

Livelihood Status and Living Standard of Urban Households of Migrants' Workers to Asian Countries from Pokhara

Yuba Raj Tripathi

School of Development and Social Engineering, Pokhara University

yubarajpatanbesi@gmail.com

Abstract

Asian emigrants' households' livelihood status is significantly increased due to the emigration. The study aims to describe the livelihood status and living standard of urban households of migrant workers to Asian countries from Pokhara, Nepal. The main concern of this paper is whether migrant workers' family livelihood status is better or not. The theoretical background of the study is the Department for International Development Livelihood Framework, and it studied the five capitals: social, financial, physical, human, and environmental. The descriptive and explanatory research design was applied. For the study, Pokhara Metropolitan City was chosen purposively, and ward number 13 was chosen by lottery method. The data was collected from 127 migrant worker households through face-to-face interviews using semi-structure questionnaire, and along with the two key informant interviews. Both descriptive and inferential analysis (Chi-square test) were employed to accomplish the study objectives.

This study revealed that foreign labor migration has greatly increased income levels and material well-being in households in Pokhara, making it a crucial livelihood strategy. While human capital gains slightly from better access to healthcare and education, remittances mostly increase financial and physical capital through consumption and asset accumulation. Weak association between livelihood outcomes and pre-departure skill training, however, points to systemic deficiencies in migration governance. Social capital is still underdeveloped despite economic advancements, which suggests low levels of social cohesiveness and community involvement. Reduced reliance on natural resources is suggested by favorable views of environmental capital. In general, migration raises living standards over national averages, but its advantages vary depending on the livelihood capital. Therefore, policies that continue to facilitate migrant workers while also strengthening social capital, encouraging skill learning, and productive investment are necessary to achieve sustainable livelihood outcomes. Future researchers would be better applied using mixed methods with large samples.

Key Words: *Households, livelihood status, living standard, migrants, migrant workers*

Introduction

Due to modernization, industrialization, technological innovation, and urbanization, the number of migrant workers is increasing throughout the world. The main purpose of international migration is for employment. International Labour Organization (ILO, 2025) stated that migrant workers increased from 115 million in 1990 to 169 million in 2019, and reached 180 million by mid-2025. In the context of a developing nation like Nepal, seven and a half percent of the total population was absent from the country in 2021 (NSO, 2022), which is 21.9 million, where males consisted of more than four-fifths (82.2%) and females accounted for 17.8 percent. The migrant workers significantly contributed on livelihood status (Weerarante, 2019) through the remittance. Furthermore, migrant workers bring new ideas and practices to their home countries (Kilkey & Palenga-Moellenbeck, 2016), such as in gender relations, civil society, education, the economy, and skill

development. According to Trask (2022), Educational attainment, vocation and skill sets, economy, religion, and socio-historical context are all components of a complex mixture that manifests itself in diverse ways based on geography and prevailing ideologies (Trask, 2022). These are the main reasons for moving to third countries for work as migrants.

A higher number of youth emigrants moved to third countries to achieve a better living standard. Poverty, lack of opportunities, conflict, social, political, and environmental issues are push factors of migrant workers (NLMS, 2022). Additionally, employment and education are also causes of foreign labour migration, which has an impact on the socio-cultural and economic status of Nepali Households (IOM 2019a; Sharma et al 2014). Karim et al. (2025) highlighted that employment, education, and higher living standards were the causes of migration.

According to the Nepal Labour Migration Report (NLMR, 2022), Nepali

youth moved to 150 countries in search of employment in 2022, especially Malaysia and the six Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) nations. Shrestha and Raya (2024) revealed that due to its high demand for labour, ease of processing, and lower prices for unskilled labour, Malaysia is another important destination for Nepali migrants. Adhikari et al. (2024) found that the UAE was the most prevalent destination for foreign employment, with many migrant workers engaged as security guards. The empirical review indicates that foreign labour migration has increased in Nepal and impacted the family's social and economic status, health, education, and welfare. This tendency was beginning from the Anglo-Nepal War (1814-1816) and the Sugauli Treaty, which gave rationale for Nepali Youth in the British Indian Army (Seddon et al., 2001), and overseas labor migrants known as *lahures* played an important role in raising households and local and national economies.

Remittances from Nepali workers overseas account for a significant share of Nepal's GDP. Dhakal et al. (2025) study showed remittances accounted for an average of 25 percent of Nepal's GDP, which significantly reduced poverty by raising household incomes and facilitating access to healthcare and education. Adhikari et al. (2024) found that the majority of migrants made between Rs. 45,000 and Rs. 50,000 a month.

