Impact of Remittance on Economic Development of Nepal

Rameshwar Acharya[1]

Abstract: *This study assesses the impact of remittance on Gross Domestic Product (GDP), Gross National Product (GNP) and Per Capita Income (PCI) of Nepal employing multiple regression method on national annual time series data for a period of 41 years (from 1974/75 to 2014/15). The results show that there is positive impact of remittance on GDP, GNP and PCI. Further, the findings clearly provide an evidence of predictive power of fixed capital formation on economic development. But the role of export could not be established. Finally, to foster the economic development, it is suggested that the government should initiate policy to channelize the remittance income into the productive uses by offering attractive investment schemes to the remittance receiving families.*

Key words: GDP, GNP, PCI, Capital formation, Export, Remittance, Saving.

I. INTRODUCTION

Migration of people from one place to another is a usual phenomenon since the beginning of human civilization. Initially, migration was for the sake of food and exploring new places for security and peace. Gradually, it took the shape in diverse form and now has become common in each and every corner of the world. International labour migration is one of the integral components of international migration. Millions of people around the world (especially from the developing countries) are leaving their birth place of residence seeking better employment and growth. Globalisation and integration of regional economics have added impetus to the growing mobility of workers across borders (ILO, 2003).Due to unemployment, internal conflict and war, natural disasters, climate change, and improved access to information through internet,the number of migrants has risen rapidly in recent years. These migrants are sending portion of earnings to the place of origin in cash and non-cash items through formal or informal channels (IMF, 2009). In 2015, worldwide remittance flows were estimated to have exceeded $601 billion where developing countries are estimated to receive about $441 billion, nearly three times the

1. Mr. Acharya is Lecturer at Public Youth Campus, Tribhuvan University.
Email: acharyarameshwar68@yahoo.com

amount of official development aids (Migration and Remittance Factbook, 2016). In 2014, India received an estimated $72.2 billion and China an estimated $63.9 billion and Nepal an estimated $6.6 billion (Migration and Remittance Factbook, 2016).However, unrecorded flows through informal channels are believed to be more than 50 percent of the recorded flows in developing countries. These inflows constitute more than 10 percent of GDP in some 25 developing countries and lead to increased investments in health, education, and small businesses in various communities (Maimbo and Ratha, 2005).

Initially, British and Indian military services were the main sources of remittances in Nepal. After the enactment of Foreign Employment Act in 1985A.D, Middle East, golf countries and other developed nations were emerged as the main destinations. The outflow of the Nepalese workers from the country in considerable number started after 1990's. The starting of Maoist movement across country worked as the push factor to migrate Nepali labour force for the employment outside country. By the end of fiscal year 2014/15, total number of Nepalese worker gone abroad for foreign employment have reached to 4.38mllion and the remittances as a main source of Nepal's foreign exchange receipts accounts more than one fourth of GDP. (MOF, Economic Survey, 2016).

Review of Literature and research questions

Despite a constant rise in remittance earnings, the productive use of remittances has been a considerable matter of concern. Whether the remittance income contributes economic development has been a part of research into the field of business, economics and public policy now a day.With the increase in remittance inflows, the direct economic impact to alleviate poverty and indirect consequences such as impact on health, education, gender issues, social participation, politics, women empowerment, and cultural and social changes are the areas of research interest. Several studies such as Karagoz (2009), Chowdhury et. *al* (2010), Dzansi (2013), have been conducted to assess the effect of remittances on different dimensions of development in developing countries. But, the findings are not unanimous across countries.

