

IMPACT OF MARRIED MALE MIGRATION ON FAMILY WELL-BEING IN KERALA, SOUTH INDIA

V. Nirmala*

Abstract: The paper analysed the socio-economic and emotional impact of married men's migration on their family's overall well-being in Kerala, south India. The results indicated that economic well-being assumed dominance in the spouse's decision to migrate in the study area. However, while socio-economic well-being improved, personal happiness was largely affected due to long separations of the family, besides the financial and physical exploitations suffered by the wives left behind.

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

Well-being is a multi-faceted concept, comprising varied dimensions. It is a subjective factor evaluating an individual's/nation's status or quality of life. Achievement of human well-being has been the focus of attention of civil society organization, national governments and international agencies like the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and World Bank. While the Millennium Development Goals of United Nations Millennium Summit 2000 aiming at achievement of the various well-being targets, indicators of well-being are used to measure the progress towards it (McGillivray 2006). The study of well-being being subjective in nature, is difficult to subject to analysis. Different methods have been developed and adopted by social scientists and psychologists to gauge the well-being (happiness) effect, which often needs to pass validation tests. Although research on subjective aspects of well-being is still in infancy stage, it suggests that several factors contribute to an individual's overall well-being within the community and the country they live in (Boarini, et al. 2006). According to economic literature, individuals derive well-being from satisfaction of their own wants as per their preferences. Individual well-being goes beyond production and consumption of economic resources, like leisure, job satisfaction and security, happy family/marriage, health, education, etc.

* Professor, Department of Economics, Pondicherry University, Pondicherry – 605014. India.

Well-being may be analysed at international, country, society or individual levels. With economic growth, there is an undermining of universal values that weaken personal relationship, social roles and spiritual beliefs, that are central to well-being. Wealth does not always or automatically produce well-being, but its pursuit crowds out more important means of happiness. Increased individualisation and materialism reduces social cohesion, confidence, trust and stability, leaving one personally more isolated and vulnerable (Eckersley 2004). Australian governments consider strong and growing economy as their prime goal and responsibility, with wealth as the basis of creating higher quality of life. However, about twice as many Australians claim quality of life to be declining, as it is getting economically better (Eckersley 2004). Diener, et al. (1993) concluded that the impact of income on life satisfaction was the highest for persons earning less than US \$ 15,000 per annum, which decreased steadily for those above this level in the United States (US). Alesina, et al. (2001) found negative and significant effect of inequality on happiness in Europe, but not in the US. This was due greater social mobility in the U.S., which was not seen as affecting future income of the poor. This explained why there was higher demand for government to fight inequality in Europe, relative to the U.S. Frey and Stutzer (2002) found the impact of income on happiness to be declining for higher income groups among the Swiss. Research also indicate though there is a positive association between people's life satisfaction and their income, difference in income do not proportionally determine difference in life satisfaction (Blanchflower and Oswald 2004). Neither do changes in individual income over time bring about similar changes in their well-being (Headey, et al. 2004). However , personal well-being is strongly governed by direction of income changes (Deiner and Seligman 2004). Studies (Layard 2005) also suggest that the effect of loss in income in reducing life satisfaction is twice larger than its gain.

Research further show that non-economic factors improve individual well-being more than their income. These subjective non-economic correlates of well-being include family relationships, social ties and institutional quality (Helliwell 2003), work and joblessness (Layard 2005), income inequality (Alesina, et al. 2001), and health and education (Ross and Van Willigen 1997, and Frey and Stutzer 2002). The weak link between income and well-being arise from adaptation of individuals to higher income over-time, followed by desire for more income, and social comparisons relative to those in same the income group. Layard's (2005) supported this evidence for the U.S., while

Frey and Stutzer (2002) found that personal well-being depended only on one's own income relative to those living in the same community. Meanwhile, social comparisons also improved well-being when it informed prospects for own improvement (Senik 2004). Flowers (2002) observed that people in Australia felt that values were changing for the worse, and the country was becoming too selfish and materialistic. Pusey (2003) found more than half of those surveyed in Australia felt that quality of life was falling due to too much greed and consumerism, break-down of traditional values and social life, greater isolation of families from extended family and community, falling living standards, work pressure, decreased job security and demanding employees.