The foreign remittance is spent on different sectors in Nepal such as investments, health care, and education (Adhikari et al., 2024; Thapa and Acharya, 2017; Bhandari, 2024), get better housing, health care, nutrition, and education (NRB, 2020), for buying land or a house (Khanal, 2023). Thus, it concluded that remittance-receiving households spend more on consumption each year than non-receiving households, which may have a favourable influence on the local economy. According to Sapkota et al. (2024), remittance is a major source of socio-economic development, raising household wellbeing and living standards. But the remittance is mostly spent on consumption (Parajuli et al., 2024). Inversely, the role of remittance is negative on labour supply and agricultural production in Nepal (Bhandari, 2024), but it supports improving household livelihood status.

Adhikari (2011) stated that remittances are regularly source of household income in Nepal. Lokshin et al. (2010) and Seddon et al. (2002) revealed that most of the remittances are utilized for household assets, food, health care, and education rather than business expansion. Acharya and Leon-Gonzalez (2014) stated that consistent remittance transfers enhance migrant-sending households' access to healthcare and education. Nepal's migration governance which are hampered by the lack of correlation between skill training and human capital satisfaction in Nepal (Sharma et al., 2014). World Bank (2019), in comparison to migrants in other Asian destinations, migrants in GCC countries frequently send larger and more frequent remittances. Remittances are often transformed into tangible improvements, including better housing and utilities (Kollmair et al., 2006). Migration can increase social isolation among migrant households, erode traditional community relationships, and decrease involvement in local institutions (Putnam, 2000; de Haas, 2010). SLF-based research argues that remittance income can reduce reliance on forest and agricultural resources, hence easing the burden on regional ecosystems (Adger et al., 2002).

Sapkota et al. (2024) showed that remittances raise the household living standards in Nepal. According to Pasa and Kharel (2024), the remittance support for rural people's economic development created self-employment and employment, diminished family poverty and social exclusion, and increased family income. NLSS (2022) report stated that remittances are crucial for rural livelihoods because remittances cover more than half of household income in rural areas and about a quarter of the country's GDP, which also support on promoting investment, education, health care, and household consumption, these may lower poverty and raise living standards.

The underlying reasons and effects of the international labor movement are covered by several migration theories. Traditional theories of migration, which are endorsed by several academics, place a strong emphasis on economic motives. Ravenstein's Laws of Migration (1885; 1889) pinpoint economic opportunity as the primary driver of migration, whereas Lee's push-pull theory (1966) highlights

migrants' rational evaluation of costs and benefits. Neoclassical economic theory holds that migration is an income-maximizing decision driven by salary differences (Todaro, 1969). In contrast, the New Economics of Labour Migration (NELM) sees migration as a household-level risk diversification strategy rather than an individual choice (Stark & Bloom, 1985). The Sustainable Livelihood Framework (DFID, 2002) is particularly pertinent for assessing its outcomes because migration theories generally suggest that labor migration is closely related to household livelihood plans. In the current situation, poverty, a lack of work opportunities at home, conflict, and other social, environmental, and political push factors have all contributed to the widespread labor migration from Nepali people, while the demand for skilled and low-skilled migrant workers, combined with the promise of higher wages in the countries of destination, are pull factors (NLMS, 2022). The Sustainable Livelihood Framework (SLF) offers a thorough approach to understanding how households combine resources, abilities, and activities to sustain their standard of living in the face of changing conditions. A livelihood is deemed sustainable if it can recover from shocks, maintain or enhance assets, and provide opportunities for future generations, according to Chambers and Conway (1992). The DFID (2002) paradigm identifies five fundamental livelihood capitals: human, financial, physical, social, and natural. By enhancing housing and infrastructure (physical), social networks (social), education and health (human), and income (financial), remittances can raise these capitals in the context of labor migration. But whether these developments lead to sustainable livelihoods has not received much attention, especially in urban areas. Most of the previous labor migration studies covered different migration theories, but did not apply livelihood frameworks and focused on rural areas. Hence, this study focused on the Sustainable Livelihood Framework, which was developed by DFID (2002), and the urban area.

