

Lijy Dominic “International male migration and its impact on left behind women in Kerala – A study of Malappuram district.” Thesis. Research and Post Graduate Department of Economics, St. Thomas’ College (Autonomous), Thrissur, University of Calicut, 2021.

---

**Profile of the study area and socio-economic  
and psychological wellbeing**

## CHAPTER 4

### PROFILE OF THE STUDY AREA AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND PSYCHOLOGICAL WELLBEING

Socio-economic characteristics means a complex of attitude that are inter related but don't form a single dimension. The socio- economic status of a person refers to his/her social position in group or the society to which he or she belongs. Socio-economic is an umbrella term to cover a wide variety of inter-related social and economic factors that might tent to explain an observed phenomena, event or set of event (Banks and Davies, 1995). This section focuses on the profile of the study area and the socio-economic, demographic and psychological characteristics of migrant and non-migrant households. This chapter starts with a brief profile of Malappuram district the study area and followed by the socio-economic and psychological wellbeing profile of the respondents.

The chapter proceeds in the following pattern as 6 sections.

#### **4.1 Description about sample area and sample profile**

The area selected for the study is Malappuram district in Kerala, since it is having largest number of male migrants so it is best suited for the present study. The socio economic and geographical details of the district are given. Then the particular sample profile is considered. Data collection and problems faced during data collection are also mentioned in this section.

#### **4.2 General information about the respondents**

This section includes Socio-economic characteristics such as area of residence, religion, caste, family type, family size, APL-BPL categorization; number of earning members, family income etc. are considered. The age, education, occupation and years of schooling of the respondent and spouse are also included in this section. In addition to this the education and occupation status of the respondents parents are also discussed in this section. Thus general socio- economic characteristics of respondents are understood by this.

#### **4.3 Housing status and material possession of the respondents**

This section includes items which help us to understand respondent's housing status and ownership of land. This section also includes the details of household durables owned by the respondents. Details regarding type of ownership, owner of the house, type and size of house, fuel used cooking in the house, house plot area, details about activities like house construction, renovation and land purchase, Period of house construction, amount spend on it, source of amount, ownership of properties other than house by the respondent and husband, the area and activity in that land etc. are included in this section. This section reflects the life style of the respondents.

#### **4.4 Consumption expenditure of the respondents**

Here total monthly consumption expenditure of the respondents, details about education and health expenditure, details about amount, frequency and shopping place of cloths, beauty parlour and health club visits etc. along with detailed expenditure priority ranking of the respondents was done and analyzed in this section. The consumer culture among the respondents can be understood from this section.

#### **4.5 Saving, investments and debt details of the respondents.**

This section explore into the saving, investment and debt details of the households in the sample Details regarding amount and type of savings, amount and type of investments, amount, sources, purpose and expected period of repayment of debt etc. are explained statistically in this section. This gives us a picture about the respondent's economic habits and the attitude of migrant and non-migrant households towards those economic activities.

#### **4.6 Psychological wellbeing of the respondents**

In this section the psychological wellbeing of the respondents is scientifically tested using Ryff's Psychological wellbeing (18 items). Here 6 sub scale items- autonomy, environment mastery, personal growth, positive relation, purpose in life, self-acceptance are examined for the women in migrant and non-migrant households and statistically analyzed using various statistical tests.

## **4.1 Description of sample area and sample profile**

This section details with the selected study area and the sample profile is examined.

### ***4.1.1 Profile of the study area***

The survey was conducted in Malappuram district, which is one of the 14 districts in Kerala. The district is having largest concentration of male migrants. About one thirds of the households in Malappuram district are direct beneficiaries of foreign remittances. There for this district is most appropriate for the present study.

This is the third largest district in Kerala in terms of area (3550 sq. kms). The district is located with Arabian Sea on the west, Nelagiris of Tamil Nadu in the east, Kozhikode and Wayanad district in the north and Trissur and Palakkad in the south.

Malappuram became a part of Indian republic since 1947. But as a separate district Malappuram formulated in June 16<sup>th</sup> 1969. Malappuram district consist of 3 land forms –low land, mid land and high land. Coastal area bounded by Arabian Sea at the west forms the low land. Ponnani, Tirur, and Tiruragadi taluks is in this region which is highly populated. Hilly area bounded by Western Ghats at the east represented by Nilambur taluk is example for high land. This is a hilly area with lots of forests. Mid land lies in between low land and high land. Geographically Ernad and Perintalmanna Taluk are located in the mid land.

Malappuram district consist of two revenue divisions –Tirur and Perintalmanna. There are 138 villages and seven taluks in these two divisions. There are 94 Grama panchayath under the 15 blocks which belongs to rural sector and 12 Municipalities in urban administrative sector. According to 2011 census 44.18 percent lives in urban regions of the district and 55.82 percent lives in rural areas of villages.

**Table: 4.1 Socio-economic and geographical details of the district**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Malappuram</b>	<b>Kerala</b>
Area	3554 km 2	38863 km 2
Population	4112920	33406061
Proportion of India/Kerala population	12.3	2.76% in India
Density of Population	1157 per sq kms	860 persons per sq. kms
Literacy	93.57	93.91
Male literacy	95.76	96.02
Female literacy	91.62	91.98
Population growth rate	13.45	4.6
Rural population percentage	55.82	52.3
Urban population percentage	44.18	47.72
Sex ratio	1096	1084
Hindu population percent in total Population	27.60	54.73
Muslim population percent in total population	70.24	26.56
Christian population percent in total population	1.98	18.38
Work participation rate	25.83 (lowest among other districts)	34.78
Male- Work participation rate	45.82	57.8
Female- Work participation rate	7.63(lowest among other district)	24.8
NSDP Per Capita Income (2018-19)	Rs.94012 Lowest among other districts	US\$ 2900 (Rs.204105) 6 <sup>th</sup> Rank
Total number of households	793999	7853754
Rural households	448037	4149641
Urban households	345962	3704113
PCI	39005	60536

Source: Malappuram district hand book, Kerala Economic review, Panchayath Level Statistics-2011, Economic and Statistics Department, Malappuram, Census Report-2011.

#### 4.1.2 Profile of the sample area

We have chosen Malappuram district purposively as our study area. The previous chapter shows the importance and reason behind choosing Malappuram district for the present study. After having a brief description about the general features of Malappuram district, we now pass on to the general characteristics of the sample area. For the selection of sample area, a systematic random sampling method was used. Therefore 6 Grama panchayaths and 4 Municipalities out of 94 grama panchayath and 12 municipalities in Malappuram district were randomly chosen. Details of the randomly chosen municipalities and gram panchayats are given below.

**Table: 4.2 Some basic demographic indicators of sample**

Place (Municipality/ Panchayat)	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	Population	Density (Per Sq.km)	Total no. of Wards	Total number of Households	Ward taken in sample	Block	Taluk	Rural /Urban
Perintalmanna (M)	34.41	49723	1445	31	10287	27	Perintalmanna	Pmna	Urban
Malappuram (M)	33.61	68127	2083	40		17	Malappuram	Eranad	Urban
Tirur(M)	16.55	56058	3400	35	10559	29	Tirur	Tirur	Urban
Kottakal(M)	20.45	44382		32	8488	20	Kottakal	Tirur	Urban
Angadippuram (GP)	38.50	56451	1466.26	23	9825	12	Perintalmanna	Pmna	Rural
Kalpakancheeri (GP)	16.25	33721	2075.14	19	6198	9	Kuttippuram	Tirur	Rural
Koottilagadi (GP)	21.5	36602	1699.26	19	7005	7	Mankada	Pmna	Rural
Kuruva(GP)	5.77	45354	1267.93	22	8513	19	Mankada	Pmna	Rural
Vengara(GP)	18.66	48600	2604.50	23	8506	10	Vengara	Tirurangadi	Rural
Thuvooor (GP)	31.38	40297	1284.16	17	8300	4	Kalikavu	Nilambur	Rural

Source: Panchayats, Block and Municipality level statistics from corresponding offices.

**Table: 4.3 Total number of NRK in the sample**

<b>Municipality/Panchayath</b>	<b>Number of Households having NRI</b>	<b>Total NRI</b>
Kottakkal (M)	2914	3802
Perintalmanna(M)	2518	3419
Tirur (M)	3548	4709
Malappuram (M)	3674	4636
Kalpakancheri	3178	4211
Koottilagadi	2293	2819
Kuruva	2962	3648
Angadippuram	2528	3220
Vengara	3974	5152
Thuvoor	1382	1622

Source: Pravasi Malayali Census-2015, Vol.2, Economic and Statistical Department Kerala.

#### ***4.1.3 Profile of the sample***

This section focuses on the samples selected for the study. For this purpose of study the primary data collected from the selected households have been analyzed. In this study women belonging to families experiencing male out-migration were the unit of analysis. For the strength of study those women without experiencing male out migration were also considered as a unit of analysis. Therefore there are two categories of women in the study, one living with her husband they are wives of non-migrants and the other not living with her husband that is wives of migrants. The second category is called left behind women in the study.

As stated earlier, 6 panchayats and 4 municipalities were randomly selected from 94 panchayats and 12 municipalities in Malappuram district. One ward from each selected municipalities and panchayats were taken at random. Then list out all households in each selected wards as migrants and non-migrants households. After that 15



households from each category were selected randomly. Thus a sample of 150 migrant household and 150 non migrant households are got. Thus the total number of samples for the study becomes 300.

#### ***4.1.4 Details of data collection***

Data collection for the study was conducted during the months of Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb and March 2018. A structured questionnaire was prepared in English for academic purpose and also in Malayalam to facilitate the respondents. A pretesting of the questionnaire was conducted before the actual survey. 20 wives, 10 from migrant household and 10 from non-migrant households were given the questionnaire. After checking the response of the respondents necessary modifications were done in order to get better response.

The researcher personally collected data for the present study. The respondents were contacted at their home. A face to face interview was conducted by the interviewer. One interview lasted for about 45minutes. It took about 6 months to collect the data.

#### ***4.1.5 Problems faced during data collection***

During data collection the researcher faced many problems. The sample households were randomly selected after dividing the total households into migrant and non-migrant households in each randomly selected ward. Thus the distance between sample households was large. Thus it took lot of time for travel especially in the case of rural samples. Also there were cases that the respondent absent when researcher went there for interview. So that the researcher had to visit there again.

Another main task was that to convince the respondent about the interview. The researcher had to spend a lot of time to explain the purpose of the study. Because in many cases the respondent were unwilling to let the researcher to interview them. Sometimes Anganawadi teachers and Asha workers of that locality accompanied the researcher in the data collection in order to convince the respondents about the survey. Many of the young respondents were under the control of their mother-in-laws and some of them were forced to answer the questions in the questionnaire in front of them. Since most of the mother-in-laws were illiterate, thus to convince them about the details of the survey was difficult. There were even cases that the researcher was suspected by the respondents and their family as thief.