Chowdhury et. *al* (2010) analyse the impact of remittance on balance of payment, foreign exchange reserves, national savings and velocity of money in Bangladesh and conclude that remittances affect these variables positively. Dzansi (2013) examines impact of remittance on domestic investment on a sample of 79 developing countries for the period 1995–2005 and suggests that remittance inflow along with sound institutions and well-developed financial sector increase domestic investment. But, Karagoz (2009) study in Turkey, for a period of 1970-2005, finds no impact on economic growth. Asmatullah and Muhammand (2011) examine the impact of worker's remittances on economic growth in Azerbaijan and Armenia using log linear regressionmodel and conclude that workers' remittances are significant and have positive impacts on economic growth. In Pakistan, Rahman (2014) examines the relationship using co-integration technique and find a long-run relationship between the worker's remittances and economic development. In Zimbabwe, Tambama (2011), using the three-stage least square estimation presents a unit increase in the share of remittances on GDP reduces poverty by 52 percent,

and increases human capital accumulation by 11.5 percent with no reverse causality. Likewise, Iheke (2012) study on the effect of remittances on the Nigerian economy for the period of 1980-2008 provides empirical evidence that the remittance inflows are one of the major macroeconomic stimuli to significantly promote economic growth.

For a panel of some Asian countries viz: Bangladesh, India, Pakistan and Philippines, Salahuddin (2013) investigates the relationship between remittances and economic growth. Findings indicate long-run positive relationship. In Chinese and Korean context, Sayed et *al*. (2012) conduct a research on worker's remittances and economic growth employing co-integration technique and error correction model for an annual time series data for the period 1980 to 2009 and confirm that there exists significant positive long-run relationship between remittances and economic growth in Korea while significant negative relationship exists between remittances and economic growth in China. Error correction model confirms the significant positive short-run relationship of remittances with economic growth in Korea, while the results of the China were insignificant in the short-run. Causality analysis confirms unidirectional causality runs from remittance to economic growth in both China and Korea.

Although, the findings support the positive role of remittances in spurring economic growth, scope exists for future research to identify the effects in Nepalese context. Shrestha (2008) concludes that remittances sent by the migrant workers are an effective tool for poverty reduction. Dhungana and Pandit (2014) suggest that remittance helps particularly in escaping poverty and increasing overall economic status of the migrants and their households. The social contribution of migration is even more encouraging in terms of improving children's education and enhancing the overall social status of the households.

Srivastava and Chaudhary (2007) explore the role of remittance in GDP and GNP. In nominal GDP and GNP, the remittance shows 61 percent and 72 percent impact respectively while in real term it shows 48 percent and 55 percent respectively. With respect to PCI, they notice a marginal positive relationship (4 percent in nominal and 1 percent in real term) and conclude that remittance has not been used effectively so as to increase the real economic growth rate. Loksin et *al*. (2005) conclude that the increase in remittances accounts for 6.2 percent decline in poverty in Nepal. Wong (2011) explores the link between remittances and family relationship in Chitwan by analysing the survey data from more than 800 Nepali adults. He finds that that migrant have better relationship with their families than that of non-migrants. But, he notes that those who remit more money do not necessarily have better family relationships than those who remit less. NRB (2016) conducted a survey among 320 remittance recipient households of 16 districts covering all five development regions. The survey shows that 66.6 per cent of the households save the remittance money. Around half or 48.8 per cent of the households that save said that they will use their savings to build a house. Similarly, 33.4 per cent of the households use the remittance money for consumption and to repay loans.

Taking together, some studies indicate that remittance income can improve

the livelihoods of receiving households by promoting education, health and capital investments. Hence, it contributes positively on economic growth. While a few studies reveal that remittances adversely affect the receiving economy by cultivating a culture of dependency. The empirical evidences, thus, remain mixed. Despite mixed literature, this study deals with issues like: What is the trend of remittance in Nepal? Is there any relationship between remittance and economic indicators (GDP/GNP)? What is the impact of remittances in living standards of Nepalese people?

Objectives of the Study

The general objective of this study is to examine the impact of remittance on economic development of Nepal. Moreover, the specific objectives of this study are to:

examine the trend of remittance in Nepal.

analyse the relationship of remittance with economic indicators (GDP/GNP), and

analyse the impact of remittance on per capita income (PCI).

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section II describes the data and methodology. Section III presents results and section IV concludes.

II. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study is descriptive, analytical and fact finding in its type. To examine the relationship between dependent and independent variables, descriptive and causal comparative research design including multiple regressions have been used. Descriptive statistics like mean, median, maximum, minimum, and standard deviation are used to understand the general nature of the variables. Besides, correlation has been used to indicate the relationship between variables. Various statistical tests like t-test, F-test have been performed and coefficient of determination (R^2) has been computed. Simple and multiple regressions have been used to estimate parameters, derive findings and make conclusion. Whether basic assumptions of OLS have been violated, D/W value and VIF values are also looked into.

Nature and Sources of Data

To fulfil the objectives, this study uses secondary data. The source of data consists of publication of different agencies. Specifically, data have been taken from Economic Survey 1998/99, 2000/01, 2005/06, 2014/15 published by Ministry of Finance (MOF) and Handbook of Government Finance Statistics, Vol. V published by Nepal Rastra Bank (NRB). Besides, publications of the World Bank are also consulted. The study period is 41 years (1974/75 to 2014/15 A.D) and comprises 246 observations. The data have been processed by using SPSS version 18.

Specification of the Model

To test the relationship between variables, the following model has been specified.

$$GDP_{i,t} = \alpha + \beta_1 RMT_{i,t} + \beta_2 K_{i,t} + \beta_3 X_{i,t} + U_{i,t} \quad \text{----------(1)}$$
$$GNP_{i,t} = \alpha + \beta_1 RMT_{i,t} + \beta_2 K_{i,t} + \beta_3 X_{i,t} + U_{i,t} \quad \text{----------(2)}$$
$$PCI_{i,t} = \alpha + \beta_1 RMT_{i,t} + \beta_2 K_{i,t} + \beta_3 X_{i,t} + U_{i,t} \quad \text{----------(3)}$$

Where, GDP = Gross Domestic Product, GNP = Gross National Product and PCI = Per Capita Income, are dependent variables and the explanatory variable is RMT = Remittance. K = Fixed Capital Formation and X = Total Merchandise Exports are the control variables, α and β are parameters and U = error term. It is expected that all explanatory variables have positive relationship with performance variables.

III. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

As the purpose of this study is to assess the impact of remittances on economic development, first, the trend of remittances and GDP is examined briefly. Second, descriptive statistics of the selected variables and correlations among pairs of variables are presented to understand the general nature of the variables. Third, with the help of statistical and econometric tools, the relationships between variables are examined. Basically, relationship between variables is observed using coefficients estimated by using the ordinary least square regression method.

Trend of Remittance and its Share on GDP

During the period of 41 years, the remittances increased from Rs. 204.3 million in 1974/75 to Rs. 589,500 million in 2014/15. In this period, the volume of remittances increased by 2885 times while GDP of the country increased by only 128 times. This shows that remittances have been rapidly increasing in comparison to GDP. The contribution of remittances on GDP is also increasing year by year. Its contribution on GDP was only 1.23% in 1974/75 and 11.67% in 1999/00 which jumped to about 27.75% in 2014/15. The rapid growth in remittances as compared to GDP indicates growing dependence of Nepalese economy on remittances. The implication is that any incidences in remittance generating countries(like recent Qatar event) may severely impact Nepalese economy.

Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics of all variables used in the study for a sample period of 41 year covering 1974/75 to 2014/15 have been shown in Table 1.

Table 1 provides descriptive statistics of all variables used in the study. GDP ranges from minimum Rs 16,571 million to maximum Rs 2,124,600 million with a mean value of Rs 448,451 million, and a standard deviation of Rs 568,321 million which indicates wider fluctuation. The variation as indicated by standard deviation is wide for all variables. For example, the remittance ranges from minimum Rs 204 to maximum Rs 589,500 million with a mean of Rs 82,323 million and a standard deviation of Rs 150,607 million. One of the reasons for such wider variation is the longer study period covering 41 years. These

descriptive figures provide some insights into important features of variables used in the study and are intended to provide some background for the analysis.