In the recent era, the pattern of foreign labour migration has changed; people moved to third countries mostly for study and employment. There is a popular saying in Nepal, *ki huncha dhan*

Bakrapathale, ki huncha dhan lama batale, which is synonymous with either keeping goats or going far away to earn money. The subsistence agricultural practices in Nepal did not provide a sustainable livelihood status and, hence Nepali have chosen the second alternative and moved to foreign workers. Since migrant workers have been sending remittances for a long time in Nepal and in Pokhara, how has it been used, and whether the livelihood status and living standard have improved? The study examines the livelihood status and living standard of foreign labor migrants' households in Pokhara, Nepal. It considers the "five livelihood capitals" (human, social, environmental, physical, and financial) with the emotional well-being of the family members left behind. The ultimate objective is to determine how these urban households use remittances and what elements actually contribute to a sustainable urban lifestyle. For the study purpose, Pokhara Metropolitan City was chosen purposively because having second largest metropolitan city in Nepal and households in Gandaki province, including Pokhara (45%), received greater remittances than the national average (38%) (NRB, 2023). Geographically, such a study has not been carried out in Pokhara; hence, the study area is chosen.

Data and methods

Both explanatory and descriptive research designs were used for the investigation. Frequency, cross-tabulation, mean, and standard deviation, organizing, and simplifying data are all included in the descriptive analysis (Creswell & Creswell, 2018), which has helped describe the socio-demographic and economic characteristics of migrant households, the utilization pattern of remittances, the status of five livelihood capitals, and the livelihood situation of foreign labor migrant households. Using the chi-square test, the explanatory study design assisted in determining the association between variables (Saunders et al., 2019). The study has employed a quantitative research approach, for what semi-structure questionnaire for face-to-face interview and the outcomes were tested statistically. Because the data was gathered at a specific point in June 2025, the study is cross-sectional.

The multistage sampling method was used in the investigation. At the first stage, Pokhara Metropolitan City was chosen purposively because having second largest metropolitan city in Nepal, and households in Gandaki province, including Pokhara (45%), received more remittances than the national average (38%) (NRB, 2023). In the second step, ward number 13 was picked by a lottery method (simple random) for the study area distinguished by enormous population composition concerning castes/ethnicities, religions, and cultural diversity. Both the semi-urban area and the high rate of foreign labor migration were covered by this ward. According to NSO (2022), of the 5758 households in ward no. 13 in the third stage, almost 25 percent had at least one member who was a foreign labor migrant. The computation stated that there were 1439 foreign labor migrants' households in Pokhara ward-13. At the fourth step, 127 households (7 percent margin of error, 90 percent confidence level, and 5 percent level of significance) were chosen from 1439 households. The 127 households were conveniently chosen at the fifth stage based on their geographic location and castes/ethnicities. As, Hair et al. (2010) suggested that a sample size of at least 100 is good for multivariate analysis, supported by studying 127 households, the result can be generalised. In the final stage, the foreign migrant workers' family members were interviewed face-to-face using a semi-structured questionnaire to gather primary data. The respondents were selected as; if the husband is a migrant worker; wife was selected as the respondent,

- if wife is a migrant worker: husband was selected as the respondent
- if children are migrant workers: available parents were selected as the respondents
- if both parents are migrant workers: the eldest family member was selected as the respondent

The study's goals were achieved by applying both descriptive and inferential analysis. To verify the validity of the questionnaires, a pilot test was conducted in Pokhara-20 with 13 respondents. Before data was collected, their verbal consent was obtained, and they were informed that the information would be kept private and used exclusively for academic purposes. After

collecting data from 127 households, two key informant interviews (KII) were carried out with the persons who have better and worse livelihood statuses.

The conceptual framework in the study was disintegrated into four parts: first, the family status at the place of origin or study area; secondly, the domestic income (remittance) from the study area and foreign remittance earned from foreign countries (place of destination) were examined. At the third stage, the effect of both domestic remittance and foreign remittance was checked on the overall livelihood status of households in the study area. Finally, assessing the livelihood level of households would determine the living standard.

For the family status, the explanatory variables such as internal migration status, types of family, number of family member and family main occupation at the place of origin (in the study area) were studied. Similarly, for the emigrants' status, numbers of emigrants from households, country to destination, years of staying in the countries of destinations, and skills acquired by emigrants in Nepal before visiting the place of destination were studied.

Furthermore, the domestic income (remittance) and foreign remittance were analyzed to evaluate the livelihood status of human, social, physical, financial, and environmental capitals under various variables. At the ends the overall satisfaction level of households was determined, and the living standard of urban emigrants' households was explained as a mediating variable. The living standard of urban emigrants' households is the dependent variable of this study, which included use of money sent by migrant workers and domestic income for food, education, health, savings, housing, property, and debt payment.