## **Socio-economic and psychological profile of the sample**

In the study the respondents are women. Those women were divided into two categories that are wives of migrants and wives of non-migrants. Women belonging to families experiencing male out migration for at least 5 years were the focus of the study. But for the proper understanding of the socio-economic and psychological background of those women, women who live with husband are also considered. This will help us to form a clear picture about both the situations and it will serve in drawing appropriate conclusions. Therefore brief descriptions of personal profile of the respondents are required. Here is an attempt to understand the socio - economic and psychological wellbeing of the respondents.

### **4.2 General Information about the Respondents**

As stated earlier, the sample size is 300. The selection of municipalities and panchayats were randomly made, and thus 6 panchayats and 4 municipalities in Malappuram district were taken. Thus the 120 households selected from municipal area represent the urban samples and those 180 households selected from various panchayats represent the rural samples. From each urban and rural category equal number of migrant and non-migrant households was taken. It was thought that selecting equal number of households from each group would make the comparison more meaningful.

#### ***4.2.1 Distribution of the Sample by social variables like Locality, Religion, Social Category, Family type and Family Size***

Social variables such as locality of residence, religion, social category/ caste, family type and family size of the respondents are examined.

Table 4.4 **Distribution of sample according to Social variables such as Locality, Religion, Social Category, Family type and Family Size**

Social variables	Migrant HH		Non migrant HH		Total	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
<b>Locality</b>						
Rural	90	60.0	90	60.0	180	60.0
Urban	60	40.0	60	40.0	120	40.0
<b>Religion</b>						
Hindu	28	18.7	48	32.0	76	25.3
Muslim	115	76.6	93	62.0	208	69.3
Christian	7	4.7	9	6.0	16	5.3
Chi Square	$\chi^2 = 7.480^*$ ; p-value = 0.020, * significant at 0.05 level					
<b>Social Category</b>						
Gen	24	16.0	21	14.0	45	15.0
SC	4	2.7	15	10.0	19	6.3
OBC	122	81.3	114	76.0	236	78.7
<b>Family type</b>						
Joint Family	52	34.7	42	28	94	31.3
Nuclear	98	65.3	108	72	206	68.7
Chi-Square	$\chi^2 = 1.549^{ns}$ ; p-value = 0.213, ns non-significant					
<b>Family Size</b>						
1--4	53	35.3	48	32.0	101	33.7
5--8	79	52.7	80	53.3	159	53.0
Above 8	18	12.0	22	14.7	40	
Chi-Square	$\chi^2 = 0.654^{ns}$ ; p-value = 0.721, ns non-significant					
<b>Total</b>	150	100	150	100	300	100

Source: Survey Data, HH denotes households

Samples for the study are selected from urban and rural areas because regional variations may influence the thoughts and attitudes of respondents. In this study respondents are taken from urban and rural localities of Malappuram district. Respondents taken from Perintalmanna, Tirur, Kottakkal, and Malappuram Municipalities represents urban samples and those taken from Grama panchayats of Koottilagadi, Kuruva, Kalpakancheri, Thuvour, Vengara and Angadippuram represents rural sample.

60% of total sample belong to rural and the rest 40 % belong to urban sample. That is 90 and 60 samples each from migrant and non-migrant households from rural and urban respectively. According to 2011 census in Malappuram district 44.18 percent of population lives in urban regions of the district and 55.82 lives in rural areas of villages. The rural-urban proportion in Malappuram district is similar to the sample.

The study area Malappuram is the only Muslim majority district in Kerala with largest number of emigrants. Among migrants 77 percent are Muslims and in non-migrants it is only 62 percent. While in case of Hindus only 19 percent are migrants and 32 percent are in non-migrant category and among Christians 5 percent are migrants and 6 percent are non-migrants. Thus it is clear that Muslims shows greater tendency towards migration. Chi- square ( $\chi^2$ ) test was done to check whether religion wise distribution of migrants and non-migrants are same or not. Chi-square value ( $\chi^2 = 7.480$ ) was found to be significant at 5 percent level which indicates that there is difference in the religious distribution among migrants and non-migrants. In the total sample, 69.3 percent of the respondents are Muslims and 25.3 percent are Hindus and 5.3 percent are Christians. This is similar to the religious composition of population in Malappuram district according to Census-2011, that is 27.60 % Hindus, 70.24 % Muslims and 1.98% Christians. General and SC population falls below OBC category in the sample. This is because about 70 percent of samples are Muslims and all of them come under OBC category.

Distribution of respondents by their caste shows that the general category is only 15% in the sample followed by 6.3 SC population remaining 78.7 percent are OBC. SC category is more in non-migrants when compared to migrants. All other categories are almost similar in migrants and non- migrants. Since Muslims category is considered as OBC, in our sample majority of samples come in this category.

Family is an important institution which acts as a basic support system for the all-round development an individual. Role of family in migration also very relevant. Family and relatives plays a major role in providing protection and support to the wife and children left behind it also supports the migrant to meet the cost of migration during his initial stage of migration. In the total sample households, about 68 percent belong to nuclear family and 32 percent belong to joint family. In the migrant households 35 percent belongs to joint and 65 percent nuclear families. Where as in the case of non-migrant households there are only 28 percent in joint family and 72 percent belongs to nuclear family.  $\chi^2$  results is non- significant which indicates that the distribution of sample according to type of family are same in migrant and non-migrant samples.

Size of family means total number of members in the family. The sample, size of family ranges in between 2 to 14 with an average size 5.78. It is classified into three categories and the classification according to that is given in Table 4.4. In the sample 53 percent is having family size 5-8 while 34 percent is having 2-4 family size, 13 percent having family size above 8. This is almost similar to the family size in Malappuram which is 5.2 and that of state average is 4.7percent. 53 percent of migrant households are in 5-8 family size it is almost same in the case of non-migrant households.  $\chi^2$  results are found to be non-significant which indicates that the distribution of sample according to size of family is same in migrant and non-migrant samples.

#### ***4.2.2 Distribution of sample according to some economic variables***

Economic variables such as ration card category, details of earning members, distribution of monthly income of the respondents are examined.

**Table 4.5 Distribution of sample according to Economic variables such as nature of ration card, number of earning members and monthly income.**

Economic variables	Migrant HH		Non-Migrant HH		Total	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
<b>Category APL/BPL</b>						
APL	123	82.0	105	70.0	228	76.0
BPL	27	18.0	45	30.0	72	24.0
Total	150	100.0	150	100.0	300	100.0
$\chi^2 = 5.921^*$ ; p-value = 0.015						
<b>No. of earning members</b>						
1	38	25.3	87	58.0	125	41.7
2	68	45.3	25	16.7	93	31.0
More than 2	44	29.3	38	25.3	82	27.3
<b>Monthly income (in Rs)</b>						
Less than or equal to 10000	0	0.0	6	4.0	6	2.0
10001-20000	0	0.0	71	47.3	71	23.70
20001-50000	10	6.7	62	41.3	72	24.0
50001-100000	76	50.7	10	6.7	86	28.7
100001-200000	51	34.0	1	0.7	52	17.3
2 lakhs and above	13	8.7	0	0.0	13	4.3
Chi square = 226.284*; P-value < 0.001						
Total	150	100	150	100	300	100

\* significant at 0.05 level

Source: survey data

Ration card category is one of the most important factors which help us to understand the economic level of the respondents. Total respondents are classified into two categories APL card holders and BPL card holders. Ration card category is one of the most important factors which help us to understand the economic level of the respondents. Total respondents are classified into two categories APL card holders and BPL card holders.

Out of 300 samples 76 percent belongs to APL category and rest 24 percent belong to BPL category. 70 percent of non-migrant households and 82 percent of migrant households belongs to APL category.  $\chi^2$  value (5.921) was found to be significant at 5 percent level which indicates that there is difference in the distribution of APL and BPL households among migrants and non-migrants. It is

found that BPL category is less in migrant households when compared to non-migrant households. Chi-square test was done to check whether the categorization of migrants and non-migrants in the ration card are same or not. Chi-square value ( $\chi^2 = 5.921$  and p value = 0.015) was found to be significant at 1 percent level which indicates that there is difference in the number of people in APL and BPL categories among migrants and non-migrants.

The number of earning members in a family is very much important when considering the economic status of the households. 25 percent in migrant households and 58 percent in non-migrant households have only single earning member and 45 percent in migrant households and 17 percent in non-migrant households have two earning members while 29 percent migrant households and 25 percent non-migrant households do have more than two earning members.

Income is one of the most important factors which help us to understand the economic status of the families. In migrant family remittances play a vital role in income, which makes a major difference in the distribution of income between migrants and non-migrants. The level of income was grouped into 6 six categories as starting from 10000, 10001 – 20000, 20001 – 50000, 50001 – 100000, 100001 – 200000, 200000 and above. Monthly income of migrants and non-migrants show very significant difference. 48 percent of non-migrants income ranges between 10000 to 20000 and 40 percent of them ranges between 20001 to 50000. While in the case of migrants 51 percent ranges from 50000 to 100000 and 34 percent ranges from 100001 to 200000. There is no migrants in the first category (less than or equal to 10000) and there is no non-migrants in the last category. (Above 2 lakhs). Chi square test was done to prove statistically the difference in the monthly income of migrants and non-migrants.  $X^2$  value (226.284 and P-value < 0.001) was found to be significant at 1 percent which indicates that there is difference in the income distribution among migrants and non-migrants.

#### ***4.2.3 Distribution based on Age, Education and Occupation of the respondents***

Age, education and occupation of the respondents are examined in detail.

**Table: 4.6 Distribution based on Age, Education and Occupation of the respondents**

Age education and occupation	Women in Migrant HH		Women in Non-migrant HH		Total	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
<b>Age</b>						
21-30	31	20.7	37	24.7	68	22.7
31-40	47	31.3	62	41.3	109	36.3
41-50	68	45.3	38	25.3	106	35.3
51-60	4	2.7	13	8.7	17	5.7
<b>Education</b>						
No formal education	0	0.0	18	12.0	18	6.0
SSLC	25	16.7	51	34.0	76	25.3
Plus Two	27	18.0	39	26.0	66	22.0
Degree	46	30.6	33	22	79	26.4
P.G	52	34.7	9	6	61	21
<b>Years of schooling</b>						
1-5	0	0.0	6	4.0	6	2.0
6-10	20	13.3	60	40.0	80	26.7
11-15	68	45.3	66	44.0	134	44.7
16-20	62	41.3	18	12.0	80	26.7
<b>Occupation Status</b>						
Govt/Quasi Govt	28	18.7	9	6.0	37	12.3
Private	48	32.0	9	6.0	57	19.0
Daily wage/Coolie	0	0.0	9	6.0	9	3.0
Self employed	4	2.7	3	2.0	7	2.3
No Occupation	70	46.6	120	80.0	190	63.4
<b>Total</b>	150	100	150	100	300	100

Source: survey data

Age is one of the important factor which can influence factors like education, occupation, income, size of family etc. Age structure of the respondents is classified into four categories. Out of 300 respondents about 70 percent belongs to age group 31 to 50. In migrant category 45 percent belong to 41 to 50 age group where as in non-migrants it is 36 percent. In both categories very few are there in the category 51 to 60.

