FAMILY OBLIGATION ATTITUDES, GENDER, AND MIGRATION IN NEPAL

Christina Hughes[1], Prem Bhandari[2], Linda Young-DeMarco[2], Jeffrey Swindle[2], Arland Thornton[2], Nathalie Williams[1]

[1] University of Washington

[2] University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Abstract

Values and beliefs have been shown to influence a number of behaviors. This study focuses on attitudes related to fulfilling family obligations and their relationship to migration behavior. Drawing upon the gender and migration literature's theorization of gender separate spheres, we hypothesize that men who highly value fulfilling family obligations will be more likely to migrate in order to fulfil material obligations while women who highly value fulfilling family obligations will be less likely to migrate in order to fulfil care obligations. Using data from the Chitwan Valley Family Study, the empirical analysis leverages event history, multinomial logistic regression models to examine whether variation in how much individuals value (1) *putting family needs before individual needs,* and (2) *caring for their adult parents* matter for whether men and women migrate at all and if so, to specific destinations that either correspond to their family values or contradict them. While some results from the analysis provide moderate support for our hypotheses, other findings lend nuance to the relationship between family obligation attitudes and migration behavior. Men with high support for fulfilling obligations migrated to India but not farther away to the more remunerative destinations, while high support women migrated domestically instead of just remaining at home. We contend that future work should be sensitive to how family attitudes influence migration behaviors in ways that might correspond to what one would conventionally expect while also being flexible enough to create room for individuals to play with gender and to choose alternative decisions, behaviors, and practices.

Introduction

A long history of migration scholarship has identified the ways in which family context influences individual migration decisions, framing these moves as either altruistic for the family's greater good (Stark and Bloom 1985; Stark and Taylor 1989) or contested by individuals who feel constrained by rigid gender expectations within family roles (Hondagneu-Sotelo 1994; Curran 1995). Gender and migration scholars have since theorized how family contexts frequently gender individual family members, imposing a framework that shapes who performs which types of labor, i.e. domestic or otherwise, and where, i.e. within or outside the home. The consequences of these gendered family expectations often translate into gender-specific migration patterns, with men frequently migrating for paid work and women either remaining at home or migrating for domestic or other feminized forms of labor. However, individuals vary in terms of how much they personally feel obligated to fulfil these expectations. Even in cases where family norms, gender expectations, and other theoretically relevant factors are comparable, individuals often make quite different migration decisions pertaining to whether to move at all and, if so, to which destinations. Thus, the present study contends that *individually held attitudes towards fulfilling family obligations* produce variation in migration behavior.

Attitudes—and cognitive factors as a whole—have been shown to influence a number of behaviors, including decisions to cohabit, spousal choice, and educational attainment (Bachrach 2014; Bachrach and Morgan 2013; Frye 2012; Johnson-Hanks et al. 2011; Lizardo 2017; Miles 2015; Vaisey 2009). This study looks to the relationship between individually held family attitudes—specifically attitudes towards one's family obligations—and migration. So, while norms and expectations that gender family obligations might drive overall migration patterns so that men migrate more than women, for example, the extent to which individuals agree with and feel the need to adhere to such expectations likely mediate those influences.

For the empirical portion of the study, we use uniquely detailed data containing information on migration behavior, sociodemographic traits, and attitudes towards fulfilling family obligations from the Chitwan Valley Family Study in Nepal (CVFS). Our analysis leverages event history, multinomial logistic regression models to examine whether variation in how much individuals value prioritizing family obligations affect migration at all, and if so, to specific destinations that allow them to fulfill their attitudes. We hypothesize that holding attitudes that prioritize fulfilling family obligations will result in men migrating more and women migrating less than their respective counterparts who hold less supportive attitudes towards fulfilling family obligations. In order to examine this relationship between family obligation attitudes and gendered migration behaviors in greater detail, we also present results from an analysis that disaggregates migration by destination types. We found that men with supportive family obligation attitudes were more likely to migrate internationally versus domestically but only significantly to India rather than to the more remunerative options of the Persian Gulf or wealthy Western and other Asian countries. Conversely, women with supportive family obligation attitudes did not just remain at home but migrated domestically within Nepal, though not significantly to any international destinations.

Overall, the results detail a complicated yet theoretically important relationship between individual attitudes towards family obligations and migration. Attitudes may either amplify or dull the effects that factors like individual gender and normative social contexts place on prospective migrants. More interestingly, though, the findings suggest that our conventional typology of gendered labor and gender expectations for masculine breadwinning and feminine care might too strictly dichotomize the reality of how individuals actually care for and provide

for their families. Gender, after all, is elastic in its mandates and capable of being negotiated. Our interpretation of individual attitudes towards family obligations as aligning with gender norms might in fact elide a far more complex reality of how both men and women themselves understand their family obligations to be both material- and care-oriented, albeit still to varying degrees.

Considering Gender and the Family in Theorizations of Migration

When the new economics of labor migration (NELM) framework emerged in the demographic migration literature, it sought to address the shortcomings of neoclassical models that only accounted for expected wage differentials as a cause of migration (Stark and Bloom 1985; Stark and Levhari 1982; Stark and Taylor 1989; Stark and Taylor 1991; Taylor 1986; Taylor 1987). Instead, NELM broadened the scope of migration decision making to the household level, arguing that individuals consulted with their families in the decision process because the aim of migration was to both diversify household income portfolios and to gain access to capital to finance family consumption. We build on this foundation that migration is frequently a collective decision made by the family rather than by just the individual. Furthermore, we additionally frame migration as being shaped by power differentials among family members to make decisions and the varying expectations towards different members regarding their obligations to the family unit.

To understand how family members' attitudes toward their perceived obligations may shape their migration behaviors, it is first necessary to engage with the gendered components of such obligations. Gender constitutes how societies generally organize their social relationships, divisions of labor, and a host of other practices, while the family is oftentimes the primary institution where gender makes itself most visible in terms of the specific forms that these social relationships and labor arrangements take. Though there was a dearth of scholarship prior to the 1970s, reviews conducted by Curran et al. (2006), Donato et al. (2006), Manalansan (2006), Silvey (2006), Mahler and Pessar (2006), Palmary et al. (2010), and Hondagneu-Sotelo (2011) chart a rich history of work during the past half century that has moved the field of gender and migration through three main emphases: (1) women's absolute invisibility in which they were not even considered as potential migrants, (2) an "add women and stir" approach that merely acknowledged the existence of migrant women without developing new theories or models to understand them, and (3) a promising, contemporary theoretical place that investigates not just men and women but *gender* as fundamentally constitutive to the migration process.

Donato et al. (2006) sum up the third orientation by arguing that gender should be defined as relational, meaning constructions of maleness and femaleness must be understood in terms of how they operate as cultural foils to each other, in hierarchies of authority that are constantly being reinscribed and contested across individual, interactional, and institutional domains. Gender, thus, broadly structures masculine and feminine obligations so that they exist in relation to each other. We define family obligation as the "culturally-defined rights and duties that prescribe how family members are expected to care for and provide support to each other" (Diwan, Lee, and Sen 2010). In many contexts, this oftentimes takes the shape of masculine obligations towards family breadwinning and feminine obligations towards family caretaking. With obligations understood in this way, migration within families can frequently be framed as a masculine endeavor as migration becomes the mechanism through which men can participate in the domain to which they are presumed to be entitled, i.e. public spheres of social life that facilitate breadwinning, whereas women are not typically seen as rightfully entitled to migration

in the same way. This is of course not to say that women never migrate, but how and when this occurs often requires greater negotiation and is frequently considered antinormative behavior (Paul 2015).