Table 1 : Descriptive Statistics of Variables Selected for the Study

GDP and GNP indicate gross domestic product and gross national productrespectively both measuredin nominal term. PCI stands for per capita income and RMT indicates remittance income. The variables K and X represent for fixed capital formation and merchandise export from Nepal. (GDP, GNP, K and X in NPR million but PCI in Rs.)

Variables	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
GDP	448,451	209,976	568,321	16,571	2,124,600
GNP	455,266	223,992	572,651	16,838	2,155,000
PCI	18,303	11,156	20,269	1,301	74,992
RMT	82,323	4,284	150,607	204	589,500
K	87,249	48,370	112,376	2,223	462,100
X	30,023	19,293	29,203	890	91,255

Source: Appendix A

Correlation Analysis

The study considers GDP, GNP and PCI as performance variables and remittance as explanatory variable. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect some sort of relationship among the pairs of variables. This section exhibits the relationship among pairs of variables with a total of 246 observations during the study period. Specifically, Pearson bivariate correlation coefficients with statistical significance are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2 : Correlation Matrix between GDP and Other Variables Selected for Study

This table shows the bivariate Pearson correlation coefficients between different pairs of variables used in the study. All variables are as defined in the Table 2. Significance at one-percent level is indicated by *.

Variables	GDP	GNP	PCI	RMT	K	X
GDP	1.00					
GNP	.975*	1.000				
PCI	.982*	.985*	1.000			
RMT	.828*	.827*	.808*	1.000		
K	.886*	.885*	.842*	.704*	1.000	
X	.234	.235	.268	.475*	.106	1.000

Source: Appendix A

The Table 2 depicts the Pearson correlation coefficients for different pairs of variables. As table shows, GDP is positively related with remittance and capital formation. The relationship is statistically significant at 1 percent level which supports the priori expectation. However, the correlation coefficient with export is not significant. Similarly, the relationship of GNP and PCI with RMT and K is positive and significant at the same level. The above table also reveals that GDP, GNP and PCI are more related to K. Of total 15 pairs of correlation coefficients, all pairs are positive out of which 11 are significant at 1 percent level. The relationship of export with other variables except remittance is not significant. In conclusion, correlation matrix shows that higher the remittances, capital

formation and merchandise export, better the economic indicators as shown by the significant positive co-efficients.

Regression Analysis

This section is devoted to test the relationship between variables. The time series data are first processed taking their first difference. Then, regressions have been run on processed data. First of all, simple regression results are presented and then multiple regression results are discussed which help to draw the conclusion about the relationship.

Table 3 : Regression Results of RMT, K and X on GDP

Model: $GDP_{i,t} = \alpha + \beta_1 RMT_{i.t} + \beta_2 K_{i,t} + \beta_3 X_{i,t} + U_{i,t} \text{ ---------- (1)}$

This table shows the regression results of GDP on three explanatory variables based on times series data with 164 observations from the year 1974/75 to 2014/15. Dependent variable is the Gross Domestic Product denoted by (GDPi,t). Remittance (RMTi,t) is independent variable and Capital (Ki,t) and Export (Xi,t)are control variables. The figures in the parentheses are t-values and (*) and (**) indicates that the result is significant at 1 and 5% level respectively. P-values are presented below the t-value in bold and italicized form. Also reported are F-statistics and coefficient of determination (R^2) and Durbin-Watson statistics (D/W).

Model	Intercept	RMT	K	X	F	R^2	D/W
	23449.58	0.828					
I	(3.406 *)	(9.102 *)			82.853 *	0.686	1.401
	0.002	0.000					
	12433.18	0.405	0.601				
II	(2.605**)	(4.821*)	(7.161*)		121.873 *	0.868	1.326
	0.013	0.000	0.000				
	13149.51	0.431	0.586	-0.033			
III	(2.588**)	(4.184*)	(6.430 *)	(-0.450)	79.564 *	0.869	1.298
	0.014	0.000	0.000	0.656			