Education is another important factor to be discussed in the study. Own educational qualification of the respondent increase her own self confidence which reflect in all



her activities inside and outside the home. In the absence of husband left behind women have to take many decisions and judgments regarding financial, mobility and many other matters. The education qualification of the respondents is grouped into 5 groups. First with no formal education, second SSLs and below, third plus two, fourth degree, fifth post- graduation. We can see significant difference in educational qualification among migrants and non- migrant women. There is no single respondent in migrant category with no formal education. Whereas it is 12 percent in non-migrant category. There are 35 percentage post graduates in migrant category while it is only 6 percent in non-migrants. From this we can understand that migrant women have more educational attainment when compared to non-migrant women. Educational attainment by number of years of schooling is also collected.

Economic status of the individual is determined by their occupation. Gainful employment assures women more decision making power in various areas. A substantial contribution to family budget gives women economic independence and an opportunity to participate in family decision making. The above table shows that there is significant difference among migrants and non- migrants in their occupational status. 80 percent in non-migrants and 47 percent in migrant are not engaged in any particular occupation, they continue to be house wives and managing the family only. In daily wage category 6 percent is reported in non-migrant household, where as in migrant households, nobody is engaged in daily wage or coolie. The table indicates that women in migrant households shows favorable attitude towards going out for jobs.

#### ***4.2.4 Details about the age, education and occupation of the respondent's spouse***

The objective of the present study is to determine the impact of international male migration on the empowerment of left behind women. In this study women in families whose husbands are migrated abroad for job were the unit of analysis but along with those left behind women, women who are living with husbands are also considered for meaningful comparison. Now the personal details of the husbands who are abroad of those left behind women and details of husbands living along with the women is given.

**.Table: 4.7 Distribution based on Age, Education and Occupation of the respondent's spouse**

Age education and occupation of spouse	Women in Migrant HH		Women in Non-migrant HH		Total	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
<b>Age</b>						
21-30	5	3.3	19	12.7	24	8.0
31-40	37	24.7	51	34.0	88	29.3
41-50	94	62.7	47	31.3	141	47.0
51-60	14	9.3	33	22.0	47	15.7
<b>Education</b>						
No formal education	6	4.0	21	14.0	27	9.0
SSLC	36	24.0	75	50.0	111	37.0
Plus Two	43	28.7	27	18.0	70	23.3
Degree	46	30.6	21	14	67	22.4
P.G	19	12.7	6	4	25	8.3
<b>Years of schooling</b>						
1-5	11	7.3	15	10.0	26	8.7
6-10	44	29.3	81	54.0	125	41.7
11-15	72	48.0	42	28.0	114	38.0
16-20	23	15.3	12	8.0	35	11.7
<b>Occupation Status</b>						
Govt/Quasi Govt	0	0	12	8.0	12	4.0
Private	24	16.0	18	12.0	42	14.0
Daily wage/Coolie	0	0	45	30.0	45	15.0
Self employed	17	11.3	45	30.0	62	20.7
Professionals	18	12.0	6	4.0	24	8.0
Agricultural activities	0	0	9	6.0	9	3.0
Trained technical jobs	45	30.0	6	4.0	51	17.0
Untrained technical job	46	30.7	9	6.0	55	18.3
<b>Total</b>	150	100	150	100	300	100

Source: survey data

Age of respondents husband is calculated and classified in order to check whether it influence women in any manner. Here we classify age structure in four classes. Major age category in which husband's included is 41 to 50 category. 22 percent in non-migrants includes in 51 to 60 age group while it is only 9 percent in migrant men.

Educational qualification of the spouse will definitely influence the behaviour pattern of the respondents. Here an attempt was done to evaluate the educational status of the spouse of the respondent. The education qualification of the respondents is grouped into 5 groups. First with no formal education, second SSLS and below, third plus two, fourth degree, fifth post- graduation. From the above table it is clear that higher level of education is more in migrants compared to non-migrants in the sample. In case of migrants 31 percent is having degree and 13 percent had post-graduation while it is 14 percent and 4 percent respectively in case of non-migrants.

The educational attainment was also calculated according to the number of years gone to school. This helped the educational analysis in the study.

The economic status of the households depends upon the occupational status of the husbands. Here we classify occupations into eight categories. They are government job, private company jobs, daily wage, self-employed or business, professionals, agricultural activities, trained technical jobs and untrained technical jobs. From the classified data it is clear that among migrants about 60 percent are engaged in technical jobs either trained or untrained and it is only 10 percent in non-migrants. But in the case of non-migrants about 60 percent are engaged in daily wage and self-employed category while it is only 11 percent in migrant category.

#### **4.2.5 Details regarding the marital duration of the respondents**

Year after marriage is ranges in between 3 to 33 years in the sample respondents. It is classified into five groups and the distribution according to that is given in Table . 4.8

**Table 4.8 Distribution of respondents according to their marital duration**

Response	Migrant		Non-migrant		Total	
	No	Per cent	No	Per cent	No	Per cent
≤ 10	16	10.7	42	28.0	58	19.3
11-15	47	31.3	18	12.0	65	21.7
16-20	63	42.0	48	32.0	111	37.0
21-25	24	16.0	21	14.0	45	15.0
Above 25	0	0	21	14.0	21	7.0
Total	150	100	150	100	300	100
$\chi^2 = 47.821^{**}$ ; p-value < 0.001						

*\*\* significant at 0.01 level, Source: Survey data*

Majority respondents are in the group 16 – 20 years of marital duration. And there is no single respondent in migrant category in the group of above 25 years of marital duration, while percent of non-migrants are in this category.

X<sup>2</sup> value (47.821 with p-value 0.001) was found to be significant at 1 percent level of significance which indicates that there is notable difference in the distribution of marital duration among migrants and non-migrants. Less than 10 years of marital duration and more than 25 years of marital duration is less in migrants when compared to non-migrants.

#### **4.2.6 Family background of the respondents**

Since the present study is about the determinants of empowerment of women in the study area. The respondents in the study are all married women from both migrant and non-migrant households. So the details about respondents own family where she was born is also considered. The employment and educational status of respondents own parents were collected because it may influence their present behavior.

**Table No 4.9 Education and Employment status of the parents of the respondents**

Family background of the respondent	Father				Mother			
	Migrant		Non-migrant		Migrant		Non-migrant	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
Not alive	14	9.3	5	3.3	3	2	2	1.3
No formal education	4	2.7	15	10	8	5.3	2	1.3
SSLC or below	104	69.3	86	57.3	114	76	108	72
Plus two	8	5.3	5	3.3	17	11.3	37	24.7
Degree and above	20	13.3	39	26.0	8	5.3	1	0.7
<b>Occupation</b>								
Employed	20	13.3	35	23.3	80	53.3	124	82.6
Unemployed	116	77.3	110	73.3	67	44.7	24	16
Not alive	14	9.3	5	3.3	3	2	2	1.3
Total	150	100	150	100	150	100	300	100

Source: Survey data

The above table shows that there is significant difference among migrants and non-migrants in their occupational status. 80 percent in non-migrants and 47 percent in migrant are not engaged in any particular occupation, they continue to be house wives and managing the family only. In daily wage category 6 percent is reported in non-migrant household, where as in migrant households, nobody is engaged in daily wage or coolie. The table indicates that women in migrant households shows favorable attitude towards going out for jobs.

### **4.3 Housing Status and Material Possession of Respondents**

#### ***4.3.1 Housing Status***

Housing status is an identification symbol showing the economic affluences. Type of house is considered as an important indicator about an individual's status in the society. In Kerala especially in Malappuram district, with large number of migrants housing status is considered as one of the most important determinant of social status and economic prosperity. Through migration, the economic status of the household may improve which gets reflected in their consumption standards, quality of housing property and income (Zachariah et al., 2002). Housing status not only help us to understand size of the house but it also gives a picture about the durables possessed and thereby the stand of living of the people live in it. While examining the impacts of migration on Kerala society, what comes immediately to mind is the huge amount of remittances which emigrants send back home, their bank deposits, the palatial houses which many migrants have built all over the Kerala, and the modern sophisticated household gadgets and electronic equipment which the migrant, households keep in their kitchens and in their living rooms. This in turn affected the standard of living of left behind women and children due to the migration of their husbands.

This section is an attempt to give an idea about the housing status and material possession of durables of left behind women in migrant households and women in non-migrant households. This aims to find out the impact of international migration on the housing status and material possession of left behind women.

In the study housing status is studied by 1) Ownership status of house that is own or rented, 2)Details regarding owner of the house, 3)Type of house, 4)Size of house, 5)Size of house plot area, 6)Period of house construction

#### 4.3.1.1 Ownership status of house

Only two categories of ownership are considered in the samples that is Own or Rented.

**Table 4.10 Details regarding ownership of house**

Ownership	Migrant		Non-migrant		Total	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
Own	142	94.7	126	84.0	268	89.3
Rented	8	5.3	24	16.0	32	10.7
Total	150	100.0	150	100.0	300	100.0
$\chi^2 = 9.955^{**}$ ; p-value = 0.003						

\*\* significant at 0.01 level

Source: survey data

In the sample taken 89.3 percent lives in their own houses only 10.7 lives in rented house. 95 percent in migrant households and 84 percent in non-migrant category lives in own house. While 12 percent in non-migrant and 5 percent migrant respondents lives in rented houses.  $\chi^2$  value (9.955 with p-value 0.003) was found to be significant at 1 percent level of significance which indicates that there is notable difference in the distribution ownership of house among migrants and non-migrants. It is found that respondents having own houses are more in migrants compared to non-migrants. While rented house is more in the case of non-migrants.

#### 4.3.1.2 Family member who own the house

The study analysis about the influence of ownership name in the status of the respondents. Unfortunately no single house is in respondent's name only both in migrant and non-migrant category.

A detail about the house ownership name of the sample respondents is shown in the table 4.11

**Table 4.11 Details about the owner of house**

Owner	Migrant		Non-migrant		Total	
	No	Per cent	No	Per cent	No	Per cent
Husband	69	48.6	72	57.1	141	52.6
Both	27	19.0	15	11.9	42	15.7
In laws	38	26.8	33	26.2	71	26.5
Others	8	5.6	6	4.8	14	5.2
Total	142	100.0	126	100.0	268	100.0

Source: survey data

In the case of ownership 52.6 percent, respondent's husbands own the house. 15.7 percent both husband and wife together own the house where as 26.5 percent ownership is in the name of their in laws. In migrant and non-migrant categories house ownership in both husband and wife name is greater in migrant households (19 percent) than in non-migrant category (11.9 percent).

#### 4.3.1.3 Type of house

Sample households are classified into four categories that is luxurious, very good, good and poor. Luxurious houses are those houses with three or more than three big bedrooms with attached bathrooms, halls and having all modern amenities. Houses with two or more small attached bed rooms and other necessities are in the category of very good home. Houses with one or two small bed rooms with common bathrooms and a small kitchen are under the category of good houses. Poor houses are those which having only less than minimum requirements.