This conceptualization of gender and its relationship to family obligations thus allows us to understand migration as a gendered process. The identities of the various actors involved (e.g. as dutiful sons and daughters or good husbands and wives), the behaviors they are expected to fulfil (e.g. as competent providers or homemakers), and the possibilities for action available to them due to structural constraints (e.g. job opportunities within gendered labor markets) all influence family-level migration behaviors along somewhat predictable lines, with men tending to migrate more than women in many parts of the world. Previous research by DeJong (2000) and Paul (2015) demonstrate how family obligations and expectations shape migration behavior. In a study on migration in the Thai context, DeJong found that men and women in families with higher expectations that members should migrate were more likely to migrate themselves. Paul (2015), however, notes that such expectations are often gendered, with men expected to migrate and women expected to take care of the home and not migrate. Paul further found that women in the Philippines who wanted to migrate but felt constrained in doing so by gender expectations needed to negotiate their migrations more actively with their families, casting their moves as part of their daughterly duties. As noted earlier, however, gendered family obligations by themselves fail to account for all variation in migration behavior. One reason why we propose this may be the case is because individuals hold varying attitudes towards fulfilling these obligations—with some highly valuing fulfilling these obligations and others less so—with potential consequences for actual migration behavior.

Attitudes towards Family Obligations, Gender, and Migration Behavior

The contention of the present study is that individually held attitudes—specifically as they concern fulfilling one's family obligations—likely matter in the stay-move calculus in important ways that can account for some of this remaining variance. We draw upon a long line of work on the importance of cognitive factors in behaviors (e.g. Johnson-Hanks et al. 2011; Lizardo 2017), including theorizing within studies of migration (Carling and Collins 2017; Williams et al. 2014). As Thornton et al. (2019) discuss, for example, while the literature often casts the motivation behind migration decisions to be economic in nature, individuals actually express varying levels of desire for material goods. Their findings suggest that it is this attitudinal variation that influences more materially aspirational individuals to migrate to more remunerative destinations compared to their counterparts who value material goods less. Therefore, personal attitudes concerning whether individuals agree with various values, norms, or expectations likely affect an individual's migration behavior.

We might expect that family members who hold the most supportive personal attitudes towards gendered family obligations will be more or less likely to migrate according to their position within the family. Within social contexts in which men tend to work outside the home and women tend to work within it, men who value most strongly fulfilling family obligations should be significantly more likely to migrate compared to men who place less value on those obligations, while women who value most strongly fulfilling family obligations should be significantly less likely to migrate compared to women who place less value on those obligations. Thus, we present two gender-specific hypotheses:

H1: Within social contexts in which men tend to work outside the home and women tend to work within it, men who have very positive attitudes towards fulfilling family obligations will be more likely to migrate compared to men whose attitudes less strongly support those obligations, ceteris paribus.

H2: Within social contexts in which men tend to work outside the home and women tend to work within it, women who have very positive attitudes towards fulfilling family obligations will be less likely to migrate compared to women whose attitudes less strongly support those obligations, ceteris paribus.

Gendered Family Obligations and Migration in Nepal

Our study focuses on the relationship between family obligation attitudes and migration in Nepal. Nepal's position as a remittance-reliant economy that sends a large number of migrants along several major corridors makes it an important case to study. Nepal is a landlocked country located mainly in the Himalayas that primarily borders China in the north and India in the south, east, and west. The country is home to a diverse geography and landscape, ranging from some of the world's highest altitudes to fertile plains as one moves from north to south. The country also has extensive social and cultural diversity that means that any generalizations made after this point about Nepali culture should be taken as analytically necessary, yet partial, descriptions of Nepali society, which will not fully reflect the immense variation in experiences and attitudes across all of Nepal's inhabitants.

Our study setting specifically covers the western Chitwan Valley in south-central Nepal. The administrative district of Chitwan borders India and is about 100 miles from Kathmandu. There is one large city, Narayanghat, while the rest of Chitwan's population—like much of Nepal—lives in small, rural neighborhoods. Chitwan's economy is dominated by agriculture; in 2006, 84% of households in the study area of the Chitwan Valley Family Study were involved in farming or animal husbandry. In the following sections, we discuss the gendered family obligations and the context of migration in Nepal.

Gendered Family Obligations in Nepal

Nepali society can be understood as a largely Hindu society with a South Asian social stratification system that relies on caste and gender as its primary modes of distinction (Cameron, 1998). According to the 2011 census, 81 percent of Nepalis were Hindu followed by Buddhists (9%) Muslims (4%), Kirati (3%), Christians (1%) and others (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2012). However, the pervasiveness of Hinduism throughout the country explicitly and implicitly plays an important role in organizing social relations, albeit to varying degrees. According to the Hindu *Dharmashastras (Manusmriti, the Hindu civil code),* "…women should be under the strict control and supervision of their fathers until marriage, under the control of the husband after marriage, and that of a son after the death of the husband" (Bista, 1991:63). Patriarchal control thus envelopes women in Nepali society throughout the life course, exerting power over their bodies, labor, income, mobility, sexuality, ideology, and identities (Acharya and Bennet, 1981; Luitel 2001, Paudel 2011).

Specifically, household activities in Nepal are highly gendered. Men are expected to be breadwinners, and as a result this expectation are cast as the ones held most accountable for the material successes and failures of their families and households. The so-called public sphere of

government agencies, politics, the market economy, and employment is largely controlled by men, which has often translated into men participating the most in "public sphere" activities, including performing physically demanding agricultural work and other forms of labor in and outside of the home. In contrast, women are primarily confined within the home to perform domestic tasks like housework and childcare as well as light agricultural work compatible with domestic tasks (Bista 1991, Acharya and Bennet, 1981). In the absence of government social security, elderly parents commonly live with their married sons and daughters-in-law as old age security, which is expected. As caretakers within the home, women are also often held responsible for this elder care as well.

Expectations for the fulfillment of family obligations within the home are hence tied to men and women's mobility. Men appear to have far fewer restrictions placed on where they can go and work, while women's obligations can heavily restrict their mobility outside the home. The long-held tradition that women move to their husband's house immediately following marriage to tend to his family is one such example (Dyson and Moore, 1983). In general, patriarchal norms often restrict the mobility of women by requiring them to receive permission from the household head to even travel locally, let alone for more distant travel. Thus, such a social and gendered power structure within the family/household has important implications on men's and women's migration decisions.

Migration in Nepal

Although Nepal has a long history of migration, the recent and dramatic changes to Nepal's political economy has reshaped men's and women's responsibilities to some degree. The culture of out-migration has especially increased after the 1990s with the political change in Nepal. More recently, migration has become a *rite of passage* and a matter of social status and prestige for individuals, especially among youths (Thieme & Wyss, 2005). In term of who migrates, migration has always been heavily influenced by gender and age, as well as economic, education, and other social predictors that closely align with migration theory and empirical patterns from other parts of the world (Bhandari 2004; Bohra and Massey 2009; Donato and Gabaccia 2015; Williams 2009, Bhandari and Ghimire 2016). The percentage of migrants is much higher for young people and for men. This gender gap in migration is indicated by the number of labor permits provided to both men and women by the Government of Nepal. In 2008/09, of the total labor permits provided (219,965), only 4% of those who had received labor permits were women. This proportion of women slightly increased to 5.3% in 2016/17 (total permits=382,871) (Government of Nepal, 2018).