Results and discussion

The livelihood status and living standard of migrants workers' households with five capitals have been investigated based on DFID's sustainable livelihood framework. The five capitals are human, social, financial, physical, and environmental. The data is presented with descriptive and inferential methods. Under the descriptive method,

frequency analysis, cross-tabulation, mean, and standard deviation are calculated; however, the inferential method chi-square test, is applied.

Table 1

Socio-demographic profile of the migrants workers' households

Socio-demographic profile	Indicators	Frequency	Percent
Internal migration status	Migrated	46	36.2
	Non-migrated	81	63.8
Sex of household head	Male	51	40.2
	Female	76	59.8
Types of family	Nuclear Family	88	69.3
	Joint Family	39	30.7
Caste/ethnicity	Janajati	63	49.6
	Brahmin/Chhetri	34	26.8
	Dalits	20	15.7
	Others (Muslim)	10	7.9

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 1 reveals that about two-thirds (63.8%) of participants were permanently living in their current place, whereas only 36.2 percent were only internal migrants. Similarly, almost three-fifths (59.8%) of participants reported that female was household heads of family members, suggesting women's autonomy in household decision-making is higher, as well as women's empowerment is also high. Furthermore, seven in ten (69.3%) participants lived with nuclear family types. The study showed the average family size is 4.6. About half (49.6%) of the migrant workers' households were Janajati, followed by Brahmin/Chhetri (26.8%), Dalits (15.7%), and Muslim (7.9%) respectively.

Table 2

Assessment of satisfaction with livelihood capitals

Livelihood capitals	Indicators	Frequency	Percent
Human capital	Yes	79	62.2
	No	48	37.8
Financial capital	Yes	85	66.9
	No	42	33.1
Physical capital	Yes	90	70.9
	No	37	29.1
Social capital	Yes	16	12.6
	No	111	97.3
Environmental capital	Yes	113	89.0
	No	14	11.0

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 2 reveals that more than three-fifths (62.2%) agreed that their family had good human capital, such as health, education, and skills. Similarly, two-thirds (66.9%) agreed on financial capital. In the study area, seven in ten (70.9%) participants reported that family physical capital is favorable, which means the family has access to facilities, infrastructure, etc. The majority (87.3%) of emigrants' households did not get significant social support or community networks. Likewise, almost nine in ten (89.0%) participants had a positive opinion of environmental capital, indicating that most people think their natural resources and environment are in good shape in the study area. The statistical data were supported by KII(I), who has a better livelihood status, informed that after migrating three members from household as the workers, the economic condition has been raised as they have good saving, bought lands and constructed houses, children are reading well, environment around house is clean but their social network is not good as there are elderly peoples and only three children at home.

Table 3
Factors associated with satisfaction with human capital

Factors	Indicators	Satisfied with human capital		p-value
		Yes	No	
Internal migration status	Migrated	18.1	18.1	0.033*
	Non-migrated	44.1	19.7	
Family size	Up to 4	33.1	25.2	0.095
	Above 4	29.1	12.6	
Family business at the place of origin	Yes	16.5	11.0	0.453
	No	45.7	26.8	
Working persons in Nepal	Up to 1	43.6	28.2	0.895
	Above 1	16.7	11.5	
Types of countries visited	Western Asian (GCC)	33.9	27.6	0.038*
	Other Asian Countries	28.3	10.2	
Duration of stay at the place of destination	Up to 5 years	25.2	23.6	0.016*
	Above 5 years	37.0	14.2	
Number of working persons abroad	Up to 1	41.7	32.3	0.022*
	Above 1	20.5	5.5	
Skill learns from Nepal	Yes	17.3	9.4	0.725
	No	44.9	28.3	

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Note: * denotes statistically significant ($p < 0.05$)

Table 3 reveals that non-migrated migrant workers' households, up to 4 family members(44.1%), having no family business in study households(45.7%), up to one member working people in Nepal(43.6%), Western Asian (GCC) migrants workers' households(33.9%), above five years duration of stay at place of destination(37.0%), up to one migrant worker(41.7%), and having not learning any skill from Nepal(44.9%) were satisfied with human capital. The p-value of internal migration status, types of countries visited,

duration of stay at the place of destination, number of working persons abroad, and satisfaction with human capital is less than a significant value, or $p < 0.05$. Therefore, internal migration status, types of countries visited, duration of stay at the destination, and the number of working persons abroad are associated with satisfaction with human capital. Remaining variables, family size, working persons in Nepal, and skill learns from Nepal are not statistically significantly related to human capital.