**Table 4.12 Details about the type of house**

Type	Migrant		Non-migrant		Total	
	No	Per cent	No	Per cent	No	Per cent
Luxurious (very big or Bungalow type)	45	30.0	9	6.0	54	18.0
Very good (Big)	67	44.7	66	44.0	133	44.3
Good(Average)	38	25.3	51	34.0	89	29.7
Poor(small)	0	0.0	24	16.0	24	8.0
Total	150	100.0	150	100.0	300	100.0
$\chi^2 = 49.906^{**}$ ; p-value < 0.001						

\*\* significant at 0.01 level

Source: survey data

In the total survey data about 44.3 percent lives in very good houses, 30 percent lives in good houses, 18 percent lives in luxurious houses and 8 percent lives in poor houses.  $\chi^2$  test was done to check whether standard of housing of migrants and non-migrants are same or not.  $\chi^2$  value (49.906) was found to be significant at 1 percent which indicates that there is difference in the standard of housing among migrants and non-migrants. 30 percent of migrant houses are luxuries houses and in that only 8.7 percent are of non-migrant houses. Whereas 18 percent houses in non-migrant category is poor houses while no such houses can be seen in the migrant category.

#### 4.3.1.4 Details about the size of house

Details about the size of house are given in table: 12. Here size of house is categorized in square feet into 5 categories that is below 1000, 1001 to 1500, 1501 to 2000, 2001 to 2500 and 2500 and above.

**Table 4.13 Details about the size of house**

Size (Sq. Feet)	Migrant		Non-migrant		Total	
	No	Per cent	No	Per cent	No	Per cent
≤ 1000	18	12.7	24	19.0	42	15.7
1001-1500	33	23.2	12	9.5	45	16.8
1501-2000	45	31.7	51	40.5	96	35.8
2001-2500	21	14.8	30	23.8	51	19.0
Above 2500	25	17.6	9	7.1	34	12.7
Total	142	100.0	126	100.0	268	100.0
Mean	1908.80		1860.71		1886.19	
SD	639.462		601.252		621.099	
t-value = 0.632 <sup>ns</sup> ; p-value = 0.528						

ns non-significant

Source: survey data

Average size of the house of migrants and non-migrants were compared using independent t-test. Its results are given in Table 14. Test statistic t-value (0.632, with p value 0.528) was found to be non-significant. This shows that there is no significant difference in the size of the house among Migrant and non-migrant. But it is evident from the above table that size of house above 2500 Sq.feet is more among migrant households (18 percent and 7 percent) and size of house below 1000 Sq.feet are more



in non-migrant households (19 percent and 13 percent). Majority in the sample are in the category of 1501 to 2000. Last category of 2500 and above is more in migrant category compared to non-migrant category. Mean square feet for migrant households are 1908.80 and that of non-migrant households are 1860.71.

#### 4.3.1.5 Details about the area of plots in which house locates.

Area of plot is categorized into 5 categories that are below 10 cents, 10 to 20 cents, 20 to 30 cents, 30 to 40 cents and 40 and above. Majority in the sample population are under the category of below 10 cents. Mean value here is 20.67 having standard deviation 51.91.

**Table 4.14 Details about area of house plot**

Area (in cents)	Migrant		Non-migrant		Total	
	No	Per cent	No	Per cent	No	Per cent
≤ 10	50	35.2	66	52.4	116	43.3
10.1-20	60	42.3	39	31.0	99	36.9
20.1-30	31	21.8	6	4.8	37	13.8
30.1-40	1	0.7	9	7.1	10	3.7
Above 40	0	0.0	6	4.8	6	2.2
Total	142	100.0	126	100.0	268	100.0
Mean	16.15		14.20		20.67	
SD	7.505		10.878		51.919	
t-value = 1.719 <sup>ns</sup> ; p-value = 0.087						

ns non-significant

Source: survey data

Average of the plot area was computed by considering that case for which the area is 500 as an outlier and the comparison was done by using independent t-test (t-value=1.719 and p-value=0.087) and the results shows that there is no significant difference in the average area of the plot among migrants and non-migrant. In migrant households 42.3 percent is having their house in 10 to 20 cents where as in non-migrant households 52.4 percent is having their house in below 10 cents. Mean of size of house plot size of migrants are 16.15 and that of non-migrant it is 25.76, the standard deviations are 7.5 and 75.13 respectively. Here the range of the total sample is 4cents and 500 cents. While that of migrants it is 5 to 40 cents and for non-migrants it is 4 to 500 cents

#### 4.3.1.6 Fuel used for cooking by the sample respondent

Most of the respondents in the sample households uses LPG for their cooking along with wood and Kerosene. Some other households uses LPG along with electricity. First category of using wood and kerosene along with LPG is a traditional way of cooking while cooking using electricity and LPG is tagged as a modern style.

**Table 4.15 Type of fuel used for cooking**

Type of fuel	Migrant		Non migrant		Total	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
Wood, Kerosene and LPG	72	48	114	76	186	62
Electricity and LPG	78	52	36	24	114	38
Total	150	100	150	100	300	100

Source: survey data

In the total sample households only 62 percent depend on wood, kerosene and LPG for cooking and 38 percent depends on LPG and electricity. In migrant households 52 percent uses LPG and electricity for cooking where as it is only 24 percent in non-migrant households. About 76 percent of non-migrant households depends on wood, kerosene and LPG for cooking it is only 48 percent migrant households. It is understood about the standard of life style from the cooking fuels used in the households. Majority of migrant (52 percent) households follows modern style of cooking while that of non-migrant(76) households follows traditional pattern.

#### 4.3.1.7 Details regarding land purchase, house construction and renovation

Respondents interest in land and house was found out by their activities like house construction, house renovation and purchase of land.

**Table 4.16 House construction and renovation among sample households**

Response	Migrant		Non-migrant		Overall	
	No	Per cent	No	Per cent	No	Per cent
No activity done	0	0.0	24	16.0	24	8.0
House Construction	113	75.3	66	44.0	179	59.7
House renovation	28	14.7	51	34.0	73	24.3
Purchase of land	8	2.7	9	6	13	4.3
Total	150	100	150	100	150	100

Source: survey data

All among the migrant household house construction, renovation and land purchase any one of the following activity were done while in non-migrant 16 percent had no such activity have been done. 75 percent of migrants and 44percent of non-migrants had house construction, 15 percent of migrants and 34 percent of non-migrants have renovated their home and very few in migrant (3 percent) and non-migrant (6 percent) had purchased land. It is remittance from abroad which enable them to do the various activities.

#### 4.3.1.8 Details regarding the period of house construction

Table 17 gives the details about the years passed after building the house which helps to understand the age of the house in which they live. About 64.6 percent is having constructed the house less than 10 years.

**Table 4.17 Years passed after building the house**

Year passed	Migrant		Non-migrant		Total	
	No	Per cent	No	Per cent	No	Per cent
≤ 10	98	69.0	75	59.5	173	64.6
10.1-20	18	12.7	30	23.8	48	17.9
20.1-30	3	2.1	15	11.9	18	6.7
30.1-40	7	4.9	6	4.8	13	4.9
Above 40	16	11.3	0	0.0	16	6.0
Total	142	100.0	126	100.0	268	100.0
Mean	14.46		12.50		13.54	
SD	16.50		8.525		13.37	
t-value = 1.244 <sup>ns</sup> ; p-value = 0.215						

ns non-significant

Source: survey data

The mean age of the house in the total sample population is 13.54 years with standard deviation 13.37. For migrants it is 14 .46 and for non-migrants it is 12.40 years. Range in the total sample is 2 and 60 years. The comparison was done by using independent t-test (t-value=1.244 and p-value=0.215) and the results shows that there is no significant difference in the average age of house among migrants and non-migrant.

#### 4.3.1.9 Details about the amount spent on land purchase, house construction and renovation

Amount spent on house is considered one of the major factors in determining the housing status of the respondents. Among migrants in Kerala especially in Malappuram district huge mansion construction is a fashion. Thus it is worthwhile to analyses the spending pattern of migrants with non-migrants. Since the respondents in this study are women knowledge about amount spent were not exactly non to them especially in case of non-migrants.

**Table 4.18 Amount spent for land purchase, house construction and renovation**

Amount spent	Migrant		Non-migrant		Overall	
	No	Per cent	No	Per cent	No	Per cent
Less than 10 Lakhs	20	13.3	54	47.4	74	28.0
10-20 Lakhs	76	50.7	30	26.3	106	40.2
Above 20 Lakhs	54	36.0	30	26.3	84	31.8
Total	150	100	114	150	264	100
Chi square value = 30.528**; p-value < 0.001						

\*\* Significant at 0.01 level

Source: survey data

When total respondents are considered about 40 percent of them spent between 10 to 20 lakhs for the purpose of land purchase, house construction and renovation activities. While in the case of non- migrants majority (47 percent) spent amount less than 10 lakhs and in case of migrants' majority (51percent) spent between10 to 20 lakhs. About 36 percent in migrant category and only 26 percent in non-migrant category spent above 20 lakhs for these activities. X<sup>2</sup> test was done to prove statistically the difference in the amount spend by migrants and non-migrants. X<sup>2</sup> value (30.528) was found to be significant at 1 percent, which indicates that there is significant difference in the amount spent on land, house and house renovation among migrants and non-migrants.

#### ***4.3.1.10 Details about source of money for land purchase, house construction and renovation***

An enquiry was done among the respondents about the source of money for the land purchase, house construction and renovation activities. This shows the relevance of remittances in these activities.

**Table 4.19 Source of amount for land purchase house construction and renovation.**

Source	Migrant		Non-migrant		Overall	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
Remittance	128	85.3	0	0	128	48.5
Bank Loan and other sources	22	14.7	114	100	136	51.5
Total	150	100	114	150	264	100

Source: survey data

About 83 percent of migrants rely upon remittance while in case of non-migrants 100 percentage depend on various other sources like bank loans, relatives and friends, sale of property etc. 15 percent of migrants depend on bank loans and others of these activities.

#### ***4.3.2. Details about ownership of land property***

The details about the property ownership of respondent and her husband is discussed in the section.1) Ownership of property by husband, 2) Area of land owned by husband, 3) Activity in that land, 4) Ownership of property by the respondent, 5) Area owned by the respondent, 6) Activity in that land.

##### ***4.3.2.1 Details about ownership of land property by respondent's husband***

Below table give the details regarding the owner ship of land other than the house plot they live.