Source: Appendix A

In specification I, the simple regression result shows a positive relationship between GDP and remittance. The coefficient of RMT is significant. This relationship is confirmed to that of observed in the correlation analysis. The F-statistics, 82.853 is statistically significant at 1% level. When both RMT and K are included as explanatory variables in the model, RMT still maintain its statistical significance and K shows significant positive relation with GDP. The effect of RMT on GDP has been captured by K as its coefficient is larger. In equation III, inclusion of all variables has provided an important insight into the regression results. The coefficient of RMT again maintains its positive sign and the coefficient is statistically significant at 1% level. The coefficient of RMT implies that marginal unit increase in remittance brings 0.431 unit increase in GDP. Capital formation is also positively related to GDP. The predictive power of specification II is stronger than specification I and III as shown by F statistics. However, the specification II and III have almost same explanatory power.The R^2 for both specifications is more than 86% which implies that explanatory variables can explain more than 86% variation in the GDP. The variance inflation factor (VIF) values of RMT, K and X are2.917,2.285 and 1.490

respectively. These values are less than 10. Hence, the model is free from multicollinerity.

Looking at the results of specification I through III, the results show the robustness of results received in the correlation analysis. In simple and multiple regressions analysis, RMT and K maintain their expected sign with statistical significance and hence confirm the hypothesis. The larger coefficient of K implies that GDP is much influenced by capital formation in Nepal. As the size of the capital formation increases, GDP values tend to increase. Comparing the result found in specification III, the effects of export on GDP is not significant.

Table 4 : Regression Results of RMT, K and X on GNP

Model: $GNP_{i,t} = \alpha + \beta_1 RMT_{i,t} + \beta_2 K_{i,t} + \beta_3 X_{i,t} + U_{i,t} \text{ ----------(2)}$

This table shows the regression results of GNP on three explanatory variables based on times series data with 164 observations from the year 1974/75 to 2014/15. Dependent variable is the Gross National Product denoted by (GNPi,t) and all independent variables i.e Remittance, Capital and Export are denoted by (RMTi t), (Ki t) and (Xi t) respectively.The figures in the parentheses are t-values and (*) and (**) indicates that the result is significant at 1 and 5% level. P-values are presented below the t-value in bold and italicized form. Also reported are F-statistics and coefficient of determination (R^2) and Durbin-Watson statistic (D/W).

Model	Intercept	RMT	K	X	F	R^2	D/W
I	23285.77 (3.262 *) 0.002	0.827 (9.055 *) 0.000			82.001 *	0.683	1.586
II	11907.22 (2.395**) 0.022	0.404 (4.765*) 0.000	0.601 (7.098 *) 0.000		119.474 *	0.866	1.684
III	12581.78 (2.375**) 0.023	0.428 (4.111*) 0.000	0.588 (6.385 *) 0.000	-0.030 (-0.406) 0.687	77.907 *	0.867	1.687

Source: Appendix A

The simple regression result in specification I shows a positive and significant relationship between GNP and remittance. This relationship is consistent to that of the correlation analysis. The F-statistics, 82.001 is statistically significant at 1% level. When both RMT and K are included as explanatory variables in the model, RMT doesn't lose its statistical significance and K maintains the positive relation with GNP. In equation III, with the inclusion of export as other explanatory variable, the coefficient of RMT again maintains its positive sign and the coefficient is statistically significant at 1% level. The predictive power of specification II is stronger than specification I and III as shown by F statistics. In specification I, the R^2 value is about 68% which implies that remittance can explain about 68% variation in the GNP. However, the specification II and III have same explanatory power. Here, the values of R^2 in both specifications are more than 86% which indicate that selected variables can explain more than 86% variation in the GNP of Nepal. The VIF values of RMT, K and X are2.917,2.285 and 1.490 respectively. These values are less than 10. Hence, the model is not suffered from multicollinerity.