Table 4
Factors associated with households' financial capital

Factors	Indicators	Satisfied with financial capital		p-value
		Yes	No	
Internal migration status	Migrated	18.1	18.1	0.002*
	Non-migrated	48.8	15.0	
Family size	Up to 4	36.2	22.0	0.123
	Above 4	30.7	11.0	
Family business at the place of origin	Yes	18.9	8.7	0.808
	No	48.0	24.4	
Working persons in Nepal	Up to 1	44.9	26.9	0.926
	Above 1	17.9	10.3	
Types of countries visited	Western Asian (GCC)	35.4	26.0	0.005*
	Other Asian Countries	31.5	7.1	
Duration of stay at the place of destination	Up to 5 years	22.8	26.0	0.000*
	Above 5 years	44.1	7.1	
Number of working persons abroad	Up to 1	46.5	27.6	0.092
	Above 1	20.5	5.5	
Skill learns from Nepal	Yes	18.1	8.7	0.917
	No	48.8	24.4	

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Note: * denotes statistically significant ($p < 0.05$)

Table 4 highlights that non-migrated migrants worker' households(48.8%), up to 4 family members(36.2%), having no family business in place of origin(48.0%), up to 1 member working people in Nepal(44.9%), Western Asian (GCC) migrant workers' households(35.4%), above five years duration of stay at place of destination(44.1%), up to one migrant worker(46.5%), and having not learning any skill from Nepal(48.8%) are satisfied with financial capital. The p-value of internal migration status, types of country visited,

and duration of stay in the place of destination is less than a significant value, or $p < 0.05$. Hence, the financial capital satisfaction is statistically significant with internal migration status, types of countries visited, and duration of stay at the place of destination. Furthermore, there is no statistically significant association between family size, family business at the place of origin, working persons in Nepal, number of working persons abroad, skill learns from Nepal, and financial capital satisfaction.

Table 5
Associated factors of satisfaction with physical capital

Factors	Indicators	Satisfied with physical capital		p-value
		Yes	No	
Internal migration status	Migrated	20.5	15.7	0.007*
	Non-migrated	50.4	13.4	
Family size	Up to 4	36.2	22.0	0.011*
	Above 4	34.6	7.1	
Family business at the place of origin	Yes	21.3	6.3	0.337
	No	49.6	22.8	
Working persons in Nepal	Up to 1	50.0	21.8	0.788
	Above 1	20.5	7.7	
Types of countries visited	Western Asian (GCC)	38.6	22.8	0.012*
	Other Asian Countries	32.3	6.3	
Duration of stay at the place of destination	Up to 5 years	26.8	22.0	0.000*
	Above 5 years	44.1	7.1	
Number of working persons abroad	Up to 1	50.4	23.6	0.244
	Above 1	20.5	5.5	
Skill learns from Nepal	Yes	18.1	8.7	0.629
	No	52.8	20.5	

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Note: * denotes statistically significant ($p < 0.05$)

Table 5 reveals that non-migrated migrant workers' households(50.4%), up to 4 family members(36.2%), having no family business in place of origin(49.6%), up to 1 member working people in Nepal(50.0%), Western Asian (GCC) migrant workers' households(38.6%), above five years duration of stay at place of destination(44.1%), up to 1 migrant worker(50.4%), and having not learning any skill from Nepal(52.8%) participants are satisfied with physical capital. The p-value of internal migration status, family size, types of countries visited, duration of stay at the place of destination, and satisfaction with

physical capital is less than a significant value, or $p < 0.05$. Therefore, there is a statistically significant association between internal migration status, family size, types of countries visited, duration of stay at the place of destination, and satisfaction with physical capital. Similarly, the study demonstrated that there is no statistically significant association between contentment with physical capital and the existence of a family business at the place of origin, skill learns from Nepal, the number of working persons abroad, the number of working persons in Nepal, and the family business at the place of origin.