**Table 4.20 Ownership of land property by the respondent husband**

Ownership of land	Migrant		Non-migrant		Total	
	No	Per cent	No	Per cent	No	Per cent
Yes	81	54.0	39	26.0	120	40.0
No	69	46.0	111	74.0	180	60.0
Total	150	100.0	150	100.0	300	100.0
$\chi^2 = 24.500^{**}$ ; p-value < 0.001						

\*\* significant at 0.01 level

Source: survey data

In the total sample 40 percent of husbands own properties in their name other than the house they live in. It is 54 percent in migrant sample and only 26 percent in non-migrant sample. The sample indicates a wider gap between both categories regarding ownership of land other than house plot they live in. X<sup>2</sup> value (24.500 with p-value 0.001) was found to be significant at 1 percent level of significance which indicates that there is notable difference in the distribution ownership of house among migrants and non-migrants.

#### 4.3.2.2 Details of area of land owned by the respondent's husband

In the total sample 120 respondents husbands are having another land other than the house plots they live. In that about 53.3 percent is having land area less than 10 cents.

**Table 4.21 Land area owned by Respondent's Husband else where**

Area owned (cents)	Migrant		Non-migrant		Total	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
≤ 10	40	49.4	24	61.5	64	53.3
10.1-20	21	25.9	6	15.4	27	22.5
Above 20	20	24.7	9	23.1	29	24.2
Total	81	100	39	100	120	100.0
$\chi^2 = 2.058$ ; p-value < 0.357						

ns non-significant

Source: survey data

24 out of 39 of non-migrants husbands and 40 out of 81 of migrant husbands are having land area less than 10 cents. In that 25 percent of migrants and 23 percent of non-migrants are having land above 20 cents. . X<sup>2</sup> value (2.058 with p-value 0.357)

was found to be non-significant, which indicates that there is no major difference in the distribution of size of holdings among migrants and non-migrants.

#### 4.3.2.3 Details regarding activity in the land

In the total sample, 120 samples having land, 30 percent are kept their land idle. About 21 percent are constructing house in it and 33.3 are doing agricultural activities.

**Table: 4.22 Activity in the Land owned by Husband**

Activity	Migrant		Non-migrant		Total	
	No	Per cent	No	Per cent	No	Per cent
Left Idle	18	22.2	18	46.2	36	30.0
House Construction	29	35.8	15	38.4	44	26.7
Agricultural activities	34	42.0	6	15.4	40	33.3
Total	81	100	39	100	120	100.0

$\chi^2 = 10.660^{**}$ ; p-value = 0.005

\*\* significant at 0.01 level

Source: survey data

In the 120 samples having land ownership 30 percent are left idle, 27 percent are doing constructional activity and 33 percent are conducting agricultural activity.  $X^2$  value (10.660 with p-value 0.005) was found to be significant at 1 percent level of significance which indicates that there is notable difference in the activity undergoing in that land - among migrants and non-migrants.

This attempt was done to understand whether husband had any other property other than their house they live in. It also helps us to understand about the attitude of migrants and non-migrants towards investing money in land. It is 54 percent migrant males and 26 percent non migrant males are having land. From this it is clear that migrants have more interest and money to invest in land. It is also clear from the activities under gone there. 78 percent of migrant's land are put into constructional and commercial activities while in case of non-migrants majority put their land idle and only few are using it for construction and commercial activities. In this study collected information reflex a positive attitude of migrants towards investing in land and doing economic activities in that land.

#### 4.3.2.4 Details of ownership of land property by the respondents

Only 8.7 percent of total sample respondents is having property in their own name. Remaining 91.3 percent is not having any property in their own name.

**Table 4.23 Respondent own house or land else where**

Ownership of land	Migrant		Non-migrant		Total	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
Yes	8	5.3	18	12.0	26	8.7
No	142	94.7	132	88.0	274	91.3
Total	150	100.0	150	100.0	300	100.0

Source: survey data

Respondents having land property are more in non-migrant (12 percent) category compared to migrants (5.3 percent)

#### 4.3.2.5 Details of area of land owned by the respondent

In the total sample respondents both migrant and non-migrant households only 26 is having land in their own name. In that 77 percent that is 20 out of 26 is having property less than 10 cents.

**Table: 4.24 Land area owned by respondent else where**

Area owned (cents)	Migrant		Non-migrant		Total	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
≤ 10	8	100	12	66.7	20	77.0
10 - 15	0	25.9	6	33.3	6	23.0
Total	8	100	18	100	26	100.0

Source: survey data

All the 8 respondents in the migrant category and 12 out of 18 in non-migrant category is having land area less than 10 cents. Only 6 out of 18 in non –migrant respondents are having 10 to 15 cents.

#### 4.3.2.6 Details regarding activity in the land

65.4 percent of total respondents having land in their own name, kept that land idle. All the 8 respondents in the migrant households and 9 respondents in non-migrant households are kept their land idle. Others in the non-migrant category are constructing house (16.7 percent) and doing agricultural activity (33.3 percent) in their land. This attempt was done to understand whether the respondent that is wives in migrant and non-migrant category had any property in their name. Unfortunately,



only few women (8 percent) in both categories are having property in their name. While we have seen earlier many husbands (40 percent) in migrant and non-migrant households are having land other than their house they live in, in their name. This reflects role of male superiority in this regard.

### 4.3.3 Possession of household durables of the respondents

In all societies especially in migrant societies the migrant express their economic status through their housing status and material possession.

#### 4.3.3.1 Details of consumer durables owned by the respondents

The material possession of household durables among the migrant and non-migrant were asked and details on this verifies the role of migration in this regard.

**Table 4.25 Details regarding the possession of household durables among the respondents**

Items	Migrant		Non-migrant		t-value	p-value
	No	Percent	No	Percent		
Television	146	97.3	135	90.0	2.638**	0.008
Vehicles	128	85.3	111	74.0	2.463*	0.014
Air conditioner	85	56.7	39	26.0	5.675**	< 0.001
Mobile phones	150	100.0	150	100.0	-	-
Refrigerator and Mixer grinder	150	100.0	114	76.0	6.882**	< 0.001
Microwave oven	62	41.3	45	30.0	2.063*	0.039
Computer/Laptop	128	85.3	78	52.0	6.669**	< 0.001
Washing Machine	144	96.0	87	58.0	8.764**	< 0.001
Net Access	117	78.0	66	44.0	6.441**	< 0.001
Inverter	111	74.0	54	36.0	7.158**	< 0.001
Vacuum cleaner	59	39.3	18	12.0	5.706**	< 0.001
Other modern equipments	33	22.0	3	2.0	5.602**	< 0.001

\*\* significant at 0.01 level; \* significant at 0.05 level

Source: survey data

The above table indicates that vast verities of modern electrical and electronic equipment are brought by migrant households than non-migrant houses. The

comparison was done by using t-test. The results show that there is significant difference in the ownership of household durables among migrants and non-migrants. The test statistics t value was found to be significant at one percent level of significance for 9 items and significant at 5 percent level for rest 2 items. All the respondents both in migrant and non-migrant households own mobile phones .

#### ***4.3.3.2. Details regarding source of money for purchasing different household durables in the case of migrant***

In this section we enquire into the source money for purchasing the material durables. This is asked to left behind wives in order to understand the influence of remittance in the purchase of household durables.

**Table: 4.26 Source of money for purchasing household durables by migrants**

Items	Purchased by remittances		Purchased by Using other sources		Total
	No	Percent	No	Percent	
Television	100	68.5	46	31.5	146
Vehicles	118	92.2	10	7.8	128
Air conditioner	81	95.3	4	4.7	85
Mobile phones	122	81.3	28	18.7	150
Refrigerator	118	78.7	32	21.3	150
Microwave oven	58	93.5	4	6.5	62
Computer/Laptop	102	79.7	26	20.3	128
Washing Machine	124	86.1	20	13.9	144
Net Access	101	86.3	16	13.7	117
Inverter	85	76.6	26	23.4	111
Vacuum Cleaner	51	86.4	8	13.6	59
Other modern equipments	29	87.9	4	12.1	33

Source: Survey data

Majority of migrants purchased all the major household durables using remittances. Only few migrants purchased household durables using other sources or purchased them before migration. Thus the importance of remittance in the purchase of household durables is unambiguously clear.

It is evident that international migration of males played an important role in the possession of consumer durables of left behind women compared to women in non-migrant households. A major part of remittances of their husbands are used for the purchase of modern equipment which in turn reflects the socio-economic status of the migrant households and their standard of living.

It is clear from the above study that international migration had played a major role in the housing status and material possession in the migrant households when compared to non-migrant households. Remittance is used for constructing luxuries houses and purchasing costly consumer durables. International male migration and their remittances are the major factors behind this change. The actual beneficiaries of this changed atmosphere are the left behind family of the migrants mainly left behind women and their children. The left behind women moved towards new life style which can be seen in their all-round standard of living.

#### **4.4. Consumption Expenditure of the respondents**

Many studies about the economic impact of migration had revealed that migrant households have higher income, more consumption when compared to non-migrant households. The migrant areas in Malappuram district started growing very especially the development in health, education and commerce. The number of hospitals schools and commercial buildings started emerged in a large amount after 1990s. This increased the consumer culture among the people.

##### **4.4.1 Details about monthly consumption expenditure**

In this study we enquired about the monthly consumption expenditure of the respondents in migrant and non-migrant households in order to understand their consumption culture.

**Table 4.27 Monthly consumption expenditure of the respondents**

Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	p-value
Migrant	22153.33	5841.0	4.651**	< 0.001
Non migrant	18450.00	7808.3		

\*\* significant at 0.01 level

Source: Survey data

Monthly consumption expenditure of migrant households and non-migrant households was calculated and found that the mean consumption expenditure of migrant households is Rs.22153.33 and that of non-migrant households found to be Rs.18450.00. From this it is clear that migrant households have more consumption expenditure than non-migrant households. This comparison is statistically proved using independent t-test (t-value= 4.657 and p-value>0.001) and the results shows that there is significant difference in the consumption expenditure between migrant and non-migrant households.

#### 4.4.2 Details regarding respondents health and treatment

Respondents preference towards government and private hospitals for treatments was observed. The study area Malappuram district , having second largest number of private hospitals in Kerala. Perintalmanna municipality one of the area included in our sample is having many big and small private hospitals. In the study respondents inclination towards type of hospitals for treatment reflects their economic background. Because treatment expense is very high in private hospitals considering government hospitals.

**Table 4.28 Place where treatment done by the respondents**

Place of treatment	Migrant		Non-migrant		Overall	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
Govt. Hospital	22	14.7	103	68.7	125	41.7
Private hospital	128	85.3	47	31.3	175	58.3
Total	150	100	150	100	150	100
Chi square value = 89.979**; p-value < 0.001						

\*\* significant at 0.01 level

Source: Survey data

In the total sample majority (58 percent) prefer private hospitals but majority (69 percent) non-migrant households in the sample prefer government hospitals. While majority(85 percent) migrant households are interested treatments in private hospitals. Thus it is found very clear that migrants in the sample prefer private hospitals and non-migrants prefer government hospitals. The variation in preference between migrants and non-migrants are statistically established using X2 test. Chi

square test.  $X^2$  value (89.9794 with p-value 0.001) was found to be significant at 1 percent level of significance, which indicates that there is notable difference in the preference of migrants and non-migrants in their attitude towards hospitals.