The 2011 population census reported about 2 million individuals as migrants (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2012). This same report indicated that one in every four households (25.42%) reported that at least one member of their household was absent or was living outside of Nepal. Nepali migrants are distributed worldwide and are working in as many as 131 countries (Government of Nepal, 2014). India has been the most popular international destination due to its open border, socio-cultural and linguistic similarities, and well-established social networks. The 2009 Nepal Migration Survey estimated that of the total 2.1 million Nepali work migrants, 41 percent were in India, 38 percent were in the Middle Eastern Gulf countries, 12 percent were in Malaysia, and 8.7 percent were in other countries (World Bank, 2011). However, more recently, countries in the Middle East, South East Asia, the West (Northern Europe and North America), and Australia have become more popular destinations. Recent estimates show that

excluding India, Malaysia, Saudi Arab, Qatar, and the United Arab Emirates accounted for nearly 85 percent of international migrants (Ozaki, 2012).

Evidence shows that about 75 percent of Nepali international migrants are unskilled and employed mainly in entry-level jobs such as cleaning and construction (Kern & Muller-Boker, 2015). Men are primarily employed as construction workers, yet it has become increasingly common for women to migrate to places like the Gulf and Israel to provide domestic and care work (Peskin 2016; Bhadra, 2007; Adhikari et al. 2006). These migration trends still reflect an overall gender division of labor in which migrant men perform "outside" work like construction and farming while migrant women perform "inside" work like domestic tasks or senior care. An injection of remittance income and changing cultural attitudes has consequently also promoted—albeit in moderate degrees—Nepal's growing infrastructure, an increase in women's educational attainment, and other increases in gender equity like political participation and representation that might have compound effects on the social context of migration for men and women in Nepal. Despite these changes, gender hierarchies that privilege men over women still characterize normative gender relations, particularly when matters concern work and the family.

Data

The empirical portion of our study draws on longitudinal data from the Chitwan Valley Family Study between 2008 and 2012. A baseline survey was conducted in 2008 for respondents ages 15 through 59, arguably the prime age range during which most migrants will choose to leave for labor employment. For those in the sample who were between the ages of 12 and 14 in 2008, their baseline surveys were subsequently administered once they turned 15. Overall, the baseline survey achieved an initial response rate of 97 percent for those contacted for an interview.

If baseline respondents continued to reside in Nepal—either in Chitwan or elsewhere within the country—they were re-contacted and interviewed three times per year from the beginning of the survey collection period through the end in 2012. 93 percent of people in this group were retained through the end of survey collection. Those who moved internationally were re-interviewed after their migration if they had moved prior to June 2011, with a completion rate of 95 percent. All respondents who migrated, either domestically or internationally, were also administered an extra migration experiences survey in which the timing and destinations of their moves were recorded .

In addition to the individual-level surveys, the CVFS also contains household-level interviews collected three times per year, which provide basic demographic information on all household members for every month throughout the data collection period. This provides an average of 49 months of observation, depending on the date of first and last interview. Sample loss is lower compared to other similar prospective surveys, with very few households lost due to migration, attrition, or refusal. The household reports of individual residential information thus cover 49 months and 98 percent of our original sample.

As a result, the survey contains information on migration destinations and dates from both migrants themselves and from their households. We use a combination of information provided by the migrants for whom it was available and migration information from a household survey to supplement when it was not. This appears to be a justifiable decision given that the internal consistency between individual and household reports on migration histories is 98%. This procedure provided us with information on the migration destinations and dates for 97% of our original sample.

Measures

Defining Migration

The people at risk of migration in our analyses are Chitwan residents aged 15-59 when first interviewed in the baseline survey. Because attitudes can change over time as a result of migration, we limit our analysis to the first migration event after the baseline interview. In our first analysis, we defined our dependent variable as any first migration out of Chitwan, with no differentiation among destinations. In our second analysis, we defined our dependent variable as first migration out of Chitwan, with the destinations divided into four categories: inside Nepal, India, the Persian Gulf, and the relatively Wealthy Western and Asian (WWA) countries.

The destinations categorized as the Persian Gulf were Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates. We also included in this category a few destinations in the same general region as the Persian Gulf—Afghanistan, Iraq, Israel, and Lebanon. Migrants to these four countries comprised 7 percent of our migrants labeled as Persian Gulf migrants.

The primary international destinations in the WWA countries were Australia, the United Kingdom, the United States, Japan, Malaysia, South Korea, and Thailand, with these seven countries accounting for 86 percent of migrants categorized as going to WWA countries. The remaining 14 percent of the migrants to WWA countries were divided fairly evenly among Belgium, Belize, Canada, China, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Maldives, Poland, Portugal, and Spain. Although these countries categorized as WWA represent a wide range of geographic locations and cultures, all are quite culturally dissimilar from Nepal and all are classified by the World Bank as upper middle- or high-income countries, justifying their grouping together for this analysis. We do not decompose international destinations further because of limitations of sample sizes within these regions. Our regional groupings are both fine-tuned enough to provide distinct and meaningful migration destination types and have large enough sample sizes to support analyses.

For our analyses, we treat as a migrant anyone who left Chitwan and resided in another geographic area for six months or more after the 2008 baseline interview. People who left Chitwan but returned prior to the six-month cut-off were not considered to be migrants. To test the sensitivity of our results to this definition of migration, we also conducted analyses with one, three, and twelve months as the minimum time away to define migration. Results are very similar across these specifications of migration, and we only report those for the six-month specification.

Out of the original baseline sample, approximately 16 percent subsequently migrated out of Chitwan for six months or more—distributed roughly equally between domestic and international migration. Dividing the migrant destinations more finely, we find that 8.5 percent went within Nepal outside of Chitwan, 2.3 percent went to India, 3.5 percent to the Persian Gulf, and 2.0 percent to wealthy western and Asian (WWA) destinations. Table 1 provides descriptive statistics on all the specified covariates used in the analysis.

Family Attitudes Measures

We identified two measures to capture individually held attitudes towards family obligation in order to test our hypotheses.

<u>Attitude towards Putting Family Needs before Individual Needs</u>

The first measure, which measures attitudes about "putting family needs before individual needs" is taken from a survey item which, when translated into English, asks the respondent "Overall, which do you think is better for most people in Nepal today—to put individual needs first or to put family needs first?" where 1 = family needs first and 0 = individual needs first or about the same for both. We interpret this measure as referring broadly to a family's needs, meaning, whether the respondent thinks it is important for Nepali people to put their family's well-being and interests, broadly defined, before their own personal preferences. As stated earlier, how individuals understand their own responsibility towards fulfilling certain aspects of those needs will vary depending on their gender, where men may feel more obligated to take care of their families' economic, material needs, while women may feel more obligated to meet their families' domestic, emotional, and care needs. Eighty six percent of the individuals reported that "it is better to put family needs before individual needs."

<u>Attitude towards Adult Children to Care for Their Parents</u>

The second measure we use is taken from a survey item which, when translated into English, asks the respondent "Overall, which do you think is better for most people in Nepal today—adult children taking care of their parents and in-laws or parents and in-laws taking care of themselves?," where 1 = adult children taking care of their parents and in-laws and 0 = parents and in-laws taking care of themselves or about the same for both. In practice, Nepali marriage customs expect that married women are thereafter most obligated to care for their in-laws while men remain most obligated to care for their own parents. Therefore, this attitude measure should be realistically interpreted as asking how much respondents believe Nepali women should care for their in-laws while asking how much they believe Nepali men should care for their biological parents. We draw upon the literature to forward the idea that what constitutes care is also broadly defined and likely varies by gender. While men likely feel as though they need to care for parents in primarily monetary ways, women likely feel obligated to care for parents in more everyday ways that require their physical presence. Eighty eight percent of the sample reported that "it is better for adult children to care for their parents."

