	Community	1	1	0	0
	Friends	4	2	2	1
	Bank / Money lender	3	0	1	0

Table 16.   Whether migrated with other family members.

Country	Type of migration	Current migrants		Return migrants	
		Male	Female	Male	Female

Egypt

Table 17.   Assistance expected and received by those with family, relatives, and/or friends in the country of destination (MMAs)

Country	Help expected	Help received	Current migrants		Return migrants	
			Male	Female	Male	Female
Egypt	Yes	Yes	20		103	6
		No	3		27	0
	No	Yes	0		10	1
		No	5		35	3
Ghana	Yes	Yes	7	0	53	27
		No	0	0	15	2
	No	Yes	1	1	7	0
		No	1	0	28	3
Senegal	Yes	Yes	43	0	42	21
		No	7	0	10	1
	No	Yes	6	0	5	0
		No	10	1	9	0

Notes: The numbers of observations are low for current migrants because the question was not asked of proxy respondents (when the current migrant was absent).
Help received comprises assistance provided to facilitate migration (e.g., funds for travel) as well as assistance in finding work, housing, etc.

Table 18.   Number of months looking for first job in country of destination (MMAs)

Country	Comparative financial situation	Current migrants [#]		Return migrants	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
Egypt	Less than 1 month	22		192	7
	1 month	3		40	
	2 months	6		36	
	3 months	2		24	
	4 months	3		10	
	5 months	0		1	
	6 or more months	3		16	
Ghana	Less than 1 month	7	4	66	19
	1 month	1	1	12	3
	2 months	2	2	19	3

Table 20.　　Current educational attainment of international migrants.

Country	Level	Current migrants		Return migrants	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
Egypt	None	200	2	172	9

Table 23.   Participation of migrants in various types of organizations

Country	Active in organization?	Current migrants		Return migrants	
		Male	Female	Male	Female

Table 26.   Sector of economic activity of international migrants

Country	Sector	Current migrants		Return migrants	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
Egypt	Primary	100	1	108	1
	Secondary	213	0	86	0
	Tertiary	298	13	233	23
Ghana	Primary	9	2	43	10
	Secondary	73	24	24	5
	Tertiary	113	62	105	40
Senegal	Primary	7	0	7	0
	Secondary	203	2	36	3
	Tertiary	370	19	92	17

Table 27.   Current mean household size of international migrants*

Country	Current Migrants		Return Migrants	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Egypt	7.6	8.0	6.6	5.9
Ghana	5.4	5.7	4.3	4.5
Senegal	15.6	16.5	14.9	14.2

* Refers to origin household of current international out-migrant, not the migrant's household size in the destination country.

Table 28.   Mean persons per room in origin household currently, and mean number of children of migrant.

Table 30. Current economic situation of household.

Country	Economic situation	Current migrants		Return migrants	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
Egypt	More than sufficient	35	7	17	9
	Sufficient	458	38	276	37
	Barely sufficient	122	6	140	10
	Insufficient	20	0	59	3
Ghana	More than sufficient	2	2	2	1
	Sufficient	117	54	67	27
	Barely sufficient	139	63	61	19
	Insufficient	106	38	72	26
Senegal	More than sufficient	11	1	2	4
	Sufficient	269	15	39	14
	Barely sufficient	308	24	84	18
	Insufficient	76	3	35	12

Table 31. Educational level currently and prior to migration

| Country | Sex | Current educational level | Educational level prior to migration | | | | | | | |
| | | | Current migrants | | | | Return migrants | | | |
			None	Primary	Secondary	Tertiary	None	Primary	Secondary	Tertiary
Egypt	Male	None	199	0	0	0	140	0	0	0
		Primary	0	79	0	0	2	48	0	0
		Secondary	0	1	197	0	2	1	122	0
		Tertiary	0	0	2	148	0	1	3	71
	Female	None	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0
		Primary	0	1	0	0	0	8	0	0
		Secondary	1	0	14	0	0	4	10	0
		Tertiary	0	0	3	28	0	3	0	17
Ghana	Male	None	4	0	0	0	9	0	0	0
		Primary	0	94	0	0	1	74	0	0
		Secondary	3	3	101	0	0	1	55	0
		Tertiary	0	1	2	53	0	0	2	31
	Female	None	6	0	0	0	15	0	0	0
		Primary	1	52	0	0	1	23	0	0
		Secondary	0	1	41	0	0	0	17	0
		Tertiary	0	1	2	14	0	0	0	4
Senegal	Male	None	514	0	0	0	97	0	0	0
		Primary	0	77	0	0	3	43	0	0
		Secondary	0	2	28	0	0	0	18	0
		Tertiary	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	4
	Female	None	18	0	0		41	0	0	
		Primary	0	14	0		1	5	0	
		Secondary	0	0	1		0	0	1	
		Tertiary	0	0	1		0	0	0	