Besides, Gross Domestic Product (GDP), income transfers received by residents from abroad also need to be added while assessing a country's well-being (Boarini, et al. 2006). Gubert (2002) observed that remittances absorbed random shocks, like bad crops or illness, thus providing some informal insurance services. However, remittances involved moral hazard (Azam and Gubert 2005), as family members receiving them tended to exert less, knowing well that the migrants would compensate consumption shortfalls in the family. Most of the earlier research had focussed on non-economic aspects of migration, like social, cultural and psychological factors (Mortora 1965, Gugler 1968, Hutton 1969, and Thomas 1970). In the late 1960s and early 1970s, it came to be widely recognized that most of the migration problem could also be explained by the influence of economic factors (Frank 1968, Harris and Todaro 1970, and Byreiee 1972). Evidence indicated that the main features of migrants was young age, besides urban employment opportunities which is positively correlated with educational selectivity (Caldwell 1969, Remple 1970, and Sabot 1972). Further, urban migrants were largely poor, unskilled and landless, whose rural employment opportunities in general were non-existent. Further, expected income differentials also attracted people out of their country (Todaro 1976).

Economic theory suggests that differences in income and employment opportunities in labour market play significant role in the decision to migrate internally or externally. In addition, technological advancement and development in communication and transports increased the tendency to migrate (Lansing and Mueller 1967). Harris and Todaro (1970) postulated the hypothesis that incidence of rural to urban migration in developing countries was motivated by expected earnings differentials between the two

regions. It led to a spurt of empirical works varying in its relevance (Yap 1977, Williamson 1988, and Ghatak and Others 1996). This hypothesis was extended on the premise that incidence of rural-urban migration differed by gender, due to factors like high fertility rate and larger distance of potential urban destination (Brockerhoff and Eu 1993, Khasiani 1991, and Jacqueline and Agesa 1999). Economists also found that people shifted among geographic areas as a kind of human investment, whereby individuals incur present monetary and psychic costs with the expectations of receiving higher earnings and benefits in future. Human investment theory assigned primary causal role to present values of spatial differences in economic opportunity as a determinant of migration (Fields 1976).

Thus, most studies have found economic factors are considered as the major contributor to well-being, besides being the main reason for migration. Both absolute and relative income variability were observed to raise vulnerability and make people move. Temporary emigration to Gulf countries peaked during the 1970s and 1980, before declining with the fall in oil prices after 1982. The Gulf war in 1991 resulted in a radical change in migrant population, with Asians and Egyptians replacing Palestinians and Jordanians in Kuwait (World Development Report 1995, p. 64). Meanwhile, international labour migration from India was high during the mid-1970s, which was the highest in early 1980s due to oil price hike. Majority of the workers who migrated were unskilled, while the semi-skilled were employed in manual or clerical occupations. The trends in annual outflow of labour from India revealed migration to have increased from 4,200 in 1976 to 2,75,000 in 1981, which slowly declined till 1984. The labour outflow to Middle East was the largest in 1981 to countries like Bahrain, Iraq, Kuwait, Libya, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates (U.A.E), which absorbed the bulk of more than 95 per cent of the country's labour outflow. Massive migration took place from Kerala to developed countries in the West and to Middle East. Of them, 73 per cent were unskilled and 15.3 per cent technically qualified. Women constituted more than 10 per cent of them and the remittances comprised nearly a quarter of the state domestic product (Bajaj and Udayana 1996). Chaudhuri (2001) examined the impact of emigration of skilled labour from developing countries on the level of welfare of non-migrants and urban unemployment of unskilled labour in a three sector Harris-Todaro model. He found that brain-drain of skilled labour raised urban unemployment of unskilled labour. Emigration of skilled labour was likely to raise the welfare of non-migrants in a tariff

distorted economy, if it imported specialized manufacturing product or labour-intensive good. On other hand, if the economy imported traditional manufacturing product, welfare of the non-migrating workers was likely to deteriorate.

Thus, majority of the studies on migration rest on judgement about its effect on the country's/family's economic well-being in terms of remittances. Although migration improves economic well-being of a household, individual well-being need not necessarily depend on it. Studies (Boarini, et al. 2006) reveal that happiness and life satisfaction based on income remittance is weakly related to economic status. However, studies assessing the well-being (happiness) of family members, particularly of the married women left behind, are lacking. Subjective aspects suggest that other domains such as emotions, psychology, and familial/community ties need to be considered for assessing their well-being. This paper intends going beyond the economic dimension of well-being, by also focusing on its other dimensions like perception of well-being in terms of social, emotional and psychological consequences of husband' migration on their spouse left behind in Kerala, south India.

The main objectives of the study are:

- 1) to overview various aspects relating the sample married male migration in Pattanamitta district of Kerala during the survey;
- 2) to analyse the main determinants of sample male migration in the study area; and
- 3) to survey the consequences of husbands' migration on the respondent wives in terms of dependency, emotional impact and exploitation.

The remaining paper is organized as follows. Section-I gives a brief introduction and objectives of the paper. Section-II describes the data and methodology used and section-III discusses the empirical results. The concluding remarks are given in section-IV.