Considering overall, the results show the robustness of results received from

correlation analysis. In simple and multiple regressions analysis, remittance (RM) and capital formation (K) maintain their expected sign with statistical significance and hence confirm the priori expectations. The coefficient of K is larger than that of RMT. This implies that GNP is much influenced by capital formation. As the size of the capital formation increases, GNP values trend to increase. However, the result found in specification III, shows that the effects of export on GNP is not significant.

Table 5 : Regression Results of RMT, K and X on PCI

Model: $PCI_{i,t} = \alpha + \beta_1 RMT_{i,t} + \beta_2 K_{i,t} + \beta_3 X_{i,t} + U_{i,t} \text{ ----------(3)}$

This table shows the regression results of PCI on three explanatory variables based on times series data with 164 observations from the year 1974/75 to 2014/15. Dependent variable is the Per Capita Income denoted by (PCIi,t) and independent variables are Remittance, Capital and Export, denoted by (RMTi,t), (Ki,t) and (Xi,t) respectively. The figures in the parentheses are t-values and (*) and (**) indicates that the result is significant at 1 and 5% level. P-values are presented below the t-value in bold and italicized form. Also reported are F-statistics and coefficient of determination (R^2) and Durbin-Watson statistic (D/W).

Model	Intercept	RMT	K	X	F	R^2	D/W
I	912.217 (3.870*) 0.000	0.808 (8.450*) 0.000			71.406*	0.653	1.392
II	588.662 (3.082*) 0.004	0.426 (4.133*) 0.000	0.542 (5.255*) 0.000		74.523*	0.801	1.219
III	580.145 (2.846*) 0.007	0.417 (3.285*) 0.002	0.548 (4.876*) 0.000	0.012 (0.133) 0.895	48.369*	0.801	1.221

Source: Appendix A

Table 5 presents the regression results on whether the variation in per capita income is captured by remittance. Further, the model investigates if inclusion of capital formation and level of exports are associated with per capita income. The first row of Table 5 presents the results of a regression of the remittance on PCI, controlling for capital and export level. From the result of specification I, it is clear that remittance has a positive and significant relationship with per capita income. This supports the hypothesis that higher remittance inflows leads to higher per capita income. The coefficient of remittance is 0.808 which means Re.1 remittance income leads to Re.0.808 per capita income. The F-statistics 71. 406 is also statistically significant at 1% level which implies that the model is better fitted. When capital formation is added in the model, the coefficient of remittance does not lose its previous sign and statistical significance. However, capital formation emerges as the prominent factor influencing per capita income. The explanatory power of the model is more than 80%. With the inclusion of export level in the final specification, the direction of relationship between remittance and PCI is still positive and significant. In Specification III, the coefficient of remittance is 0.417 which is significant. This indicates that remittance has role to build PCI in Nepal. Although positive relationship has been noticed between PCI and K, the relationship between export and PCI could not be established. The larger

coefficient of capital formation 0.548 indicates that a unit capital formation contributes 0.548 unit increase in PCI. The model is also better fitted as suggested by the significant value of F statistics. The exploratory power of the model is about 80% which says that the variables taken into the model are sufficient to explain the variation in PCI. The VIF values of RMT, K and X are 2.917, 2.285 and 1.490 respectively. These values are lower than 10 which suggest that the model is free from multicollinerity.

The major finding of the above table is that remittance and capital formation can be considered as the good predictor of per capita income in Nepal. The insignificant coefficient of export indicates that the nominal export values do not contribute much to the per capita income.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The study investigated the impact of remittances on economic indicators of Nepal using 41-year time series data. The study reveals that remittance is in increasing trend and has become one of the major sources of income of Nepalese people. Using OLS regression analysis, it is found that economic indicators are the positive function of remittances. Hence, it can be concluded that remittance income have contribution on the economic development of the nation. However, it also implies that if there is any disturbance in the inflow of remittances, then the Nepalese economy will face difficulties as well. Since the remittance is the determinant factor of GDP, GNP and PCI, it should be used in the productive sector. The major implication of the study is that the government should initiate new policy to control unproductive use of remittance. Without any delay, Government of Nepal has to formulate suitable policies to attract remitted money into productive investment such as small scale industries, micro enterprises, modernization of agriculture, small hydro project, etc. However, remittance might not be long term and sustained source of external financing since downturn in economy of host countries may adversely affect economy of home country.