#### 4.4.3 Health expenditure of the respondents

It was almost clear about the expenditure from the preference of the respondents for private and government hospitals. Expenditure for treatment in private hospitals is far high compared to government hospitals.

**Table 4.29 Place where treatment done by the respondents**

Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	p-value
Migrant	30573.33	2478.78	9.125**	< 0.001
Non migrant	6273.00	973.288		

\*\* significant at 0.01 level

Source: Survey data

The mean yearly health expenditure for migrants is Rs.30573.33 and that of non-migrants it is Rs.6273.00. . From this it is clear that migrant households have more health expenditure than non-migrant households. This comparison is statistically proved using independent t-test (t-value= 9.125 and p-value<0.001) and the results shows that there is significant difference in the health expenditure between migrant and non-migrant households.

#### 4.4.4. Details regarding respondents children's education

One of the important socio economic variable is education. The attitude of respondents towards private English medium schools and government was considered. In the study area as in the case of hospitals mentioned above the number of schools in private sector also increased after 1995. The impact of international migration on the education of children in the migrant families is clearly understood from their preference towards English medium private schools having high fees and facilities.

**Table 4.30 Place where education of children done by the respondents**

Place of education	Migrant		Non-migrant		Overall	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
Govt. school	16	10.7	114	76.0	130	43.3
Private school	134	89.3	36	24.0	170	56.7
Total	150	100	150	100	150	100
Chi square value = 130.371**; p-value < 0.001						

\*\* significant at 0.01 level

Source: Survey data

About 89 percentage of children in migrant families are studying in private schools giving high fees. While that of non-migrants it is only 24 percent. Majority (76 percent) children in non-migrant families are studying in government schools. Thus it is found very clear that migrants in the sample prefer private schools and non-migrants prefer government schools. The variation in preference between migrants and non-migrants are statistically established using X2 test. Chi square test. X<sup>2</sup> value (330.371 with p-value <0.001) was found to be significant at 1 percent level of significance, which indicates that there is notable difference in the preference of migrants and non-migrants in their attitude towards the education of children.

#### 4.4.5 Education expenditure of the respondents

The expense of education in private sector is very high compared to government sector. From the above data it is clear that majority migrants prefer education in private sector compared to non-migrants. Major portion of remittance is used for the educational expense of their children.

**Table 4.31 Education expenditure of the respondents**

Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	p-value
Migrant	55013.3	4129.60	5.488**	< 0.001
Non migrant	22193.3	4325.11		

\*\* significant at 0.01 level

Source: Survey data

The educational expense of migrants is far high compared to the non-migrants. The mean educational expense of migrants is Rs.55013.3 and that of non-migrants it is Rs. 22193.3. Special tuition fees, other course fee etc. are also included in the education expense.

#### 4.4.6 Shopping place of the respondents

As the impact of remittance many big malls and shopping complexes emerged in all municipalities and in small towns of Malappuram district in the last few years. Now in this modern world attitude towards consumer culture is fast increasing especially in the case of wives of migrants. All these malls and shopping complexes were over crowded by people, ladies and kids are the main customers there. In order to understand the shopping culture of the respondents question were asked about their shopping spots.

**Table 4.32 Visiting big mall and supermarket for shopping**

Visiting mall	Migrant		Non-migrant		Overall	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
Yes	80	53.3	54	36.0	134	44.7
No	70	46.7	96	64.0	166	55.3
Total	150	100	150	100	300	100
Chi square value = 9.117**; p-value = 0.003						

\*\* significant at 0.01 level

Source: Survey data

The table above shows that 53 percent of migrants and 36 percent non-migrants visit big malls for their stoppings. 64 percent of women in non-migrant households do not prefer big shops or malls for shopping but it is only 47 percent among migrant women who are left behind. There is clear picture of difference between migrants and non-migrants in their shopping place. This is statistically proved using Chi square test, where the  $X^2$  value (9.117 with p-value 0.003) was found to be significant at 1 percent level of significance which indicates that there is notable difference among migrants and non-migrants in the places from where they purchase various goods.

#### 4.4.7 Details about cloth purchase

Since all the direct respondents in the study are females it is worthwhile in asking about their expenditure and spending pattern on cloths, beauty parlours, cosmetics etc. Inorder to understand about the respondents preference in these matters, the frequency of cloth purchase, amount spent on it and place of purchase was investigated among the respondents.

##### 4.4.7.1 The frequency of cloth purchase

**Table 4.33 Frequency of purchase of cloth by the respondents**

Frequency	Migrant		Non-migrant		Overall	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
Monthly	8	5.3	0	0.0	8	2.7
Quarterly	23	15.3	36	24.0	59	19.7
Half yearly	24	16.0	30	20.0	54	18.0
According to occasions	87	58.0	72	48.0	159	53.0
Irregular	8	5.3	12	8.0	20	6.7
Total	150	100	150	100	300	100
Chi square value = 13.746**; p-value = 0.008						

\*\* significant at 0.01 level

Source: Survey data

The frequency of cloth purchase among the respondents shows a monthly frequency of cloth purchase in 5 percent of migrant households. Occasional purchase of cloths are high in both category that is 58 percent in migrant households and 48 percent in non-migrant households. It is evident from the table above that a higher frequency of cloth purchase can be seen among migrants compared to non-migrants. This is statistically proved using Chi square test.  $X^2$  value (13.746 with p-value 0.008) was found to be significant at 1 percent level of significance, which indicates that there is notable difference in the frequency of cloth purchase by migrants and non-migrants.

Since majority of the respondents in the sample (about 70 percent) were Muslims and are very much ahead in shopping and spending when compared to Hindus and Christians. Marriages and other celebrations are accompanied by huge amount in



spending by shopping on cloths and jewels by Muslims. Gulf remittance had made a massive increase in the cloth purchase of the respondents especially women in migrant households. The number of shops for cloths, chappels, cosmetics, and fancy items has a massive increase in the last ten years in Malappuram distict, the study area. This increased the shopping culture among all the people not only migrants.

#### 4.4.7.2 *The amount spend on cloth purchase*

**Table 4.34 Money spent yearly for cloth purchase**

Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	p-value
Migrant	16420.00	13828.42	4.319**	< 0.001
Non migrant	9700.00	13112.47		

\*\* significant at 0.01 level

Source: Survey data

The mean amount spend on cloth purchase is Rs.16420 among migrants and Rs.9700 among non-migrants.

The difference in the mean amount shows that the migrants have a higher consumption expenditure on cloths compared to non-migrants. This comparison is statistically proved using independent t-test (t-value= 4.319 and p-value>0.001) and the results with one percent level of significance shows that there is significant difference in the consumption expenditure on cloths between migrants and non-migrants.

#### 4.4.7.3 *The place of cloth purchase*

**Table 4.35 Type of shops where cloths are purchased**

Type of shops	Migrant		Non-migrant		Overall	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
Ordinary shops	24	16.0	78	52.0	102	34.0
Big Shops	75	50.0	48	32.0	123	41.0
Shops in big malls	51	34.0	24	16.0	75	25.0
Total	150	100	150	100	300	100

Source: Survey data

From the survey data it is very clear that majority respondents in migrant households prefer to buy clothes from big shop(50 percent) and shops in malls(34 percent). While that of majority non- migrants prefer ordinary shops(52 percent).Very few that is only 16 percent in non-migrants go to big malls for shopping.

#### 4.4.8 Details about respondents visits to beauty parlours

The respondents attitude towards the maintenance of fashion and fitness, was investigated through their visits in beauty parlours and health clubs.

##### 4.4.8.1 Periodicity of visits of respondents in beauty parlours and health clubs.

Unlike women in olden days now women are aware about their health and beauty. Respondents consciousness about their health, fitness and beauty is assessed by their visits in beauty parlours and health clubs.

**Table 4.36 Periodicity of visiting beauty parlour and health clubs**

Periodicity	Migrant		Non-migrant		Overall	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
Regularly	29	19.3	9	6.0	38	12.7
Rarely	25	16.7	27	18.0	52	17.3
Occasionally	35	23.3	24	16.0	59	19.7
Not visited	61	40.7	90	60.0	151	50.3
Total	150	100	150	100	300	100

Chi square value = 18.224\*\*; p-value < 0.001

\*\* significant at 0.01 level

Source: Survey data

About 50 percent respondents in the total sample are not at all visited beauty parlours or health clubs. In this only 40 percent is from migrants and majority(60 percent) in non-visited category is from non-migrants. About 19 percent in migrant category visits regularly in these places while this is only 6 percent among non-migrant category. From this it is clear that women in migrant households have more interested visiting beauty parlours and health clubs. This is statistically proved using Chi square test. X<sup>2</sup> value (18.224 with p-value 0.001) was found to be significant at 1 percent

level of significance, which indicates that there is notable difference in the frequency of beauty parlor visits among migrants and non-migrants.

#### ***4.4.8.2 Details of money spent for a single visit in beauty parlor and health club.***

Only 60 respondents among non-migrants and 89 in migrants have a regular visits to these places.

**Table 4.37 Money spent for a single visit to beauty parlour and health clubs**

Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	p-value
Migrant (n=89)	732.58	492.16	0.704 <sup>ns</sup>	0.483
Non migrant (n=60)	787.50	427.51		

ns non-significant

Source: Survey data

In that mean expense for single visit was calculated and found to be similar in both migrants and non-migrants. This similarity in comparison was statistically established. The comparison was done by using independent t-test (t-value= 0.704 and p-value=0.483) and the results shows that there is no significant difference in the average amount spent by migrants and non-migrants for a single visits in beauty parlour and health club.

This does not means that non-migrants are spending similar to migrants. This similarity is in the case of the expense incurred for a single visit. We have already found out that the frequency of visits are far higher in migrant category and it is statistically proved also. So when we calculate monthly or yearly expense in this matter it will be far higher for migrants.

#### ***4.4.9 Expenditure priority of the respondents***

Expenditure priority of the respondents in 15 different areas where asked to rank. The expenditure priority exhibits a similar pattern among the respondents. Almost all the respondents first five preference is the basic needs of the human beings, that is food, housing, education, health and cloths

**Table 4.38 Expenditure priority of the respondents**

Particulars	Migrant		Non migrant	
	Index	Rank	Index	Rank
Day to day expenses	14.15	1	14.62	1
Education of children	11.78	3	9.02	3
Pay back debt	7.6	5	8.28	4
Renovation/building new house	11.8	2	6.94	6
In business activity	1.12	15	2.4	12
Deposit in bank or others	7.2	6	2.78	10
Health care expenditure	9.77	4	11.78	2
Purchase of durables	7.17	7	8.06	5
Purchasing jewels	3.45	11	1.78	13
Entertainment	5.52	8	5.92	7
Purchase of cloths	4.76	9	5.66	8
Conduct marriage expenditure	1.96	13	0.78	14
Purchase of land	2.79	12	0.34	15
Maintain agriculture	1.19	14	2.92	9
Donation to temple/church/Mosque	3.6	10	2.66	11
Z-value = 0.909 <sup>ns</sup> ; p-value = 0.363				

*ns non-significant*

Source: Survey data

A preference index was computed for each particular by the following procedure. A total of 15 items are there to which respondents were given their preference. Respondents rank these items according to their preference. These ranks were scored as follows rank 1 is given a score of 15, rank 2 is given a score of 14 and so on rank 15 is given a score 1 and if they have not ranked the item it is given a score of zero. After giving score average score was worked out which taken as the preference index. As the index is higher the preference to that item will be more. So based on the preference index were ranked to identify for which item they give more priority.