Covariates

We used a number of theoretically-motivated individual-, household- and community-level controls to isolate the direct effect of attitudes towards family obligation on migration hazard. Individual-level controls include gender (= 1 if female), time-varying measure of age in years (measured in six categories: 15-19, 20-24, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39 and 40+), a time-varyng measure of marital status (ever married=1), caste/ethnicity (advantaged castes (Brahmin, Chhetri and Newar) vs. disadvantaged castes (Dalit, Hill Janajati, and Terai Janajati)), and nonfamily work experienced by individuals prior to the baseline interview (never worked, wage work only, and any salary work), and a time varying measure of school attainment (grades 1–5, 6–8, 9–10, and 11 plus years, compared with no schooling). In addition, we also used the migration experience of individuals prior to the baseline interview to control for the effect of migration specific capital. This migration specific capital is measured as: respondent has no migration

experience from age 15 to baseline interview, has had domestic migration experience only, and has had any international migration experience.

The household-level controls include a time-varying measure for the number of residents. In addition, we controlled for household resources—a variable that is a composite of land ownership, livestock ownership, housing quality, and income measured in 2006. Each of these indicators provides partial measures of economic status and together provide a more comprehensive record of household resources. For each of these four measures, we logged the indicators to correct for skewness, calculated a *z*-score for each of the logged variables, and then added the *z*-scores. In addition, we also controlled *relative* household wealth of the respondent's household. For this purpose, we compared the wealth of the respondent's household with the wealth of the households in the respondent's neighborhood. The relative household wealth measure was grouped into thirds (lower, middle, and upper third of relative household wealth). As the household-level measure of migration specific capital, we also used a time-varying measure of logged percent of household members migrating.

At the community level, we included neighborhood proximity in miles to the urban center of Narayanghat. In addition, as the community-level measure of migration specific capital, we used a time-varying measure of logged percent of community members migrating.

Because our 2008 baseline data collection did not collect household resource information, we relied on a 2006 household survey that collected this information. Thus, household wealth and relative household wealth variables were not available for 10 percent of the initial 2008 sample living in households that were not surveyed in 2006. We excluded this 10 percent from our main analyses. With the exclusion of individuals without economic resource data, our analysis sample consists of a maximum of 4415 individuals. However, the caring for parent measure was asked in the first follow-up interview occurring after the baseline interview. Only respondents who had not migrated by the first follow-up interview were included in the analysis using this measure, while the monthly hazard file only begins the month following their first follow-up interview. For the analysis using this measure, only 4233 respondents were eligible to be included.

Methods

All dependent variables are specified as a monthly hazard of making the transition. Each person at risk of the transition is followed from the baseline interview until they experience the transition or are censored because the observation period terminated. We estimate the hazard as a function of the predictors using logit regression and multinomial logit regression. We analyze the rates of migration using discrete-time multivariate event history models with person-months as the unit of analysis (Axinn and Thornton 1993; Massey et al. 2010; Thornton, Axinn and Teachman 1995; Thornton and Rodgers 1987; Williams 2009; Williams et al. 2012). Because the odds of migrating are so small within each one-month interval, the estimates from discrete-time methods are very similar to those that would be obtained using continuous time models (Petersen 1991). While using person-months of exposure to risk as the unit of analysis in discrete-time models substantially increases the sample size, it does not deflate standard errors, and thus provides appropriate tests of statistical significance (Allison 1984; Petersen 1986; Petersen 1991).

We specified two separate outcomes, both as the rate of making a transition in residence to either (1) any location outside of the origin community, and (2) specific regional destinations divided into other locations inside Nepal but outside Chitwan, India, the Persian Gulf, and

Wealthy Western and Other Asian countries (WWA). The first specification directly tests our hypotheses, which postulate that greater support for fulfilling family obligations will increase high-support men's odds of migrating and decrease high-support women's odds of migrating as a whole.

We use the second specification to see if granularity in destination type reveals a clearer picture of how attitudes influence migration behavior since where migrants decide to ultimately go, if they decide to go at all, will enable them to meet these family obligations in different and substantively important ways. For example, migrating within Nepal might yield the least monetary gain compared to migrating to India and especially compared to the Persian Gulf and WWA, where remittance income tends to be highest. Conversely, migrating within Nepal increases the ability of migrants to return home more easily and more often due to cost of travel and proximity. Due to Nepal's open border with India, ease of return from there is also relatively informal, particularly compared to returning from the Persian Gulf and WWA, which might require breaking the terms of a labor contract, acquiring all the necessary travel documents and paperwork, and paying for the trip back itself.

The analysis primarily inspects the influence of the attitudinal measures on both any migration and migration to specific destinations. The primary estimates to consider are the estimates for the attitudinal measure itself, the estimates for gender, and the estimates for the interaction term between the two.

Results and Discussion
Attitudes towards Putting Family Needs before Individual Needs

(Table 2 about here)

The first family attitudes measure examines whether the respondent agrees with the sentiment that it is better for Nepali people to put the needs of their family before their own. Table 2 displays the results for the analysis using this measure for both outcomes of any migration and no migration versus migration within Nepal, to India, to the Persian Gulf, and to the WWA. In general, the estimates for the attitudinal measure in the first row can be interpreted as the relative odds of migration for men who support putting family needs first compared to men who do not since men are coded as 0 and high support respondents are coded as 1in the data. The second row indicates the effect of the gender-times-attitudes coefficient—the extent to which being a woman modifies the coefficient for family attitudes observed for men. Multiplying the estimates from the first row with the estimates for the interaction term in the second row can be interpreted as the odds of migration for women who support putting family needs first compared to women who do not since women are coded as 1 and, again, high support respondents are coded as 1.

Therefore, the estimates for the attitudinal covariate in Table 2 indicate that men who express support for putting family needs before individual needs have a 0.98 lower odds of migrating at all compared to men who do not express support—a coefficient that is not statistically significant. This result, therefore, does not provide evidence to support H1.

However, results from the multinomial analysis tell a more complicated story. Men who express support for putting family needs before individual needs have a significant 0.55 (p < 0.001) lower odds of migrating within Nepal, a marginally significant 1.89 (p < 0.10) higher odds of migrating to India, a 1.37 not significant higher odds of migrating to the Persian Gulf,

and a 1.39 not significant higher odds of migrating to WWA. These results suggest that men who express support for putting family needs before individual needs are less likely to migrate domestically and more likely to migrate internationally to at least India. While the estimates for the Persian Gulf and WWA are not significant, the direction of the estimates corresponds to this domestic versus international interpretation. These estimates suggest that attitudes that prioritize family obligations influence men's migration to relatively more remunerative destinations, though the significance of the India result compared to the farther and generally more remunerative destinations of the Persian Gulf and WWA might speak to a desire to balance monetary gain with proximity.

Turning now to the gender-times-attitudes interaction effects in row 2 of Table 2, we see that the interaction coefficient is a statistically insignificant .88 for any migration. This means that the family attitude effect for women is not statistically different from the effect for men. In examining the results for the interaction between gender and the attitudinal measure multiplied with the estimates for the attitudinal measure itself, we find that women who express support for putting family needs before individual needs have a 0.98 x 0.88 = 0.86 lower odds of migrating anywhere compared to women who have weaker attitudes supporting family obligations. Thus, the results for the any migration analysis do not lend support for H2 either.

Again, however, the multi-destination analysis paints a more complex picture. The estimates indicate that the interaction term for gender-times-attitudes is statistically significant and positive for migration within Nepal and negative for all international destinations (and statistically significant for India and WWA). This suggests that the large negative effects of family attitudes on migration within Nepal for men is much less negative for women. It also means that the general positive effects of family attitudes on international migration for men is much less positive for women.