SECTION II: DATA AND METHODOLOGY

Kerala state contributes one of the major chunks of emigrants of India. Its Pattanamithitta district accounts for about 17 per cent of the migrants in the state (2001 Census). Primary data for the study were collected from a stratified random sample of 400 married women, comprising 200 each with migrated and non-migrated husband,

residing in Thiruvalla municipality of Pattanamithitta district during March 2005 using pre-tested schedules. The objectives of the study have been analysed using simple averages, percentages, ratios, logit multiple regression and Garret ranking technique (1969).

The estimated migration function using logit regression is as given:

$$\text{MGRN} = f(\text{HMAG}, \text{HEDU}, \text{FTYP}, \text{DEPR}, \text{OWNH}, \text{OWNL}, \text{ASST}, \text{NJOB}, \text{HINC}, \text{RMIT}, \text{PERD}, \text{EMOT})$$

where,

- MGRN = migration dummy, taking value one if husband has migrated abroad, and zero otherwise;
- HMAG = husband's age at migration in years;
- HEDU = husband's education in years;
- FTYP = family type dummy, taking value one for nuclear and zero for joint;
- DEPR = dependency ratio (ratio of children and the elderly to working members in the family);
- OWNH = house ownership dummy, taking value one if owning house and zero otherwise;
- OWNL = land ownership in hectares;
- ASST = total asset value in Rupees (1US \$ = Rs. 42 during survey);
- NJOB = nature of job dummy, taking value one for government sector and zero otherwise;
- HINC = husband's annual income in Rupees;
- RMIT = monthly remittance to family from abroad in Rupees;
- PERD = period of stay with respondent after marriage before the spouse left abroad; and
- EMOT = emotional disturbance of respondent in the absence of husband dummy, taking value one if yes and zero for no.

The *a priori* expected association between dependent and independent variables may be discussed here. Higher the married male's age at migration, the lower would be his desire to migrate. On the other hand, higher the level of his education, greater would be the chances of his migration due to better earning prospectus abroad.

A nuclear family is likely to discourage married male's migration due to the need for family's safety/security in his absence, whereas larger dependency ratio would encourage it. Greater economic security in terms own house, land and assets is hypothesised to be negatively related to male migration. Likewise, having a government in India at the time of migration is also expected to discourage it due to job security back home.

Meanwhile, better current income and remittances encourage migration. Greater the period of stay with wife after marriage, higher the chances of migration, whereas consequent emotional disturbance of wife would discourage it.

Although the paper collects data from both respondents with migrated and non-migrated husband, the paper focuses only on the former. Hence, no data on the latter is discussed, except for using them in the regression analysis to analyse determinants of migration. This is because the paper focuses on the well-being of migrant household, and analyses why despite unhappiness the married males in the study area are still willing to migrate.

Garret ranking technique (1969) has been used to rank the reasons of whether the respondents want their spouse to return back permanently to home country or not on a priority basis. The ranks assigned to each item by the sample respondents have been converted into percentage scores, using the Garret table. The total scores of each item thus obtained have been divided by the number responded to each item to compute the mean score. The mean scores are then arranged in descending order and ranks assigned. The percentage position has been computed using the formula:-

$$\text{Per cent position} = 100 [(R_{ij} - 0.5) / N_j]$$

where,

R_j = rank given to the i th item by the j^{th} respondent, and

N_j = total number of items ranked by the j^{th} respondent

SECTION III: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section discusses the results of empirical analyses. Table - 1 presents details of migration of spouse of the sample respondents. Details of country migrated to reveals that majority of the sample men have migrated to U.A.E. (65%), followed by Saudi Arabia (20%) and the rest to Malaysia (4%), African countries (3%), U.S.A. (2%) and South Korea, Canada, France, Germany, Singapore and Bhutan (1% each).

Period of migration shows that the married men (63%) have been away from their family for 5-10 years, and nearly one-third (31%) for 10-15 years. A negligible percentage have migrated for less than five years (5%) and for over 15 years (1%). This

reflects huge loss of personal happiness suffered for economic well-being by the migrant family.

Age at migration of the married men reveals migration to be declining with the rise in age. It shows two-third of them to have migrated between 25-30 year of age, while 20 per cent did so between 20-25 years. Only 12 per cent migrated between 30-35 year and just two per cent at the age of above 35 years.

As regards the period within which the migrated men left their wife behind after marriage, majority (27%) are observed to have migrated within 0-3 months, followed by 3-6 months (18%), 9-12 months (17%) and 6-9 months (12%) respectively. This shows that as much as three-fourth of them left their wife behind in less than a year. Whereas, 11 per cent left within 2-3 years, eight per cent within 1-2 years, and the rest nine per cent between three to over five years.