Table 6
Factors associated with satisfaction with social capital

Factors	Indicators	Satisfied with social capital		p-value
		Yes	No	
Internal migration status	Migrated	6.3	29.9	0.220
	Non-migrated	6.3	57.5	
Family size	Up to 4	7.1	51.2	0.861
	Above 4	5.5	36.2	
Family business at the place of origin	Yes	6.3	21.3	0.032*
	No	6.3	66.1	
Working persons in Nepal	Up to 1	10.3	61.5	0.537
	Above 1	2.6	25.6	
Types of countries visited	Western Asian (GCC)	5.5	55.9	0.120
	Other Asian Countries	7.1	31.5	
Duration of stay at the place of destination	Up to 5 years	4.7	44.1	0.333
	Above 5 years	7.9	43.3	
Number of working persons abroad	Up to 1	11.8	62.2	0.054
	Above 1	0.8	26.2	
Skill learns from Nepal	Yes	3.9	22.8	0.665
	No	8.7	64.6	

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Note: * denotes statistically significant ($p < 0.05$)

Table 6 illustrates that non-migrated migrant workers' households(57.5%), up to 4 family members(51.2%), having no family business in place of origin(66.1%), up to one member working people in Nepal(61.5%), Western Asian (GCC) migrant workers' households(55.9%), above five years duration of stay at place of destination(44.1%), up to one migrant worker(62.2%), and having not learning any skill from Nepal(64.6%), are not satisfied with social capital. There is no statistically

significant association between internal migration status, family size, working persons in Nepal, types of countries visited, duration of stay at place of destination, number of working persons in abroad and skill learns from Nepal because the p-value is greater than significant value or $p > 0.05$, whereas the study found that there is a statistically significant association between contentment with social capital and the existence of a family business.

Table 7
Factors associated with satisfaction with environmental capital

Factors	Indicators	Satisfied with environmental capital		p-value
		Yes	No	
Internal migration status	Migrated	29.1	7.1	0.021*
	Non-migrated	59.8	3.9	
Family size	Up to 4	52.0	6.3	0.928
	Above 4	37.0	4.7	
Family business at the place of origin	Yes	26.8	0.8	0.070
	No	62.2	10.2	
Working persons in Nepal	Up to 1	60.3	11.5	0.046*
	Above 1	28.2	0.0	
Types of countries visited	Western Asian (GCC)	53.5	7.9	0.415
	Other Asian Countries	35.4	3.1	
Duration of stay at the place of destination	Up to 5 years	42.5	6.3	0.509
	Above 5 years	46.5	4.7	
Number of working persons abroad	Up to 1	65.4	8.7	0.680
	Above 1	23.6	2.4	
Skill learns from Nepal	Yes	24.4	2.4	0.632

No

64.6

8.7

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Note: * denotes statistically significant ($p < 0.05$)

Table 7 finds that non-migrated migrant workers' households (59.8%), up to 4 family members (52.0%), having no family business in place of origin (62.2%), up to one member working people in Nepal (60.3%), Western Asian (GCC) migrant workers' households (53.5%), above five years duration of stay at place of destination (46.5%), up to one migrant worker (65.4%), and having not learning any skill from Nepal (64.6%) are satisfied with environmental capital. The p-value of internal migration status, working persons in Nepal with environmental capital satisfaction, is less than a significant value, or $p < 0.05$. Therefore, there is a statistically significant association between internal migration status, working persons in Nepal, and environmental capital satisfaction. Likewise, there is no statistically significant association between family size, family business at place of origin, types of countries visited, duration of stay at place of destination, number of working persons abroad, skill learns from Nepal, and environmental capital satisfaction.

Discussion

The study found that the majority of households depend on foreign remittances, which is supported by Adhikari (2011), who stated that remittances are regularly source of household income in Nepal. Seven in ten of the households had no family business, which is similar to what Lokshin et al. (2010) and Seddon et al. (2002) revealed: most of the remittances are utilized for household assets, food, health care, and education rather than business expansion. The study highlighted that over three-fifths of households expressed higher satisfaction with human capital, such as skills, education, and health. This is similar to what Acharya and Leon-Gonzalez (2014) stated, that consistent remittance transfers enhance migrant-sending households' access to healthcare and education. There is no association between skills learn from Nepal and human capital, which is supported by previous studies on Nepal's migration governance, which are hampered by the lack of association between skill training and human capital satisfaction in

Nepal (Sharma et al., 2014), which suggests a structural deficiency in pre-departure skill development systems.

Internal migration status, destination country, and duration of stay abroad are associated with satisfaction with financial capital. The finding is supported by the World Bank (2019) in comparison to migrant workers in other Asian destinations; migrant workers in GCC countries frequently send larger and more frequent remittances.