Multiplying the coefficients for family first attitudes in row 1 times the interaction coefficients in row two provides estimates of the effects of family first attitudes on migration for women with high support for family obligations. Such multiplications indicate that if a woman expresses support for putting family needs before individual needs, she has a 0.55 x 1.75 = 0.96 lower odds of migrating within Nepal, a 1.89 x 0.26 = 0.49 lower odds of migrating to India, a 1.37 x 0.83 = 1.13 higher odds of migrating to the Persian Gulf, and a 1.39 x 0.39 = 0.54 lower odds of migrating to WWA compared to a woman who expresses less support for putting family needs before individual needs (results not shown in table). These results suggest that the effects of family attitudes for women migrating domestically or migrating to the Persian Gulf are relatively small, but the effects of family attitudes on women's migration to India and to WWA are substantial and negative.

Overall, the estimates concerning the influence of family obligation attitudes on any migration were not significant and thus do not lend support for H1 or H2. However, the multivariate analysis demonstrates that attitudes matter in a more complex way. Men who express greater support for putting family needs first are less likely to migrate domestically and more likely to migrate internationally. While India was the only international destination with a significant coefficient, the direction of the estimates for the Persian Gulf and WWA correspond to this interpretation. This suggests that support for putting family needs first for men translates into migrating to generally more remunerative destinations, though perhaps to ones that are more proximate. For women, the estimates indicate that having supportive family first attitudes still results in less migration within Nepal, India, and WWA.

Attitudes towards Adult Children Caring for Their Parents

   The second family attitudes measure examines the effects of the indicator of whether the respondent agrees with the sentiment that it is better for Nepali people if adult children care for their parents. Unlike the very small and statistically insignificant effect of the Family Needs variable on overall migration for men, the estimates for the Children Caring for the Parents attitudinal covariate on overall migration for men in Table 3 indicate that men who express support for putting family needs before individual needs have a marginally significant 1.27 higher odds of migrating at all compared to men who do not express support. This result, therefore, provides moderate support for H1.

   Results from the destination-specific, multinomial analysis again tell a more complicated story than the story for overall migration. Men who express support for putting family needs before individual needs have a not significant 0.95 lower odds of migrating within Nepal, a significant 3.62 ($p < 0.05$) much higher odds of migrating to India, a not significant 1.44 higher odds of migrating to the Persian Gulf, and a not significant 1.10 higher odds of migrating to WWA. These results suggest, akin to the other analysis, that men who express support for children caring for parents are less likely to migrate domestically and more likely to migrate internationally, especially to India. These estimates again imply that attitudes that prioritize family obligations encourage men to migrate to relatively more remunerative destinations, though the significance of the India result compared to the farther and generally more remunerative destinations of the Persian Gulf and WWA might evince a desire to balance monetary forms of care with other forms of everyday care.

   Turning now to the gender-times-attitudes interaction effects in row 2 of Table 3, we see that the interaction coefficient is a statistically insignificant 1.05 for any migration. This means that the children caring for parents attitude effect for women is not statistically different from the effect for men. In examining the results for the interaction between gender and the attitudinal measure multiplied with the estimates for the attitudinal measure itself, we find that women who express support for adult child caring for their elderly parents have a 1.27 x 1.05 = 1.33 higher odds of migrating anywhere compared to women who have weaker attitudes supporting children caring for parents. Given that this is in the opposite direction as hypothesized, the results for the any migration analysis for women do not lend support for H2 either.

   Turning to the multinomial results in which destinations were disaggregated, the estimates indicate that the interaction terms for gender-times-attitudes are not statistically significant for any of the possible destinations, meaning that the family attitude effects for women are not statistically different from those for men. However, the pattern of interaction coefficients in Table 3 for the Adult Children Caring for Parents indicator is very similar to the interaction coefficients in Table 2 for the Family Needs indicator in that it is very positive for migration within Nepal and generally negative for the international destinations (with the exception of the WWA destination).

   Multiplying the coefficients for Adult Children Care for Parents indicator in row 1 times the interaction coefficients in row two provides estimates of the effects of Adult Children Care attitudes on migration for women with high support for children caring for parents. Such multiplications indicate that if a woman expresses support for adult children caring for elderly parents, she has a 0.95 x 1.57 = 1.49 higher odds of migrating within Nepal, a 3.62 x 0.31 = 1.12 higher odds of migrating to India, a 1.44 x 0.82 = 1.18 higher odds of migrating to the Persian

Gulf, and a 1.10 x 1.03 = 1.13 higher odds of migrating to WWA compared to a woman who expresses less support for children caring for parents (results not shown in table). However, again, the interaction term coefficient estimates were not statistically significant for any of the possible outcomes.

Overall, the results from this portion of the analysis provide some support for H1 but no support for H2. Men who express greater support for adult children caring for parents are somewhat more likely to migrate overall compared to men who express less support. However, these findings come with an expected caveat. While migrating to WWA and the Persian Gulf would be most remunerative, there is no statistically significant difference in migration risk between men who support or do not support this attitude for these destinations. The estimate for migration to India, on the other hand, was substantially higher in comparison to any other possible destination for men who expressed greater support for adult children caring for their parents. It is unclear why this would be the case, but we propose that one possible explanation may be that men who value caring for adult parents may themselves define care more capaciously. Rather than limiting care to just masculinized, material and monetary definitions, men who highly value caring for parents may also seek to balance the material obligations to which they feel beholden with other forms of care like physical presence and everyday support. Migration to India would facilitate such a balance since the border is permeable, work is oftentimes more short-term, and the distance is shorter while the remittance payoff is still notable. Lastly, the estimates provide no support for H2, where women who express support for adult children to care for their parents were shown to be more rather than less likely to migrate compared to women who expressed less support.

Conclusion

The empirical results provide some support for the claim that the character of Nepali migration remains gendered and that such gendered patterns are mediated by the extent to which individuals support prioritizing family obligations. Gender and migration scholarship offers us a way to make sense of this pattern, suggesting that migration itself is largely understood to be within the masculine domain of expected and acceptable activities. Particularly in the Nepali context, migration is usually done in order to find employment or to pursue higher education, both of which also constitute masculine domains of gender activity[1]. Given this, we might expect, as argued in earlier sections of our paper, that the extent to which women and men value family obligations would affect their overall migration experience—increasing men's overall migration and decreasing women's overall migration. However, as discussed above, our results concerning this overall hypothesis are mixed, with the strongest support being for the Adult Care for Parents indicator where the effect for men is positive, as hypothesized, but is only marginally statistically significant.

However, our destination-specific analyses are more complex and powerful. One substantial observation here is that the effects of high valuation of family commitments vary dramatically between domestic and international destinations. Although the coefficients are not

---

[1] This is not to imply that the work Nepali men often migrate to perform is not precarious, degrading, dangerous, and under coercive circumstances. There have been documented trends that have brought to light the exploitative conditions under which many Nepali men are forced to work, particularly in the Persian Gulf. However, this does not discount the idea that migration for work, in general, is understood as situated within the sphere of typical and expected masculine activities.

consistently statistically significant, the general pattern for men is for positive attitudes toward family obligations to negatively affect migration within Nepal and to positively affect migration outside of Nepal. Thus, Nepali men with high valuation of family commitments are tending to favor international destinations over domestic ones. This suggests that in addition to any effect that positive family obligation attitudes may have on overall migration for men, these attitudes affect the choice of migration destination for men in that men with strong family obligation attitudes tend to migrate farther away from home to more lucrative jobs. However, while men who expressed support for adult children caring for their parents were more likely to migrate to India compared to not migrating at all, they were not more likely to migrate to the faraway and more remunerative destinations in the Persian Gulf and WWA compared to not migrating at all. These findings compel us to question the strict and dichotomous ways we oftentimes conceptualize gendered family obligations and the individuals we think are held to their standards. For the men who are more likely to migrate to India but not to the Persian Gulf or WWA compared to remaining at home, perhaps rigid definitions of what constitutes care for men do not fully encapsulate the scope of their obligations or their own desires to remain close to home while still being able to provide monetarily for their families. Future research would benefit from investigating these more capacious understandings of gendered care further.