The table indicates that majority of the spouse have migrated at young age within one year of their marriage. This is reflective of the emotional hardship the couple undergo on having to stay away from their spouse for economic well-being.

Table - 2 gives information on frequency of visit, children and expected period of permanent return of spouse to India. It shows that majority (40% each) of the spouse visit India once a year and once in two years. Only 18 per cent visit their family twice and thrice a year respectively, followed by two per cent visiting once in three years. It is worth noting here that only professional occupations offer holidays within a year.

Age at first delivery shows that more than two-third of the respondents had their first delivery between 20-25 years, less than one-third between 25-30 years and the rest between 15-20 years. As regards the number of children, around half the respondents have two children (51%), followed by one (39%), three (9%) and four (1%) respectively.

Expected period of permanent return indicates that while nearly a half (45%) of the respondents has no idea as to when their spouse would return back permanently to India, 18 per cent expect their spouse to return in 10-15 years. About 13 per cent expect it within five years, and 12 per cent each within 5-10 and 15-20 years respectively. This indicates that majority of the respondents are spending most of their married life in separation from their spouse for economic well-being.

Table - 3 illustrates the nature of employment, monthly income and remittance of the sample spouse during the survey. It reveals that nearly three-fourth of the spouse are employed in private concerns (as accountant, manager, doctors, engineers, technicians, drivers and teacher), while only 10 per cent are employed in government sector (as doctors, teachers and bank employees) and the rest (16%) are self-employed (as shopkeepers, own business and hotels). Income distribution shows that majority of them earn a monthly income of Rs. 20000-40000 (40%), 36 per cent between Rs. 40000-60000, and only 17 per cent above Rs. 60000. About seven per cent earn a monthly income upto Rs. 20000.

Monthly remittances of the spouse shows that more than half of them (52%) remit Rs. 10000-15000, less than one-third between Rs. 5000-10000 and 16 per cent between Rs. 15000-20000. Only two per cent remit above Rs. 20000 per month. Thus, the monthly remittances of the spouse are not very high.

Descriptive statistics relating to the sample respondents are shown in Table - 4. It reveals the mean age of the spouse to be around 27 years during the survey. Their average education level was 15 years (i.e., undergraduate). Family type shows that 66 per cent of the respondent households were nuclear in nature, with a mean dependency ratio of about three members.

As regards property and assets, 74 per cent of the respondents owned house, while the average land ownership among them was 44.73 cents. Further, the mean value of their total assets amounted to Rs. 13,339,60.00.

Information on employment of spouse shows that 44 per cent of them are employed in government jobs (as doctors, engineers, clerks and drivers). Their average earnings amounted to Rs. 62,808.81 per month, while the mean monthly remittance was Rs. 11,030 during the survey.

The period of stay of the spouse with the respondent after marriage was 2.60 years on an average. Further, 65 per cent of the respondents experienced severe emotional disturbances and wanted their spouse to return back to India for good.

Table - 5 presents the Logit regression results of factors determining married men's function. The findings indicate that, *ceteris paribus*, higher age at migration discourages

them from going abroad. However, its effect emerges insignificant, as the influence of other more important factors tend to dominate. On the other hand, higher educational level, staying in nuclear family and high dependency ratio significantly encourages them from seeking employment abroad. The latter may be due to the desire to ease economic burden and provide a better standard of living to the dependent children and elderly in the family. Staying in nuclear family makes this even more convenient, as there is no need to seek permission from any elders, except for making a joint decision by the couple.

House ownership is also observed to have a positive but insignificant influence on the spouse's decision to migrate. This is because house ownership need not necessarily reflect the economic status of the household. Whereas, larger land ownership and higher property and asset values are found to significantly affect the spouse's decision to migrate, owing to better economic well-being.

Being employed in government job in the home country before migration also significantly affects the decision to migrate, due to better work and job security back home.

However, receipt of higher income abroad and remittances to families in India significantly encourage the married men to migrate, due to greater income variations compared to home country and their capacity to offer better economic well-being to the family.

Increased period of stay with wife after marriage is found to have a positive effect on migration. On the other hand, greater emotional disturbance of the respondents in the absence of their spouse has a negative impact on the spouse's decision to migrate. However, both their effects emerge statistically insignificant, implying that these are less important factors when compared to economic necessities.

Table - 6 shows details on residence and type of dependency under necessity of the sample women in the absence of their migrated husband. Majority (66%) of them live along with their children, followed by in-law (22%), relatives (8%) and parents (4%).

As regards help under necessity, 29 per cent of the respondents depend on their in-law and 26 per cent on servants. About 18 and 15 per cent respectively manage on their

own or depend on their grown-up children. The remaining 12 per cent depend on own family members (8%), relatives and friends (2% each) respectively. Thus, majority of the respondents are compelled to depend on others under necessity for works inside/outside the house.