This study revealed that remittance use in Pokhara frequently results in investments in housing, infrastructure, and household assets, which are reflected in high satisfaction with physical capital. This confirms earlier research showing that remittances are often transformed into tangible improvements, including better housing and utilities (Kollmair et al., 2006). Almost nine in ten households expressed unhappiness with social capital. This result supports previous research showing how migrant workers can increase social isolation among migrant households, erode traditional community relationships, and decrease involvement in local institutions (Putnam, 2000; de Haas, 2010). Which is supported by KII(II), she mentioned that when the economically active member migrated as a worker, she faced many difficulties at home, she could not visit places during rituals, she faced increased household burdens, and she experienced sexual violence as well.

The majority of households' satisfaction with environmental capital indicates favorable views of the natural resources and environmental conditions. This aligns with SLF-based research that argues remittance income can reduce reliance on forest and agricultural resources, thereby easing the burden on local ecosystems (Adger et al., 2002).

According to the DFID Sustainable Livelihood Framework (2002), livelihood strategies and results are shaped by a combination of five fundamental capitals: human, financial, physical, social, and environmental. Structures, processes, and vulnerability situations mediate these assets. The results of this study show that, albeit not consistently across all types of capital, foreign labor migration serves as a crucial

livelihood strategy for households in Pokhara.

The total monthly income, including internal remittance and foreign remittance, is NRs. 16100000. In 127 households, there are 584 individuals. The monthly average household's income is NRs. 126771.7. The annual average household's income is NRs. 15,21,260.4. which indicates the living standard of the study households is higher than the national household income, which shows the average household income of Nepal is NRs.5,51,148. Similarly, per capita income is NRs. 1,36,707 (NLSS-IV, 2022). Now, calculating the individual's average monthly income is NRs 27568.5. Then per capita annual income is NRs 330822.0. The NLSS-IV (2022) gave the average per capita income was NRs.1,36,707. Hence, the per capita annual average income is higher in the study households. Both households and individuals' income is higher than the national income; it is concluded that the living standards of the emigrants' households are better, which indicates that foreign employment considerably raises household purchasing power and living standards (DFIDs, 2002).

Conclusion

This study evaluated the livelihood results of households with foreign labor migrants in Pokhara, Nepal, using the DFID Sustainable Livelihood Framework (2002). The results verify that employment abroad serves as a crucial livelihood option, significantly raising household income and material well-being. Remittances, which are mostly utilized for basic consumption and asset accumulation rather than investment, are the principal source of income for the majority of households. As a result, while productive livelihood diversification is still restricted, financial and physical capital are greatly enhanced. Because of steady remittance flows, human capital outcomes are somewhat favorable, especially in the areas of health and education. However, the absence of a relationship between pre-departure skill training and human capital satisfaction shows structural problems in Nepal's migration governance. The importance of foreign labour migration conditions is highlighted by the fact that migration-related factors, such as destination country and length of stay abroad, have a considerable impact on

satisfaction with financial and physical capital.

However, social capital is still poor, with the majority of households reporting low levels of community involvement and social support, suggesting that social cohesiveness is not always strengthened by economic improvements. Positive perceptions of environmental capital imply less reliance on natural resources. Improved living standards are confirmed by income analysis, which reveals that household and per capita earnings are higher than national norms. In conclusion, the study shows that labour migration improves livelihoods in several ways, highlighting the necessity of policies that support social capital, skill development, and profitable investment in order to guarantee sustainable livelihood outcomes. This study suggests that migrant workers are better to taken vocational training before visiting, and expanding social ties with the respective communities. Future researchers would be better served by using mixed-methods and longitudinal approaches across larger metropolitan contexts and comparing with rural setting and to better capture the large sample size of migrant worker households.

References

- Acharya, C. P., & Leon-Gonzalez, R. (2014). How do migration and remittances affect human capital investment? *The Journal of Development Studies*, *50*(3), 444–460. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2013.858122>
- Adger, W. N., Kelly, P. M., Winkels, A., Huy, L. Q., & Locke, C. (2002). Migration, remittances, livelihood trajectories, and social resilience. *Ambio*, *31*(4), 358–366.
- Adhikari, J. (2011). Labour migration and remittances in Nepal. *International Migration*, *49*(4), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2435.2010.00639.x>
- Adhikari, R., Ghimire, S., & Kandel, M. (2024). Foreign employment and remittance utilization patterns in Nepal. *Journal of Migration Studies*, *10*(1), 45–63.
- Bhandari, P. (2024). Remittances, labor supply, and agricultural productivity in Nepal. *Economic Journal of Development Issues*, *28*(1), 1–17.