A second substantial observation is that the coefficients for the interactions of gender with the family obligation attitudes in the destination-specific analyses suggest that there are strong gender interactions in the effects of family obligations on migration destinations. For both the Family Needs and Adult Children Care indicators, the interaction coefficients are large and positive for migration within Nepal. This means that while the effect of family obligation attitudes for men's migration within Nepal tends to be small or negative, the effect for women's migration within Nepal tends to be small or positive.

Whereas the effects of the gender interactions by family obligation attitudes for domestic migration are positive and large, with one exception, all of the interaction effects on international destinations are negative. This suggests that the effects of strong attitudes favoring family obligations for international destinations are weaker among women than among men (although only statistically significant in two tests). In addition, in every instance, the multiplication of the interaction term times the term for men brings the coefficients for migration to international destinations for women to be very close to one or even below one. In the cases of India and the WWA, the estimated effects for the Family Needs First indicator for women are about .5. These results indicate that while strong family obligation attitudes tend to lead men to migrate internationally, the effect of strong family obligation attitudes either have little effect on women or lead them to avoid India and WWA.

This study ultimately contributes to family, gender, and migration scholarship by bringing the role of individual attitudes towards family obligations into the literature. The incorporation of agency and cognitive factors into our consideration of the gendered institution of the family allows us to understand why some individuals might migrate more than others and to which destinations. Our unexpected yet noteworthy findings from the disaggregated, destination-specific analyses additionally reveal how gender and family expectations are not rigid mandates for who migrates and where they migrate. Individuals may act in ways that reconcile competing demands by migrating to closer destinations and rearticulate what it means to fulfil family obligations depending on their circumstances.

We close with a call for more research to ascertain why these migration patterns arise. Of importance is more understanding of the gender division of labor that leads family obligation

attitudes to affect migration differently for women and men. Also of importance is more insight into how and why family obligation attitudes affect the choice of migration between domestic and international migration. In addition, it would be useful to investigate these issues in other settings around the world.

References (being updated)

Acharya, M., L. Bennett (1981). The status of women in Nepal. Field Studies. Vol. 2 (9). Centre for Economic Development and Administration. Kathmandu: Tribhuvan University.

Allison, Paul D. 1984. *Event History Analysis: Regression for Longitudinal Event Data*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Axinn, William G., and Arland Thornton. 1993. "Mothers, Children, and Cohabitation: The Intergenerational Effects of Attitudes and Behavior." *American Sociological Review* 58(2):233-46.

Bachrach, Christine A. 2014. "Culture and Demography: From Reluctant Bedfellows to Committed Partners." *Demography* 51(1):3-25.

Bachrach, Christine, and S. Phillip Morgan. 2013. "A Cognitive-Social Model of Fertility Intentions." *Population and Development Review* 39(3):459-85.

Barber, Jennifer S., Ganesh P. Shivakoti, William G. Axinn, and K. Gajurel. 1997. "Sampling Strategies for Rural Settings: A Detailed Example from Chitwan Valley Family Study, Nepal." Nepal Population Journal 6(5): 193-203.

Bennet, L., D.R. Dahal, and P. Govindasamy (2008). Caste, ethnic and regional identity in Nepal: further analysis of the 2006 Demographic and Health Surveys. Macro International Inc., Calverton, Maryland, USA.

Bhandari, Prem. 2004. "Relative Deprivation and Migration in an Agricultural Setting of Nepal." *Population and Environment* 25(5):475-99.

—. 2013. "Rural Livelihood Change? Household Capital, Community Resources and Livelihood Transition." *Rural Studies* 32:126-36.

Bhandari, Prem, and Dirgha Ghimire. 2013. "Rural Agricultural Change and Fertility Transition in Nepal." *Rural Sociology*.

Bhandari, Prem and Indra Chaudhary. 2016. "A Calendar Method of Collecting Remittance Use Data in a Remittance Dependent Setting of Nepal." Migration and Development. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/21632324.2015.1129689.

Bhandari, Prem. 2016. "Remittance Receipt by Households in Rural Nepal: Does Migrant's Destination Make a Difference?" Dhaulagiri Journal of Sociology and Anthropology, 10, 1-35.

Bista, D.B. (1991). Fatalism and development. Calcutta: Orient Longman.

Blanc, A.K. (2001). The effect of power in sexual relationships on sexual and reproductive health: an examination of the evidence. Studies in Family Planning. 32 (3), 139-213.

Bloom, S.S., D. Wypij, and M. das Gupta (2001). Dimensions of women's autonomy and the influence on maternal health care utilization in a North Indian City. Demography. 38 (1), 67-78.

Bloom, S.S., T. Lippeveld, and D. Wypij (1999). Does antenatal care make a difference to safe delivery? A study in urban Uttar Pradesh, India. Health Policy Plan 1999. 14 (1), 38-48.

Bohra, Pratikshya. & Massey, Douglas S. 2009. "Processes of internal and international migration from Chitwan, Nepal." *International Migration Review* 43(3):621-651.

Central Bureau of Statistics. 2012. *National Population and Housing Census 2011 – National Report*. Kathmandu: National Planning Commission Secretariat, Government of Nepal.

Curran, Sara R., Feliz Garip, Chang Y. Chung, and Kanchana Tangchonlatip. 2005. "Gendered Migrant Social Capital: Evidence from Thailand." *Social Forces* 84(1):225-55.

De Jong, Gordon F. 2000. "Expectations, Gender, and Norms in Migration Decision-Making." *Population Studies* 4(3):307-19.

De Jong, Gordon F., Ricardo G. Abad, Fred Arnold, Benjamin V. Carino, James T. Fawcett, and Robert W. Gardner. 1983. "International and Internal Migration Decision-Making: A Value-Expectancy Based Analytical Framework of Intentions to Move from a Rural Philippine Province." *International Migration Review* 17(3):470-84.

De Jong, Gordon F., and James T. Fawcett. 1981. *Motivations for Migration: An Assessment and a Value-Expectancy Research Model*. New York: Pergamon Press.

De Jong, Gordon F., Kerry Richter, and Isarabhakdi Pimonpan. 1996. "Gender, Values, and Intentions to Move in Rural Thailand." *International Migration Review* 30(3):748-70.

Donato, Katharine M., and Donna Gabaccia. 2015. Gender and International Migration: From the Slavery Era to the Global Age. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Donato, Katherine M. 1993. "Current Trends and Patterns in Female Migration: Evidence from Mexico." *International Migration Review* 27(4):748-71.

Dudgeon, M.R. and M.C. Inhorn (2004). Men's influences on women's reproductive health: Medical anthropological perspectives. Social Science & Medicine. 59 (7), 1379-95.

Dyson, T. and M. Moore (1983). On kinship structure, female autonomy and demographic behavior in India. Population and Development Review. 9 (1), 35-60.

Government of Nepal. 2013/14. *Labour Migration for Employment: A Status Report for Nepal: 2013/2014*. Kathmandu, Nepal: Department of Foreign Employment, Ministry of Labour and Employment, Government of Nepal.

Graner, Elvira, and Ganesh Gurung. 2003. "Arab Ko Lahure: Looking at Nepali Labour Migrants to Arabian Countries." *Contributions to Nepalese Studies* 30 (2): 295–325.