Preference index worked out for migrant and non-migrant were compared using Wilcoxon signed rank test to examine the preference to various particulars are same or not for both the groups. Non-significant results (z-value = 0.909; p-value = 0.363) shows that the preference to different items are almost same among the migrants and non-migrants.

Expenditure priority of the respondents in 15 areas where asked to rank. It is found that the ranking came almost similar for migrants and non-migrants. All the

respondents irrespective of migrant or non-migrant households ranked first for daily expenses. Education expenditure, health expenditure, house construction expenditure, expenditures on cloths, debt repayments etc. are the items which are higher ranked by the respondents.

Here only the preference or ranks of the respondents are asked and not the amount spends on each. Details on the amount spent on each item were discussed earlier.

#### 4.4.10 Details regarding not ranking preference for certain items

There were 15 items or particulars given to mark the respondent's preferences in ranks. But all the items were not considered by the respondents. Thus the reason was asked to the respondents for their indifference in ranking their preference for certain items.

**Table 4.39 Reasons for not ranking preference for certain items**

Reasons	Migrant		Non-migrant		Overall	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
Insufficient income	71	47.3	108	72.0	179	59.7
Now it is not required or not interested	35	23.3	33	22.0	68	22.7
Considered to do in future	40	26.7	9	6.0	49	16.3
Others reasons	4	2.7	0	0.0	4	1.3
Total	150	100	150	100	300	100
Chi square value = 31.319**; p-value = 0.003						

\*\* significant at 0.01 level

Source: Survey data

In sufficient income was the major reason for the majority respondents (60 percent) to be indifferent in ranking all the given preferences. Among non-migrants it is 72 percent and among migrants it is 47 percentage insufficient income was the reason for not ranking certain items in preference chart. 22 percent in both category did not require the particular item at present so they did not include them in preference. About 40 percent of migrants and 9percent of non-migrants are planning the particular activity only in future so they are reluctant to mark their preference now. Thus there is

a clear difference in the percentage of migrants and non-migrants in not ranking their preference due to various reasons like insufficient income, uninterested, consider to do it in future or some other reasons like have done it earlier.

#### 4.5 Saving, investment and debt details of the respondents

##### 4.5.1 General information regarding respondents savings, investments and debt

Respondent's status about savings, investment and debt was asked to in order to analyse the economic status of respondents in migrant and non-migrant households.

**Table 4.40 Details about respondents saving, investment and debt**

Variables	Migrant		Non-migrant		Chi square	P-value
	No	Percent	No	Percent		
Savings	150	100	81	54.0	89.610**	< 0.001
Investment	92	61.3	45	30.0	29.676**	< 0.001
Debt	103	68.7	105	70.0	0.063 <sup>ns</sup>	0.802

\*\* significant at 0.01 level; ns non-significant

Source: Survey data

All migrant households are having savings while only 54 percent of non-migrants is having some type of savings. 61 percent of migrants are having investments but it is only 30 percent in case of non-migrants. Thus it is clear from the survey data that respondents status regarding savings and investments varies widely in migrant and non-migrant households. But in the matter of debt both categories of households are having similar status. About 70 percent of migrant and non-migrant households are having debt. X<sup>2</sup> test was done to establish statistically the above matter. The difference among migrants and non-migrants in the saving and investment status was found significant at 1 percent level of significance with X<sup>2</sup> value (89.610, p value=>0.001 and 29.676, p value=>0.001) which indicates that there is significant difference among migrants and non-migrants in their savings and investment status. While in the case of debt status X<sup>2</sup> value (0.063 with p value p=0.802) is found to be non-significant which indicates that there is no major difference in the debt status among migrants and non-migrants.

#### 4.5.2 Savings details

We have already seen that all the respondents in migrant category have some sort of savings but only half of the non-migrant respondent households have savings. Now here the amount of monthly savings of migrants and non-migrants are considered.

**Table 4.41 Details about the amount of savings**

Amount of savings	Migrant		Non-migrant		Overall	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
Less than 5000	60	40.0	33	40.7	93	40.3
5000 -10000	52	34.7	27	33.3	79	34.2
Above 10000	38	25.3	21	25.9	59	25.5
Total	150	100	81	100	231	100
Chi square value = 0.042 <sup>ns</sup> ; p-value = 0.979						

*ns non-significant*

Source : Survey data

The savings of migrant and non-migrant category in the sample is almost similar. It is found that 40 percent respondents in both category saves less than Rs.5000, 35 percent of migrant category and 34 percent of non-migrant category saves between Rs.5000 to Rs. 10000, and about 25 percent in both category saves above Rs. 10000. The similarity in the amount saved by migrants and non-migrants is statistically established using  $X^2$  test.  $X^2$  value (0.042 with p-value 0.979) was found to be non-significant, which indicates that there is no major difference in the amount of savings among migrants and non-migrants.

#### 4.5.3 Type of savings

The savings details of respondents are further investigated to find the preferences on various types of savings among migrants and non-migrant households.

**Table 4.42 Details about type of savings**

Saving type	Migrant		Non-migrant		Overall	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
No Savings	0	0.0	69	46.0	69	23.0
Bank	079	52.7	33	22.0	112	37.3
P.F,Insurance etc	41	27.3	20	13.3	61	20.3
Chitty, Kuri R.D etc.	20	13.3	10	6.7	30	10
Others	10	6.7	18	12.0	28	9.3
Total	150	100	150	100	300	100

Source: Survey data

It was found that about 53 percent of migrant respondents put their savings in banks while that of non-migrants it is 22 percent. Among migrants 27 percent and in non-migrants 13 percentage have their savings in PF and insurances. 13 percent in migrant category and 7 percent in non-migrant category have chitty, kuri, post office RD etc. Some other sorts of saving are also done by migrant households (7 percent) and by non-migrant (12 percent) households.

#### 4.5.4 Investment details

Regarding investments, it was already found that only 60 percent migrant households and 30 percent non-migrant households have investments. Now the amount of yearly investments among migrant and non-migrant households are considered. **Table 4.43**

**Table 4.43 Details about amount of investments**

Amount of investments	Migrant		Non-migrant		Overall	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
Less than 25000	36	39.1	27	60.0	63	46.0
25000 -50000	35	38.0	18	40.0	53	38.7
Above 50000	21	22.8	0	0.0	21	15.3
Total	92	100	45	100	137	100
Chi square value = 13.164**; p-value = 0.001						

\*\* significant at 0.01 level

Source: Survey data



It was found that about 39 percent in migrant households and 60 percent in non-migrant households invest below Rs. 25000, 38 percent migrant households and 40 percent of non-migrant households invest between Rs.25000 to Rs.50000 and 23 percent of migrant households invest above Rs.50000 while there is no single respondent in non-migrant category investing above Rs.50000. From this it is clear there is difference in investment amount among migrants and non-migrants. This difference is statistically established using x2 test.

X<sup>2</sup> value (513.164with p-value 0.001) was found to be significant at 1 percent level of significance, which indicates that there is notable difference in the investment amount of migrants and non-migrant households.

#### 4.5.5 Types of investments

The investment details of respondents are further examined to find the preferences on various types of investments among migrants and non-migrant households.

**Table 4.44 Details about type of investment**

Investments	Migrant		Non-migrant		Overall	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
Gold	35	38	10	22.2	45	32.8
Shares	21	22.8	5	11.1	26	18.9
Business	9	9.8	9	20.0	18	13.2
Insurance	12	13.1	3	6.7	15	10.9
Others	15	16.3	18	40	33	24.2
Total	92	100	45	100	137	100

Source: Survey data

It is found that 38 percent of migrants and 22 percent of non-migrants invest their money in gold. 22 percent of migrants and 11 percent of non-migrants investments in shares, 10 percent of migrants and 20 percent of non-migrants invest in business . Mixed pattern of investments is also done by migrants(16 percent) and non-migrants(40 percent) households.

#### 4.5.6 Debt details

Regarding debt, it was already found that there is no major difference in the debt status among migrants and non-migrants. Now the amount of debt among migrant and non-migrant are considered.

**Table:4.45 Details about the amount of debt**

Amount of debt	Migrant		Non-migrant		Overall	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
Less than 5 Lakhs	0	0.0	51	48.6	51	24.5
5-10 Lakhs	81	78.6	33	31.4	114	54.8
Above 10 Lakhs	22	21.4	21	20.0	43	20.7
Total	103	100	105	100	208	100
Chi square value = 71.221**; p-value < 0.001						

\*\* significant at 0.01 level

Source: Survey data

Regarding the amount of debt there is variation among migrants and non-migrants. Majority non-migrant's debt amount come under the first category that is less than one lakhs but there is no migrants in that category. Majority non migrants (79 percentage) are in the second category with 5 to 10 lakhs debt. 21 percent of migrants and 20 percent of non-migrants are in the third category with above 10 lakhs of debt. . From this it is clear there is difference in debt amount among migrants and non-migrants. This difference is statistically established using x2 test.

X<sup>2</sup> value (71.221with p-value< 0.001) was found to be significant at 1 percent level of significance, which indicates that there is notable difference in the debt amount of migrants and non-migrant households. Thus though the debt status among migrants and non-migrants are almost same but there is significant difference in the amount.

#### 4.5.7 Sources of debt details

The sources from which the respondents have taken loans or debt is considered.

**Table 4.46 Details about the Source of debt**

Sources of debt	Migrant		Non-migrant		Overall	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
Bank loan	60	58.3	30	28.6	90	43.3
Friends and relatives	25	24.3	30	28.6	55	26.4
Others	4	3.9	6	5.7	10	4.8
Various sources	14	13.6	39	37.1	53	25.5
Total	103	100	105	100	208	100

Source: Survey data

Majority migrants (58 percentage) have their debt in banks while this is only 29 percent in non-migrants. 24 percent in migrant and 29 percent in non-migrants are indebted to friends and relatives. 37 percent in non-migrants and 13 percent of non-migrants have debt from some other sources.

#### ***4.5.8 Expected period of repayment of debt***

The expected time of repayment is one of the important matter which help us to understand the economic situation of the respondents.