Emotional effects of the spouse's migration on the respondent is recorded in table - 7. It shows that except two per cent, all miss their husband's presence. Of the latter, 59 per cent miss their spouse very much, nearly 31 per cent much, while the rest feel it is okay to compromise. As regards managing their emotions, 60 per cent find it very difficult to do so, 20 per cent say it is difficult, and the rest feel it is okay (10%), no problem, or with the help of others (5% each). Thus, almost all the respondents miss their husband, and majority find it very difficult to manage on their own, reflecting a huge cost of loss of personal happiness paid for economic well-being.

Table - 8 furnishes information on financial and physical exploitation of the respondents in the absence of their husband. While majority (70%) faced no financial exploitation, 30 per cent reported being financially exploited mainly by own brothers (37%) and sisters (23%), followed by in-law (17%), friends (13%) and relatives (10%) respectively.

Being a very personal question, ridden with taboo in a country like India, only 20 per cent of the respondents were bold enough to openly report that they also suffer sexual exploitation, mainly by male servants (including, car driver - 35%) and neighbours (20%), followed by father-in-law and brother-in-law, relatives and friends (15% each). These respondents also reported that sexual harassment was quite common in households with migrated husband, which women do not generally reveal out of fear and social taboos. A verification of the nature of exploitation revealed that it mainly took place under the claim of being a male helper (30%) or care taker (20%). About 15 per cent each reported that it was by force or by own willingness, followed by blackmail and as friend (10% each).

In sum, living in the absence of their husband merely to enjoy a better standard of living is not a pleasing experience for these women, due to emotional disturbances suffered caused by both financial and physical exploitations.

Table - 9 contains opinion of the sample respondents on permanent return of their spouse to India. They were asked to rank reasons for why their spouse should return permanently and why not. About 64 per cent of them wanted their husband to return back permanently, mainly because of their current economic soundness, besides a feeling of terrible loneliness. Difficult to manage alone was ranked third and ill-health as the fourth reasons, followed ill-treatment by in-law and other family members, and too much financial and physical exploitations, respectively. Thus, once economic well-being is attained, the respondents are more concerned about their social and physical security/well-being.

Of the 36 per cent respondents who do not want their husband to return back immediately, ranked unsound economic condition of the family as the foremost reason. Better job and salary abroad, too many dependents and heavy debt were assigned the subsequent ranks. The remaining ranks were assigned to other reasons, like all live like this, adds to social status, and need luxurious life, respectively.

Thus, while personal factors following economic soundness comprise the main reasons for the respondents' desire for their spouse to return back permanently, economic concerns constitute the major reasons for their not wanting their spouse to return immediately.

SECTION IV: CONCLUDING REMARKS

Well-being is often measured as happiness or satisfaction with life, more than having a good life, having meaning in life, fulfilling one's potential and feeling that life is worthwhile. Since individual well-being governs a country's well-being, it is important to look into the former. The paper explores the socio-economic and emotional consequences of married men's migration on their spouse's overall well-being in Kerala. It also examines the factors determining the married men's decision to migrate, despite the hardships involved. Data for the purpose were collected from a stratified random sample of 400 married women, comprising 200 each with migrant and non-migrant spouse, belonging to Pattanamithitta district of Kerala, India, during March 2005, using pre-tested schedules. The objectives of the study were analysed using simple averages, ratios, percentages, Logit regression and Garret ranking technique.

The survey revealed that majority of the married males had migrated mainly to Gulf countries and were largely engaged in private concerns or self-employed. The findings indicated the emergence of a new family system in Kerala, with majority of the respondents spending most of their early married life in separation from their husband, with only periodic visits from them. The income variations compared to the home country were quite large, resulting in higher monthly remittances and economic status of the sample households.

The analysis of the determinants of the sample spouse's decision to migrate abroad revealed that higher educational qualifications, dependency ratio, monthly income and monthly remittances significantly encouraged it, whereas larger land ownership and assets, and government employment significantly discouraged it. Emotional disturbances of the wife had a negative effect on the spouse's migration, which emerged insignificant implying that it was of less importance as compared to economic well-being.

As regards the respondent women, majority of them lived with their own children in the absence of the husband and mainly depended on relatives and servants for their daily errands. Emotional consequences indicated that almost all of them missed their husband and found it difficult to manage on their own. Majority of the spouse had remained there for quite long and were expected to stay longer. As a consequence, the respondents suffered both financial and physical exploitations. However, having achieved financial soundness, the respondents mostly felt that their spouse should return back to India for good. They also felt lonely, found it difficult to manage without spouse and suffered ill-health. On the other hand, those who felt that their husband should stay abroad longer ranked need for economic well-being, better job and salary abroad, too many dependents, and heavy debts as the major reasons for it.