Kollmair, Michael, Siddhi Manandhar, Bhim Subedi, and Susan Thieme. 2006. "New Figures for Old Stories: Migration and Remittances in Nepal." *Migration Letters* 3(2):151-60.

Luitel, S. (2001). The social world of Nepalese women. Occasional Papers in Sociology and Anthropology. 7, 101-114. doi: 10.3126/opsa.v7i0.1113.

Massey, Douglas S., Joaquin Arango, Graeme Hugo, Ali Kouaouci, Adela Pellegrino, and J.E. Taylor. 1993. "Theories of International Migration: A Review and Appraisal." *Population & Development Review* 19(3):431-66.

——. 1994. "An Evaluation of International Migration Theory: The North American Case." *Population & Development Review* 20(4):699-751.

Massey, Douglas S., William G. Axinn, and Dirgha J. Ghimire. 2010. "Environmental Change and Out-migration: Evidence from Nepal." *Population and Environment* 32(2-3):109-136.

NIDS Nepal Migration Year Book 2010. 2011. Kathmandu, Nepal: Nepal Institute of Development Studies.

Paudel, S. (2011). Women's concerns within Nepal's patriarchal justice system. Ethics in Action. 5(6). Retrieved on October 3, 2015. http://www.ethicsinaction.asia/archive/2011-ethics-in-action/vol.-5-no.-6-december-2011/womens-concerns-within-nepal2019s-patriarchal/

Petersen, Trond. 1986. "Estimating Fully Parametric Hazard Rate Models with Time-Dependent Covariates. Use of Maximum Likelihood." *Sociological Methods and Research* 14:219-47.

—. 1991. "The Statistical Analysis of Event Histories." *Sociological Methods and Research* 19:270-323.

Seddon, David, Jagannath Adkhikari, and Ganesh Gurung. 2002. "Foreign Labor Migration and the Remittance Economy of Nepal." *Critical Asian Studies* 34(1):157-73.

Sharma, Jan, and Ganesh Gurung. 2009. *Impact of Global Economic Slowdown on Remittance Inflows and Poverty Reduction in Nepal*. Mandikhatar, Kathmandu, Nepal: Institute for Integrated Development Studies (IIDS).

Thieme, Susan, and Simone Wyss. 2005. "Migration Patterns and Remittance Transfer in Nepal: A Case Study of Sainik Basti in Western Nepal." *International Migration* 43(5):59-98.

Thornton, Arland, William G. Axinn, Thomas Fricke, and Duane F. Alwin. 2001. "Values and Beliefs in the Lives of Children and Families." Pp. 215-43 in *The Well-Being of Children and Families: Research and Data Needs*, edited by Arland Thornton. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Thornton, Arland, William G. Axinn, and Jay D. Teachman. 1995. "The Influence of School Enrollment and Accumulation on Cohabitation and Marriage in Early Adulthood." *American Sociological Review* 60(5):762-74.

Thornton, Arland, William G. Axinn, and Yu Xie. 2007. *Marriage and Cohabitation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Thornton, Arland, and Willard L. Rodgers. 1987. "The Influence of Individual and Historical Time on Marital Dissolution." *Demography* 24(1):1-22.

Vaisey, Stephen. 2009. "Motivation and Justification: A Dual-Process Model of Culture in Action." *American Journal Of Sociology* 114(6):1675-715.

Williams, Nathalie. 2009. "Education, Gender, and Migration in the Context of Social Change." *Social Science Research* 38(4):883-96.

Williams, Nathalie E., Wiliam Axinn, Dirgha Ghimire, Elyse Jennings, and Meeta Sainju-Pradhan. 2012. "A Micro-Level Event-Centered Approach to Investigating Armed Conflict and Population Responses." *Demography* 49(4):1521-49.

Williams, Nathalie E., Arland Thornton, and Linda C. Young-DeMarco. 2014. "Migrant Values and Beliefs: How are they Different and How do they Change?" *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 40(5):796-813.

World Bank. 2009. "Impact of Global Financial Crisis on South Asia." Washington, DC.

World Bank. (2011). Migration and development brief 17. Migration and Remittances Unit, Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Table 1. Percent Distributions or Means and Standard Deviations for Respondents in Chitwan at the Baseline Interview who are at risk for Migration (N=4415)

____

	% Distribution Or Mean
1st Migration Destination	
No Move	83.6
Within Nepal	8.5
India	2.3
Persian Gulf	3.5
Wealthy Western & Asian	2.0
Respondent Predictor Variables	
Better: Put Family Needs 1st (0-1)	.86 (Mean) .34(Std. Dev)
Better: Adult Children Care for Parents (0-1)	.88 (Mean) .33 (Std. Dev)
Respondent Demographic Characteristics	
Gender: Female	60.8
Male	39.2
Age: 15-19 month of baseline (time varying)[a] [b]	27.7
20-24	11.6
25-29	10.7
30-34	9.8
35-39	9.5
40+	30.7
Caste Status:	
Belongs to a disadvantaged caste (Dalit, Hill Janajati, Terai Janajati)	49.0
Belongs to an advantaged caste (Brahmin-Chettri, Newar)	51.0
Family Characteristics	
Respondent: Ever married (time varying)[a]	65.0
Number household members (time varying)[a]	3.4(Mean) 1.5(Std. Dev)
Respondent never worked	45.9
Respondent wage work only	34.9
Respondent any salary work	19.2

Socioeconomic Characteristics

Distance to Narayanghat (miles)	8.6(Mean) 3.9(Std. Dev)
Respondent no school attainment (time varying)[a]	25.4
Respondent 1-5 years of school	15.5
Respondent 6-8 years of school	26.7
Respondent 9-10 years of school	14.6
Respondent 11+ years of school	17.9
Household Resources	.45(Mean) 2.48(Std. Dev)
Relative Household Resources:	
Lower Third	24.4
Middle Third	37.3
Upper Third	38.3

Migration Specific Capital

Respondent has no migrations age 15 to Baseline interview	62.8
Respondent has domestic migration only	23.2
Respondent has any international migrations	13.9
Logged % of household members migrating (time varying)[a]	3.2(Mean) 1.1(Std. Dev)
Logged % of neighborhood members migrating (time varying)[a]	3.7(Mean) .30(Std. Dev)

[a] Frequency or mean in Table 1 is calculated from the value of the variable at Respondent's baseline interview
 month

[b] There were a few contradictory reports of age for some young people in that they were recorded as ages 14 or 15
 in different reports. We categorized them here as age 15.

Table 2. Predicting migration of 6 months or more from Better to put Family Needs First, gender interaction & control variables for Respondents at risk for Migration