Table 32. Marital status currently and prior to migration (MMAs)

Country	Sex	Current marital status	Current migrants				Return migrants			
			Single	Married	Divorced / separated	Widowed	Single	Married	Divorced / separated	Widowed
Egypt	Male	Single	186	0	0	0	45	0	0	0
		Married	57	286	0	1	95	189	2	1
		Divorced/separated	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0
		Widowed	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
	Female	Single	2	0			1	0		0
		Married	0	12			2	10		0
		Divorced/separated	0	0			0	1		0
		Widowed	0	0			0	1		1
Ghana	Male	Single	102	0	0	0	49	0	0	
		Married	52	139	5	0	35	85	1	
		Divorced/separated	1	4	8	0	0	4	2	
		Widowed	1	1	0	1	1	2	0	
	Female	Single	18	0	0		7	0	0	0
		Married	20	63	6		13	20	0	1
		Divorced/separated	1	2	7		1	4	2	0
		Widowed	0	1	1		0	0	0	3
Senegal	Male	Single	125	0	0		34	0		
		Marrie	TD.7(056(			84.7(i)sb365)77		91.8(		674	TD0

61

Table 33. Work status currently and prior to migration (MMAs)

Works status prior to migration

Table 33 (continued).　　Work status currently and prior to migration (MMAs)

| | | | Works status prior to migration | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Current migrants | | | | | | Return migrants | | | | | |
Country	Sex	Current work status	Employer	Employee	Self-employed	Casual / family	Unempl.	Not working[#]	Employer	Employee	Self-employed	Casual / family	Unempl.	Not working[#]
Senegal	Male	Employer	0	0	2	0	1	2	0	1	1	1	0	0
		Employee	1	26	97	28	9	17	0	14	2	2	1	1
		Self-employed	4	11	179	40	6	13	1	6	32	7	1	5
		Casual/family	0	1	2	10	1	1	0	0	1	5	0	0
		Unemployed	0	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	2
		Not working [#]	0	1	1	0	0	9	0	0	2	1	1	0
	Female	Employer		0	0		0	0		0	1		0	0
		Employee		2	1		1	4		1	0		0	1
		Self-employed		0	3		0	2		0	3		1	4
		Casual/family		0	0		0	2		0	0		0	1
		Unemployed		0	1		0	0		0	0		0	1
		Not working [#]		1	0		1	7		1	0		1	7

#　　Includes student or military service, intended to migrate, housework, disabled, and other.

Table 34. Financial situation of household currently and prior to migration (Main Migration Actors only)

| Country | Sex | Current financial situation | Financial situation prior to migration of MMA | | | | | | | |
| | | | Current migrants | | | | Return migrants | | | |
			More than sufficient	Sufficient	Barely sufficient	Insufficient	More than sufficient	Sufficient	Barely sufficient	Insufficient
Egypt	Male	More than suff.	1	3	1	0	4	6	1	0
		Sufficient	0	21	4	1	4	134	38	9
		Barely sufficient	0	2	4	1	2	31	48	18
		Insufficient	0	1	0	0	0	7	6	26
	Female	More than suff.					1	3	0	0
		Sufficient					1	7	0	0
		Barely sufficient					0	2	1	1
		Insufficient					0	0	0	0
Ghana	Male	More than suff.		0	0	0	0	1	1	0
		Sufficient		1	2	0	2	35	13	13
		Barely sufficient		3	1	3	0	18	16	20
		Insufficient		1	2	1	4	18	18	23
	Female	More than suff.		0	0	0		0	0	1
		Sufficient		1	0	1		8	5	3
		Barely sufficient		0	1	1		4	3	4
		Insufficient		0	0	0		8	5	9
Senegal	Male	More than suff.	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Sufficient	0	11	22	3	0	12	9	1
		Barely sufficient	1	6	19	7	1	10	27	13
		Insufficient	0	1	2	0	0	2	6	8
	Female	More than suff.		0	0	0	1	0	0	0
		Sufficient		0	0	0	0	2	1	0
		Barely sufficient		1	1	0	1	3	4	2
		Insufficient		0	0	1	0	3	1	3

Table 35.   Financial situation of household currently and prior to migration of MMA, compared to situation of other households in the neighborhood, MMAs only

Country	Sex	Current comparative financial situation	Comparative financial situation prior to migration of MMA					
			Current migrants			Return migrants		
			Better off	About the same	Worse off	Better off	About the same	Worse off
Egypt	Male	Better off	2	4	1	6	17	0
		About the same	1	21	7	12	195	34
		Worse off	0	1	2	0	26	44
	Female	Better off				2	2	0
		About the same						