Thus, although migration improves socio-economic well-being of the family, this raises questions on the emotional impact and emergence of the new family culture in the study area arising out of the increased lone migration of the husband.

REFERENCES:

Agesa, Jacqueline and Richard U. Agesa (1999), "Gender Differences in the Incidence of Rural to Urban Migration: Evidence from Kenya", *Journal of Development Studies*, Vol. 35, No. 6, August, pp. 36-58.

- Alesina, A., Rafael Di Tella and R. MacCulloch (2001), “Inequality and Happiness: Are Europeans and Americans Different?”, National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 8198, Cambridge, April.
- Azam, Jean-Paul and Flore Gubert (2005), “Migrants’ Remittances and the Household in Africa: A Review of Evidence”, *Journal of African Economics*.
- Bajaj, Subash C. and B. Udayana (1996), “International Labour Migration in Indian Context: Impact and Implication for Kerala”, *Labour and Development*, Vol. 1, No. 2, January, pp. 163-192.
- Blanchflower, D. and A. Oswald (2004), “Well-Being Over Time in Britain and in USA”, *Journal of Public Economics*, Vol. 88.
- Boarini, Romina, Asa Johansson and Marco Mira d’Ercole (2006), “Alternative Measures of Well-Being”, DELSA/ELSA/WD/SEM(2006)2, OECD (Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development), Social, Employment and Migration Working Paper No. 33, France, 17 February, pp. 1-58.
- Byerlee, D. (1972), “Research on Migration in Africa: Past, Present and Future”, African Rural Employment Paper No. 2, Department of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University, East Lansing.
- Caldwell, J.C. (1969), *African Rural-Urban Migration*, Australian National University Press, Canberra.
- Chaudhri, Sarbajit (2001), “International Migration of Skilled Labour, Welfare and Unemployment of Unskilled Labour: A Note”, *Asian–African Journal of Economics and Econometrics*, Vol. 1, No.1, June, pp. 86-94.
- Deiner, E., E. Sanvik, L. Seidlitz and M. Diener (1993), “Relationship between Income and Subjective Well-Being: Relative or Absolute?”, *Social Indicators Research*, Vol. 28.
- Deiner, E. and Martin E.P. Seligman (2004), “Beyond Money: Towards an Economy of Well-Being”, *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, Vol. 5.
- Eckersley, Richard (2004), *Well and Good: How We Feel and Why it Matters*, Text Publishing, Melbourne.
- Fields, Gary S. (1976), “Labour Force Migration, Unemployment and Job Turn-Over”, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 57, January, pp. 407-415.
- Flowers, C. (2002), *Values and Civic Behaviour*, Australia Project Report, Brotherhood of St. Lawrence, Melbourne, www.bsl.org.au.
- Frank, C. R. (1968), “Urban Unemployment and Economic Growth in Africa”, *Oxford Economic Papers*, No. 20, pp. 250-74.

- Frey, B.S. and Q. Stutzer (2002), *Happiness and Economics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Garret, Henry E. and R. S. Woodworth (1969), *Statistics in Psychology and Education*, Valkis, Feffer and Simons Private Limited, Bombay.
- Gubert, F. (2002), “Do Migrants Insure Those Who Stay Behind? Evidence from the Kayes Area (Western Mali)”, *Oxford Development Studies*, Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 267-287.
- Gugler, J. (1968), “The Impact of Labour Migration on Society and Economy in Sub-Saharan Africa: Empirical Findings and Theoretical Considerations”, *African Social Research*, No. 6, pp. 463-486.
- Harris, J. R. And M. P. Todaro (1970), “Migration, Unemployment and Development: A Two Sector Analysis”, *American Economic Review*, Vol. LX, No. 1, pp. 126-142.
- Headey, B., R. Muffets and M. Wooden (2004), “Well-Being Over Time in Britain and in USA”, IZA Working Paper No. 218.
- Helliwell, J. F. (2003), “How’s Life? Combining Individual and National Variable to Explain Subjective Well-Being”, *Economic Modelling*, No. 20.
- Hutton, C.R. (1971), “The Causes of Labour Migration”, *Urbanization in Sub-Saharan Africa*, (Ed.) Yugler, Kampala.
- “International Migration” (1995), *World Development Report: 1995*, Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 64-69.
- Khasiani, S. (1991), “A Model of Migration Motivations: Migration Valuations and Migration Dispositions among Rural Youth in Kenya”, *Eastern Africa Economic Review*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 27-38.
- Layard, R. (2005), *Happiness: Lessons from New Science*, Penguin Press, New York.
- McGillivray, Mark, Ed. (2006), *Human Well-Being: Concept and Measurement*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, December.
- Mortora, G. (1965), “Factors Affecting Rural-Urban Migration in Latin America”, Paper Presented at World Population Conference, Belgrade, Yugoslavia.
- Office of Registrar General (2002), *Census 2001*, Government of India Publication, New Delhi.
- Pucey, Michael (2003), *The Experience of Middle Australia: The Dark Side of Economic Reforms*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Registrar General Office (2002), *Census 2001*, Government of India Publication, New Delhi.
- Remple, H. (1970), *Labour Migration into Urban Centres and Urban Unemployment in Kenya*, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