	Analysis 1		Analysis 2		
	Any Migration	Within Nepal	India	Persian Gulf	WWA
Better: Put Family Needs 1st (0-1)	0.98 (.12)	0.55***(3.22)	1.89+(1.45)	1.37 (1.08)	1.39 (.88)
Family Needs 1st x Gender	0.88 (.67)	1.75*(2.23)	0.26*(1.85)	0.83 (.26)	0.39*(1.66)
Respondent Gender (Female=1)	0.50***(3.76)	0.71+(1.51)	0.70 (.62)	0.08***(3.81)	0.34*(2.06)
Respondent Age: 15-19 (Tvary)	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
20-24	1.76***(5.00)	1.28+(1.63)	1.58 (1.55)	5.84***(5.65)	4.03***(3.38)
25-29	0.87 (.82)	0.56*(2.44)	0.44 (1.67)	4.53***(3.83)	1.76 (1.11)
30-34	0.57**(2.98)	0.37***(3.52)	0.21**(2.79)	2.88*(2.47)	1.09 (.16)
35-39	0.36***(4.75)	0.20***(4.45)	0.17**(2.96)	1.67 (1.13)	0.76 (.43)
40+	0.14***(9.50)	0.20***(5.49)	0.04***(5.03)	0.20**(3.18)	0.20**(2.61)
Caste Status: Advantaged	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Disadvantaged	0.95 (.54)	0.83 (1.42)	1.22 (.80)	1.11 (.50)	0.86 (.54)
Respondent Ever Married (Tvary)	0.76*(2.15)	0.50***(3.82)	0.74 (.85)	1.21 (.69)	2.28*(2.44)
Total # of HH members (Tvary)	0.92**(2.70)	0.84***(3.73)	0.86 (1.59)	1.09 (1.37)	0.88 (1.35)
Respondent: never worked	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
wage work only	1.14 (1.27)	1.07 (.53)	1.66*(2.03)	1.70*(2.15)	0.43*(2.09)
any salary work	1.18 (1.39)	1.22 (1.13)	0.87 (.41)	1.50 (1.64)	0.46*(2.53)
Distance to Narayanghat (miles)	1.01 (.79)	0.99 (.82)	1.07*(2.22)	1.06*(2.10)	0.95 (1.41)

Respondent : no school (Tvary)	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
1-5 years of school	1.94***(3.29)	1.97*(2.43)	2.33 (1.47)	1.53 (1.07)	1.78 (.67)
6-8 years of school	1.70**(2.66)	1.47 (1.37)	1.96 (1.16)	1.76 (1.41)	2.80 (1.29)
9-10 years of school	2.00***(3.39)	2.11**(2.66)	1.97 (1.13)	1.42 (.82)	2.77 (1.25)
11+ years of school	2.26***(3.97)	2.26**(2.91)	1.28 (.40)	1.39 (.77)	6.24*(2.32)
Household Resources	0.99 (.12)	0.99 (.07)	0.94 (.91)	0.99 (.03)	1.09 (1.05)
Relative HH Resources: lower third	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
middle third	1.01 (.06)	0.95 (.33)	1.08 (.25)	1.18 (.67)	0.90 (.29)
upper third	1.01 (.10)	0.93 (.35)	1.36 (.80)	0.96 (.14)	0.99 (.03)
R's migration history from Age 15-BL					
No migration	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Domestic migration only	1.62***(4.05)	1.99***(4.40)	0.65 (.78)	0.97 (.11)	1.98*(2.26)
Any International migration	2.73***(7.44)	1.39 (1.32)	7.86***(5.81)	2.07**(2.86)	3.68***(3.82)
Logged % HH mber migration (Tvary)	1.04 (1.16)	1.00 (.11)	1.05 (.43)	1.01 (.10)	1.38*(2.50)
Logged % NBH mber migration (Tvary)	1.14 (.88)	1.19 (.85)	1.69 (1.20)	0.79 (.72)	0.65 (1.06)
Number of Person Periods	192598	192598	192598	192598	192598
Number of Moves	721	375	103	155	88
Fit Statistics AIC:	8804.67	5094.70	1581.86	2181.72	1366.74
BIC:	8885.41	5175.44	1662.61	2262.46	1447.48

Significance: +.10, *.05, **.01, *** .001 (one-tailed for predictor variables, two-tailed for controls). Tvary=Time-varying.
Note: For Analysis 1 the reference category is "No Migration", For Analysis 2 the reference category is "No Migration and all other Destinations"

Table 3. Predicting migration of 6 months or more from Better for Adult Children to Care for Parents[a] with gender interaction & control variables for Respondents at risk for Migration

| | Analysis 1 | | Analysis 2 | | |
	Any Migration	Within Nepal	India	Persian Gulf	WWA
Better: Adult Children Care for Parents (0-1)	1.27+(1.41)	0.95 (.21)	3.62*(2.14)	1.44 (1.09)	1.10 (.24)
Care for Parents x Gender (0-1)	1.05 (.17)	1.57 (1.27)	0.31 (1.36)	0.82 (.18)	1.03 (.04)
Respondent Gender (Female=1)	0.45**(3.08)	0.74 (.92)	0.85 (.20)	0.06**(2.68)	0.12**(2.52)
Respondent Age: 15-19 (Tvary)	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
20-24	1.87***(4.90)	1.40*(2.03)	1.49 (1.20)	5.78***(5.01)	3.97***(3.02)
25-29	0.92 (.46)	0.59*(1.99)	0.72 (.61)	4.30*(3.16)	1.60 (.80)
30-34	0.62*(2.23)	0.37***(3.24)	0.36 (1.61)	2.91*(2.12)	1.22 (.33)
35-39	0.43***(3.51)	0.21***(4.05)	0.36 (1.56)	2.05 (1.35)	0.83 (.27)
40+	0.14***(8.02)	0.16***(5.46)	0.10***(3.38)	0.17**(2.85)	0.20*(2.35)
Caste Status: Advantaged	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Disadvantaged	0.98 (.20)	0.84 (1.24)	1.58+(1.65)	1.06 (.25)	0.76 (.86)
Respondent Ever Married (Tvary)	0.73*(2.13)	0.55**(2.95)	0.58 (1.26)	1.10 (.27)	2.34*(2.14)
Total # of HH members (Tvary)	0.88***(3.40)	0.82***(3.90)	0.79*(2.25)	1.06 (.79)	0.88 (1.25)
Respondent: never worked	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
wage work only	1.07 (.60)	1.08 (.50)	1.48 (1.43)	1.41 (1.21)	0.44+(1.90)
any salary work	1.14 (.97)	1.23 (1.03)	0.72 (.84)	1.29 (.88)	0.47*(2.18)

Distance to Narayanghat (miles)	1.02+(1.87)	1.00 (.08)	1.08*(2.28)	1.08*(2.58)	0.98 (.40)
Respondent : no school (Tvary)	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
1-5 years of school	1.81*(2.56)	1.77+(1.82)	2.84 (1.60)	1.04 (.08)	1.75 (.65)
6-8 years of school	1.74*(2.45)	1.20 (.58)	2.36 (1.31)	1.94 (1.36)	2.95 (1.36)
9-10 years of school	2.16***(3.31)	2.08*(2.37)	2.58 (1.40)	1.28 (.47)	2.56 (1.13)
11+ years of school	2.43***(3.82)	2.25**(2.61)	2.28 (1.18)	1.35 (.58)	4.42+(1.85)
Household Resources	0.99 (.18)	1.03 (.66)	0.90 (1.35)	0.97 (.42)	1.00 (.02)
Relative HH Resources: lower third	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
middle third	0.99 (.02)	0.86 (.85)	1.44 (1.06)	1.12 (.40)	1.00 (.01)
upper third	0.99 (.02)	.78 (1.09)	1.78 (1.33)	0.87 (.36)	1.48 (.77)
R's migration history from Age 15-BL					
No migration	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Domestic migration only	1.46**(2.76)	1.83***(3.42)	0.37 (1.29)	0.72 (.84)	1.99+(1.93)
Any International migration	2.64***(6.24)	1.29 (.89)	6.67***(4.72)	2.16*(2.49)	3.44**(3.25)
Logged % HH member migration (Tvary)	1.05 (1.18)	0.98 (.33)	1.13 (1.02)	1.11 (1.04)	1.37*(2.18)
Logged % NBH member migration (Tvary)	1.32 (1.64)	1.46 (1.59)	1.78 (1.21)	0.90 (.27)	0.71 (.73)
Number of Person Periods	164699	164699	164699	164699	164699
Number of Moves	569	309	82	109	69
Fit Statistics AIC:	7033.39	4213.37	1289.67	1570.21	1109.27
BIC:	7114.13	4294.12	1370.42	1650.95	1190.01