REFERENCES

Asmatullah, K., & Muhammand, A. (2011). Workers' remittances and economic growth: Evidence from Azerbaijan and Armenia. *Global Journal of Human Social Science,* 41-61.

Chowdhury K. R., Hamid, F., & Chatterjee, D. D. (2010). Remittance as a tool of economic development. *Bangladesh Research Publications Journal,* IV, 286-296.

Dhungana, A. R., & Pandit, D. (2014). Socio-economic impact of remittance on households in Lekhnath Municipality, Kaski, Nepal, *Economic Literature*, XII, 39-49.

Dzanis, J. (2013). Impact of remittance on domestic investment: The role of institutional and financial development. *Global Review of Accounting and Finance*, IV, 65-84.

Iheke, O.R. (2012). The effect of remittances on the Nigerian economy. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*, 2, 614-621.

I. L.O (2003). *Challenges to Labour Migration policy and Management in Asia*, Geneva.

I. M.F (2009). Balance of payment and international investment position, *Manual* BPM6.

Karogoz, K. (2009). Workers' remittance and economic growth: Evidence from Turkey. *Journal of Yasar University,* 4 (13), 1891-1908.

Lokshin, M., Bontch-O., & Elna, G. (2005). Remittances and poverty in Nepal. *World Economic Outlook*, World Bank.

Maimbo, S.M., & Ratha, D. (2005). *Remittances, development impact and future prospects,* Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

MOF (1999). *Economic Survey, FY 1998/99*. Kathmandu: Ministry of Finance, Government of Nepal.

MOF (2006). *Economic Survey, FY 2005/06*. Kathmandu: Ministry of Finance, Government of Nepal.

MOF (2013). *Economic Survey, FY 2012/13*. Kathmandu: Ministry of Finance, Government of Nepal.

MOF (2015). *Economic Survey, FY 2014/15*. Kathmandu: Ministry of Finance, Government of Nepal.

MOF (2016). *Economic Survey, FY 2015/16*. Kathmandu: Ministry of Finance, Government of Nepal.

NRB (2016). Saving *and investment trend of remittance recipient households*, Kathmandu: Nepal Rastra Bank.

NRB (2017). *A handbook of government finance statistics*, V, Kathmandu: Nepal Rastra Bank.

Rahman, Z. (2014). Workers' remittance and economic development in Pakistan: A time series analysis. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 5(22), 51-54.

Salahuddin, M. (2013). Empirical link between growth and remittance: Evidence from panel data. *Journal of Applied Business and Economics*, 14(5), 19-29.

Sayed, T. J., & Sayed, A. R. (2012). Worker's remittances and economic growth in China and Korea: An empirical analysis. *Journal of Chinese Economic and Foreign Trade Studies,* 5, 185-193.

Shrestha, B. (2008). Contribution of foreign employment and remittance to Nepalese economy. *Economic Review,* 20, 1-15.

Srivastava, N. L., & Chaudhary S. K. (2007). Role of remittance in economic development of Nepal. *The Journal of Nepalese Business Studies,* IV(1), 28-37.

Tambama, J. (2011). *The impact of remittances on Zimbabwean economic development.* An Unpublished Dissertation of Master of Science in Economics. University of Zimbabwe, Zimbabwe.

Wong, K. Y. (2011). *The link between remittances and family relationships in Chitwan Valley of Nepal.* An Unpublished Thesis, Ann Arbor Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, USA.

World Bank (2016). *Migration and Remittance, Factbook (3rd edition) ,* Washington D.C.: World Bank.