- Ross, C. and M. Van Willigen (1997), "Education and the Subjective Quality of Life", *Journal of Health and Social Behaviour*, Vol. 38.
- Sabot, R. H. (1972), "Education, Income Distribution and Urban Migration in Tanzania", Unpublished Paper, Economic Research Bureau, University of Dar es Salaam, Dar es Salaam.
- Senik, C. (2004), "When Information Dominates Compassion: Learning from Russian Subjective Panel Data", *Journal of Public Economics*, Vol. 88.
- Thomas, R. N. (1970), "Internal Migration in Latin America: Analysis of Recent Literature", Paper Presented to the National Conference for Latin Americanist Geographers, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana.
- Todaro, Michael P. (1976), "Rural-Urban Migration, Unemployment and Job Probabilities: Recent Theoretical and Empirical Research", *Economic Factors in Population Growth*, (Ed.) Ansley J. Coale, Proceedings of Conference held by the International Economic Association at Valescuse, France.
- Williamson, J. G. (1998), "Migration and Urbanization", *Handbook of Development Economics*, Vol. 1, (Ed.) H. Chenery and T. N. Srinivasa, North-Holland, Amsterdam, pp. 424-465.
- Yap, L. Y. L. (1977), "The Attraction to Cities: A Review of the Migration Literature", *Journal Development Economics*, Vol. 4, pp. 239-64.

TABLE - 1
MIGRATION DETAILS

Sl. No.	Details	No.	%
A. Country Migrated:			
i)	UAE	130	65
ii)	Saudi Arabia	40	20
iii)	African Countries	6	3
iv)	U. S. A	4	2
v)	Malaysia	8	4
vi)	Bhutan	2	1
vii)	Canada	2	1
viii)	France	2	1
ix)	Germany	2	1
x)	Singapore	2	1
xi)	South Korea	2	1
	Total	200	100
B. Period of Migration (in year):			
i)	0-5	10	5
ii)	5-10	126	63
iii)	10-15	62	31
iv)	15 and above	2	1
	Total	200	100
C. Age at Migration :			
i)	20-25 yrs	40	20
ii)	25-35 yrs	132	66
iii)	30-35 yrs	24	12
iv)	35 and above	4	2
	Total	200	100
D. Period Within Which Left After Marriage:			
i)	0-3 months	54	27
ii)	3-6 months	36	18
iii)	6-9 months	24	12
iv)	9-12 months	34	17
v)	1-2 years	12	6
vi)	2-3 years	22	11
vii)	3-4 years	6	3
viii)	4-5 years	4	2
ix)	5 and above	8	4
	Total	200	100

TABLE - 2
 DETAILS OF VISIT, CHILDREN AND RETURN OF SPOUSE

Sl. No.	Details	No.	%
A.	How Often Comes?:		
	i) Thrice in a year	16	8
	ii) Twice in a year	20	10
	iii) Once in a year	80	40
	iv) Once in two years	80	40
	v) Once in three years	4	2
	Total	200	100
	100		
B.	Age at First Delivery:		
	i) 15-20 yrs	4	2
	ii) 20-25 yrs	136	68
	iii) 25-30 yrs	60	30
	Total	200	100
C.	No of Children:		
	i) One	78	39
	ii) Two	102	51
	iii) Three	18	9
	iv) Four	2	1
	Total	200	100
D.	Expected Period of Permanent Return:		
	i) 0-5 yrs	26	13
	ii) 5-10 yrs	24	12
	iii) 10-15 yrs	36	18
	iv) 15-20 yrs	24	12
	v) No idea	90	45
	Total	200	100

TABLE - 3
OCCUPATION, INCOME AND REMITTANCE

Sl. No.	Details	No.	%
A.	Nature of Employment:		
i)	Government	20	10
ii)	Private	148	74
iii)	Self-Employed (Shops, business, etc)	32	16
	Total	200	100
B.	Monthly Income Distribution (in Rs.):		
i)	0-20000	14	7
ii)	20000-40000	80	40
iii)	40000-60000	72	36
iv)	Above 60000	34	17
	Total	200	100
C.	Monthly Remittance (in Rs.):		
i)	5000-10000	68	4
ii)	10000-150000	104	52
iii)	15000-20000	24	12
iv)	Above 20000	4	2
	Total	200	100