- Chambers, R., & Conway, G. (1992). *Sustainable rural livelihoods: Practical concepts for the 21st century* (IDS Discussion Paper No. 296). Institute of Development Studies.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
- de Haas, H. (2010). Migration and development: A theoretical perspective. *International Migration Review*, 44(1), 227–264. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2009.00804.x>
- Dhakal, S., Poudel, S., & Acharya, B. (2025). Macroeconomic contribution of remittances to Nepal's economy. *South Asian Economic Journal*, 26(1), 88–105.
- Department for International Development (DFID). (2002). *Sustainable livelihoods guidance sheets*. DFID.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Pearson.
- International Labour Organization. (2025). *Global estimates on migrant workers*. ILO.
- International Organization for Migration. (2019a). *Migration in Nepal: A country profile*. IOM.
- Karim, R., Hossain, M., & Rahman, S. (2025). Determinants of international labour migration in South Asia. *Asian Population Studies*, 21(2), 176–194.
- Khanal, S. (2023). Remittance use and land acquisition behavior in Nepal. *Journal of Rural Development Studies*, 5(2), 23–39.
- Kilkey, M., & Palenga-Möllenbeck, E. (2016). Family life and migration. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 8(4), 475–492. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12165>
- Kollmair, M., Manandhar, S., Subedi, B., & Thieme, S. (2006). New figures for old stories: Migration and remittances in Nepal. *Migration Letters*, 3(2), 151–160.
- Lee, E. S. (1966). A theory of migration. *Demography*, 3(1), 47–57.
- Lokshin, M., Bontch-Osmolovski, M., & Glinskaya, E. (2010). Work-related migration and poverty reduction in Nepal. *Review of Development Economics*, 14(2), 323–332. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9361.2010.00555.x>
- National Living Standards Survey (NLSS). (2022). *Nepal living standards survey IV*. Central Bureau of Statistics.
- National Labour Migration Survey (NLMS). (2022). *Nepal labour migration survey report*. Government of Nepal.
- Nepal Labour Migration Report (NLMR). (2022). *Labour migration for employment*. Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security.
- Nepal Rastra Bank. (2020). *Impact of remittance on Nepalese economy*. NRB.
- Nepal Rastra Bank. (2023). *Economic review*. NRB.
- National Statistics Office. (2022). *National population and housing census 2021*. Government of Nepal.
- Parajuli, R., Timsina, K., & Karki, D. (2024). Consumption behavior of remittance-receiving households in Nepal. *Journal of Development Policy*, 8(1), 55–71.
- Pasa, R., & Kharel, R. (2024). Remittance and rural economic development in Nepal. *Nepalese Journal of Development Studies*, 7(1), 91–108.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon & Schuster.
- Ravenstein, E. G. (1885). The laws of migration. *Journal of the Statistical Society of London*, 48(2), 167–235.
- Ravenstein, E. G. (1889). The laws of migration: Second paper. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 52(2), 241–305.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019). *Research methods for business students* (8th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Sapkota, C., Bhandari, D., & Ghimire, R. (2024). Remittances and household wellbeing in Nepal. *Economic Journal of Nepal*, 47(2), 1–18.
- Seddon, D., Adhikari, J., & Gurung, G. (2002). *Foreign labour migration and the remittance economy of Nepal*. Nepal Institute of Development Studies.
- Seddon, D., Gurung, G., & Adhikari, J. (2001). *The new Lahures: Foreign employment and remittances in Nepal*. NIDS.

- Sharma, S., Pandey, S., Pathak, D., & Sijapati-Basnett, B. (2014). *State of migration in Nepal*. Centre for the Study of Labour and Mobility.
- Shrestha, P., & Raya, M. (2024). Nepal-Malaysia labour migration corridor. *Migration and Development Review*, 6(1), 33-50.
- Stark, O., & Bloom, D. E. (1985). The new economics of labor migration. *The American Economic Review*, 75(2), 173-178.
- Thapa, R., & Acharya, S. (2017). Remittance utilization and its impact on household welfare in Nepal. *Journal of Development Economics*, 15(2), 87-101.
- Todaro, M. P. (1969). A model of labor migration and urban unemployment. *The American Economic Review*, 59(1), 138-148.
- Trask, B. S. (2022). *Global families: A sociological perspective* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Weeraratne, B. (2019). Migration, remittances, and household livelihoods. *Asian Development Review*, 36(1), 1-24.
- World Bank. (2019). *Migration and remittances: Recent developments and outlook*. World Bank.