Appendix A

Remittances & Macroeconomic Indicators: 1974/75 – 2014/15 (PCI in Rs. and others are in Rs. million)

S.N	FY	GDP	GNP	PCI	RMT	K	X	Rem.as % of GDP
1	1974/75	16571	16838	1312.39	204.30	2223	889.60	1.23
2	1975/76	17349	17671	1341.76	231.30	2443	1185.80	1.33
3	1976/77	17280	17599	1300.74	268.30	2580	1164.70	1.55
4	1977/78	19732	20023	1442.58	219.40	3294	1046.20	1.11
5	1978/79	22215	22605	1586.32	303.10	3263	1296.80	1.36
6	1979/80	23351	23845	1629.87	357.30	3681	1150.50	1.53
7	1980/81	27307	27894	1857.12	484.20	4299	1608.70	1.77
8	1981/82	30988	31603	2060.17	427.10	5465	1491.50	1.37
9	1982/83	33761	34458	2200.38	549.70	6576	1132.00	1.62
10	1983/84	39390	40015	2502.50	614.10	6907	1703.90	1.55
11	1984/85	44441	47248	2895.10	690.70	9386	2740.60	1.55
12	1985/86	53215	56443	3385.90	809.10	9431	3078.00	1.52
13	1986/87	61140	65067	3822.97	1292.60	11825	3011.40	2.11
14	1987/88	73170	78481	4518.19	1608.40	13414	4114.60	2.20
15	1988/89	85831	90811	5119.00	1628.60	16392	4195.30	1.89
16	1989/90	99702	105350	5817.23	1747.00	17002	5156.20	1.75
17	1990/91	116127	122517	6625.76	2128.30	22780	7387.50	1.83
18	1991/92	144933	152202	8063.25	2316.50	29277	13706.50	1.59
19	1992/93	165350	174705	9066.64	2994.30	37278	17266.50	1.81
20	1993/94	191596	203135	10327.15	3469.10	42032	19293.40	1.81
21	1994/95	209976	223992	11155.54	5063.60	48370	17639.20	2.41
22	1995/96	239388	252479	12317.85	4283.60	56081	19881.10	1.79
23	1996/97	269570	285173	13629.64	5595.00	60794	22636.50	2.08
24	1997/98	289798	306870	14367.92	6987.80	65375	27513.50	2.41
25	1998/99	330018	352917	16187.37	10314.60	65269	35676.30	3.13
26	1999/00	366251	392613	17641.56	42759.10	73324	49822.70	11.67
27	2000/01	394052	427447	18815.34	53525.20	78031	55654.10	13.58
28	2001/02	406138	441182	19056.71	55805.90	81613	46944.80	13.74
29	2002/03	437546	472869	19531.97	61530.60	87024	49930.60	14.06
30	2003/04	536800	509700	21689.00	66493.80	95124	53910.70	12.38
31	2004/05	589400	543982	23292.00	78043.40	101094	58705.70	13.24
32	2005/06	654100	595675	25279.00	97700.00	117290.60	60177.20	14.94
33	2006/07	727800	735300	28905.00	100100	135398.70	59679.60	13.75
34	2007/08	815700	823600	31946.00	142700	153565.80	59546.10	17.49
35	2008/09	988300	1000000	38172.00	209700	178638.30	68192.70	21.22
36	2009/10	1192800	1201900	45435.00	231700	210507.90	60832.80	19.42
37	2010/11	1366900	1374500	51594.00	253600	264801.60	64244.30	18.55
38	2011/12	1527300	1539600	56880.00	359600	292516.60	74837.70	23.54
39	2012/13	1695000	1708100	62283.00	434600	317678.40	76275.00	25.64
40	2013/14	1941600	1974500	70394.00	543300	383070.00	91255.20	27.98
41	2014/15	2124600	2155000	74992.00	589500	462100.80	84984.00	27.75

Sources: Adapted and Calculated from Economic Survey 1998/99(pp: 1-7, 64, 99), 2000/01(pp: 1-4, 48, 69) and 2005/06(pp: 1-4, 18), Economic Survey 2014/15(pp: xxvi), handbook of government finance statistics, Vol. V published by Nepal Rastra Bank.