TABLE - 4
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Sl. No.	Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
i)	MGRN	26.80	2.75
ii)	HMAG	15.34	2.10
iii)	FTYP	0.66	0.48
iv)	DEPR	2.60	1.08
v)	OWNH	0.74	0.49
vi)	OWNL	44.73	66.27
vii)	ASST	1333960.00	1054302.10
viii)	NJOB	0.10	0.38
ix)	HINC	628081.81	802183.79
x)	RMIT	11030.00	3266.62
xi)	PERD	2.60	1.80
xii)	EMOT	0.65	0.48

TABLE - 5
LOGIT REGRESSION RESULT: MIGRATION FUNCTION

Sl. No.	Variable	Coefficient Value	t-value
1.	CONSTANT	14.257	0.96
2.	HMAG	-12.475	0.52
3.	HEDU	2.578	2.73*
4.	FTYP	3.902	1.86***
5.	DEPR	0.736	3.44*
6.	OWNH	5.130	0.93
7.	OWNL	-8.911	3.59*
8.	ASST	-0.004	8.10*
9.	NJOB	-1.729	3.94*
10.	HINC	1.679	2.27**
11.	RMIT	784.561	1.98**
12.	PERD	0.604	0.97
13.	EMOT	-0.813	0.05
-2 Log Likelihood		132.76	

Note: *, ** and *** indicate significance at 1%, 5% and 10% values respectively.

TABLE - 6
RESIDENCE AND DEPENDENCY OF THE RESPONDENTS

Sl. No.	Details	No.	%
A.	Living with:		
	i) Children	132	66
	ii) Parents	8	4
	iii) In-laws	44	22
	iv) Relatives	16	8
	Total	200	100
B.	Dependency in Necessity:		
	i) Self	36	18
	ii) Children	30	15
	iii) In-law	58	29
	iv) Relatives	4	2
	v) Servants	52	26
	vi) Friends	4	2
	vii) Own family members	6	8
	Total	200	100

TABLE - 7
EMOTIONAL EFFECT OF MIGRATION OF SPOUSE ON RESPONDENT

Sl. No.	Details	No.	%
A.	Do You Miss your Spouse?		
	i) Yes	194	98
	ii) No	4	2
	Total	200	100
B.	If Yes:		
	i) Very much	118	54
	ii) Much	62	31
	iii) It is okay	20	10
	Total	200	100
C.	How do you Manage:		
	i) Very difficult	120	60
	ii) Difficult	40	20
	iii) It is okay	20	10
	iv) No problem	10	5
	v) Other help	10	5
	Total	200	100

TABLE - 8
EXPLOITATION OF RESPONDENTS

Sl. No.	Details	No.	%
A.	Financial Exploitation:		
	i) Yes	60	30
	ii) No	140	70
	Total	200	100
	If yes, by Whom?		
	i) In-law	10	17
	ii) Brother	22	37
	iii) Sister	14	23
	iv) Relatives	6	10
	v) Friends	8	13
	Total	60	100
B.	Physical Exploitation:		
	i) Yes	40	20
	ii) No	160	80
	Total	200	100
	If Yes, by Whom?		
	i) Father and brother-in-law	6	15
	ii) Relatives	6	15
	iii) Friends	6	15
	iv) Neighbour	8	20
	v) Male servant and car driver	14	35
	Total	40	100
	Nature of Exploitation:		
	i) Care taker	8	20
	ii) Male helper	12	30
	iii) By force	6	15
	iv) Black Mail	4	10
	v) Friends	4	10
	vi) Willing	6	15
	Total	40	100

TABLE - 9
OPINION ON RETURN OF MIGRATED SPOUSE: GARRET RANKS

Sl. No.	Reasons	Total Score	Mean Score	Rank
A.	Should Come Back (128):			
	i) Feeling lonely	6152	64.88	2
	ii) Ill health	5430	53.59	4
	ii) Difficult to manage	5620	56.56	3
	iv) Ill treatment	3860	29.05	5
	v) Too much financial exploitation	3680	26.25	6
	vi) Too much physical exploitation	3440	22.5	7
	vii) Now economically sound	7480	85.63	1
B.	Should Stay Longer (72):			
	i) Economically unsound	4274	63.17	1
	ii) Need luxurious life	3004	27.89	7
	iii) All live like this	3604	44.56	5
	iv) Social status	3120	31.56	6
	v) Better job and salary	4220	61.67	2
	vi) Too many dependents	3888	52.22	3
	vii) Heavy debts	3784	49.56	4