**Table 4.47 Details about expected period for repayment of debt**

Period of repayment	Migrant		Non-migrant		Overall	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
Less than 4 years	58	56.3	30	28.6	88	42.3
5-8 years	45	43.7	60	57.1	105	50.5
Above 8 years	0	0.0	15	14.3	15	7.2
Total	103	100	105	100	208	100
Chi square value = 26.035**; p-value < 0.001						

\*\* significant at 0.01 level

Source: Survey data

56 percentage of migrants and 29 percent of non-migrants needed only less than 4 years to pay back their debt. While 44 percent of migrants and 57 percent of non-migrants needed 5 to 8 years for their debt repayment. 14 percent of non-migrants needed more than 8 years for the repayment. The fact understood from the table is that non-migrants require more time compared to migrants for their debt repayment. This difference is statistically proved using X2 test. X<sup>2</sup> value (26.035 with p-value < 0.001) was found to be significant at 1 percent level of significance, which indicates that

there is notable difference in the debt repayment of migrants and non-migrant households. Thus though the debt status among migrants and non-migrants are almost same but like the amount, there is significant difference in the length of repayment

#### **4.5.9 Details about the purpose for which debt was taken.**

Details regarding the purpose of debt are considered.

**Table 4.48 Details about the purpose of debt**

Purpose	Migrant		Non-migrant		Overall	
	No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent
Money to go abroad	29	28.2	0	0	29	14
House construction	61	59.2	42	40.0	103	49.5
Various	13	12.6	63	60.0	76	36.5
Total	103	100	105	100	208	100

Source: Survey data

Majority of migrants (59 percent) purchased money for house construction and renovation activities and some others (28 percent) purchased money for their travel expense to go abroad. In case of non-migrants majority(60 percent) purchased money of various purpose and 40 percent become indebted after their house construction or renovation activities.

### **4.6 Psychological wellbeing of the respondents**

The psychological wellbeing of the respondents is one of the important areas to be considered. In the study two categories of women are considered one left behind women and the other those women who lives along with their husbands. Women living in two different situations are undergoing through different psychological conditions. The environment surrounded to both may influence their psychological status.

#### **4.6.1 Details about the psychological wellbeing test**

The psychological wellbeing - 18 items is a standardized questionnaire developed by Ryff and Keyes (Ryff,C.D & Keyes,C.L.M,1995) is used in the study. Psychological wellbeing is assessed by using the 18 item scale in which responses are scored as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 5, 6, 7 and the responses were strongly agree, somewhat agree, a little agree,

neither agree nor disagree, a little disagree, somewhat disagree and strongly disagree. Then the positive questions are reversely scored. Six subscale items were measured by the 18 item questionnaire in which each dimension related carry three questions. Six subscale items included in this questionnaire are the autonomy subscale, the environment mastery subscale, the personal growth subscale, the Positive Relations with others subscales the purpose in life subscale, and the self-acceptance subscale. Then the scores for each dimensions was obtained by adding the score for the statements related to that dimensions.

For overall psychological wellbeing, score was obtained by adding the scores for all the statements. As there is only three items in each dimension, the total scores for each dimension may ranges in between 3 to 21. This entire ranges equally classified in such a way that for each dimension, the scores ranges in between 3 to 8 is classified into low level, 9 to 14 is classified as average level and 15 to 21 as high level of category. As there is 18 items in the entire scale, the total scores for overall psychological wellbeing may ranges in between 18 to 126. This entire ranges equally classified in such a way that, the scores ranges in between 18 to 53 is classified into low level, 54 to 89 is classified as average level and 90 to 126 as high level of category. Classification according to this is given in Table 4.57.

**Table 4.49 Distribution of respondents based on levels of different dimensions of psychological well being**

Dimensions	Migrant (n=150)			Non-migrant (n=150)			Overall (n=300)		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Autonomy	13 (8.7)	57 (38)	80 (53.3)	102 (68)	21 (14)	27 (18)	115 (38.3)	78 (26)	107 (35.7)
Environmental Mastery	5 (3.3)	29 (19.3)	116 (77.3)	36 (24)	66 (44)	48 (32)	41 (13.7)	95 (31.7)	164 (54.7)
Personal growth	3 (2)	26 (17.3)	121 (80.7)	33 (22)	42 (28)	75 (50)	36 (12)	68 (22.7)	196 (65.3)
Positive relations	3 (2)	16 (10.7)	131 (87.3)	27 (18)	45 (30)	78 (52)	30 (10)	61 (20.3)	209 (69.7)
Purpose of life	0 (0)	79 (52.7)	71 (47.3)	24 (16)	69 (46)	57 (38)	24 (8)	148 (49.3)	128 (42.7)
Self-acceptance	0 (0)	28 (18.7)	122 (81.3)	3 (2)	84 (56)	63 (42)	3 (1)	112 (37.3)	185 (61.7)
Overall Well being	2 (1.3)	27 (18)	121 (80.7)	18 (12)	87 (58)	45 (30)	20 (6.7)	114 (38)	166 (55.3)

Values in the brackets are percentages

Source: Computed by the researcher

Total scores worked out for each dimension and also overall psychological wellbeing and then scores were subjected to Kolmogorov Smirnov Test to test whether the scores are following normality distribution. Results shows that in all cases p-value is less than 0.001 which indicate that the observations are not following normal distribution. So further analysis was done by using non-parametric test. The comparison between migrant and non-migrant was done by using Mann Whitney U test and the results are given in Table 4.67.

#### 4.6.2. Psychological wellbeing of the respondents in 6 dimensions of life

Six life dimensions considered are autonomy, environment mastery, personal growth, positive relations, purpose of life, and self-acceptance. Wellbeing of respondents in each area and all-round wellbeing is also calculated and compared statistically.

**Table 4.67 Results of comparison of different dimensions and overall wellbeing between the respondents**

Dimension	Migrant		Non-migrant		Z-value	P-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Autonomy	15.23	4.63	8.24	5.38	9.901**	< 0.001
Environment mastery	16.27	3.91	12.54	4.78	6.820**	< 0.001
Personal growth	17.51	3.34	13.92	4.69	7.118**	0.194
Positive relation	17.59	2.97	14.12	4.67	6.636**	< 0.001
Purpose of life	14.55	2.73	12.40	3.84	4.259**	< 0.001
Self-acceptance	17.76	2.65	13.90	3.86	8.572**	< 0.001
Overall wellbeing	98.89	14.39	75.12	21.34	9.154**	< 0.001

\*\* significant at 0.01 level

Source: Computed by the researcher

Results show that in all dimensions and also in the case of overall psychological wellbeing z-value was found to be significant at 0.01 levels. This indicates that there exists significant difference in all dimensions and also overall psychological well-being among migrants and non-migrants. Comparing the mean values it is observed that in all cases migrants have higher mean compared to non-migrants which indicates that psychological wellbeing is more among migrants compared to non-migrants. Thus it is concluded that left behind women are having more psychological wellbeing and strength when compared to women who lives with their husbands.

In all tables migrant indicate women in migrant households or the left behind women and non-migrant represent women in non- migrant households who lives along with their husbands.

## **Conclusion**

This chapter gives us an idea about the study area and an outline of the socio economic and psychological background of the respondents in the sample.

The first section gives the rationale behind choosing the study area. Since Malappuram district is having largest number of male migrants so it is best suited for the present study about the impact of international migration on left behind women. Economic, geographic and demographic details of the district were also described in this section. Then six Grama panchayats and four Municipalities from the selected area was randomly selected. After that one ward from each selected Grama panchayat and Municipalities were randomly selected. After categorizing the households into two sections of migrant and non-migrant households, 15 samples from each category were randomly selected for a meaningful comparison. Thus we get 150 migrant households samples and 150 non-migrant household samples. Thus 180 rural samples from 6 panchayats and 120 urban samples from 4 municipalities were collected. Thus total sample size for the study is 300. Demographic indicators of the selected Grama panchayats and Municipalities were also mentioned along with a map of study area also given for clarity in understanding. Problems faced during data collection by the researcher are also included in this section. In the second section general socio economic details regarding respondents birth place, area of locality, religion, caste, family type, family income, number of earning members, type of ration card, cooking fuel used, marital duration along with, the age, education, year of schooling, occupation of respondents and their husbands were well furnished and presented. The respondents are of two categories one left behind women and the other is women in non-migrant households. Since the study area is Malappuram about 70 percent of sample is from Muslim households. Family type, family size is almost similar in both categories. While in case of income, educational qualification, years of schooling, occupation, APL-BPL classification and found favorable towards left behind women in migrant households.

In the third section the housing status and material possessions of the respondents are well documented which help us to understand the standard of living of the respondents. From various factors regarding house like ownership of house, type of house, size of house, fuel used for cooking and amount spend on house, it is clear and statistically proved that migrant's houses are far better compared to non-migrants. House plot size and year of construction of house is almost similar for migrants and non-migrants. Ownership of property other than house and activity in that land is high among migrants but the area of land is almost similar between migrants and non-migrants. Regarding the ownership name of house and land or other property is very rare among women in both categories which reflect the position of women still back in the property ownership. When considering the possession of household durables migrant households are far ahead than non-migrant households. Since the ownership of those items is considered as status symbol most migrant households are having almost all modern equipment inside the home which make easy their household task and make life more ease and comfortable. The enquiry about the source of purchase made it clear that major part of remittances were used for the purchase of those modern equipment's, vehicles etc. Thus the impact of international male migration reflects the housing status of the migrants.

The fourth section deals with the consumption expenditure of the respondents. It was found scientifically significant that the migrants total monthly consumption expenditure is higher than non-migrants. Expenditure on education, health shows high level for migrants compared to non-migrants. Because in the case of treatment and education majority migrants prefer private institutions where as non-migrants prefer government institution. New consumer culture in the respondents especially among left behind women can be seen in investigating about their frequency of shopping, amount spent for shopping, shopping place, and periodicity of beauty parlour visits etc. most of the left behind women prefer shopping in big malls when compared to non-migrant women. The expenditure priority of migrants and non- migrants are found almost similar. This shows that wants and desire of the respondents are same but due to insufficient income, the amounts spend on each item by non-migrants lag behind migrants.



Fifth section deals with the economic variables such as saving, investment and debt details of the respondents. Respondents having saving and investments are more in migrant compared to non-migrant households. While in the case of debt almost similar numbers of respondents in migrant and non-migrant households are having debt. But when the amount is considered debt shows higher amount in migrants compared to non-migrants. Similar pattern is seen in saving and investments among the respondents. Regarding the expected time of repayment of debt also migrants expect lesser time compared to non-migrants.

Last section deals with the psychological wellbeing of the respondents which was examined using Ryff's Psychological wellbeing test. Questions from six different dimensions of life which includes autonomy, environment mastery, personal growth, positive relations, purpose of life and self-acceptance was asked to the respondents through an 18 item questionnaire. The responses of the respondents were statistically tested and found that in psychological wellbeing left behind women are far ahead than women living with husband. This may be due to the exposure attained by left behind women in all levels especially outside the home. On the other hand women in non-migrant households are getting lesser exposure since they are living together with husbands. So almost all outside household responsibilities are done by their husbands. Thus they become lazy and inactive in outside household activities. Whereas the left behind women utilizes their opportunity in the absence of their husbands, to exhibit their full potential in all out door and in door household activities. Thus they started to realize their own potential which increases their psychological strength.

