



Impact of Remittance, Relationship Between Profile Characteristics and Perception on Determinants of Out Migration : A Study on Interstate Migration from Assam to Kerala

Shinu Thomas, Rituraj Boruah, Chittaranjan Deka, Debojit Bora, Jayanta Kumar Dutta and Hemanga Kumar Kalita

Department of Extension Education, Assam Agricultural University, Jorhat-785013

Email : boruahrituraj09@gmail.com

Abstract

Migration is a process of movement of an individual from his place of birth to a new place of residence. Interstate migration is an outcome of social, economic and cultural diversity in India. The factors in the state of origin forms the basis for people to migrate to another state while certain factors in destination state also attract people to it. The increasing urbanization trends in the past show that there is larger migration from rural to urban parts of India. Various push & pull factors are the reason for rural to urban migration of these Interstate migrants, which arise due to regional disparities among the states in India. The study on reason for migration of youth from Assam was conducted in the year 2020 with 120 respondents. The respondents were rural youths of Assam migrated to Ernakulam and worked in unorganized sector. The Snow ball technique was applied to select the respondents. Majority (71.66%) of the respondent's monthly income was in the range of Rs. 14,000 to Rs. 18,000 at the destination. Majority (75.83%) of the respondents send Rs. 11000 to Rs. 15000 as remittance per month to home. However, 80 per cent of the respondents were using banks for sending remittance to home. Majority (87.5%) of the respondents sent remittance monthly. Majority of the respondents (94.16%) had utilized their remittance for household consumption followed by health care (61.66%). On analyzing the opinion on impact of remittance, highest impact was seen on the increase in family income (mean score: 2.80) followed by impact on food consumption (mean score: 2.32).

Key words : *Interstate out migration, push and pull factors, remittance, utilization pattern*

Introduction

Migration is a universal phenomenon. People explored all around the world for better economic condition and secure places. The migration phenomenon has gained a huge momentum in recent years. Even by rough estimates, three out of every ten Indians are internal migrants. During migration people change their residential location for a variety of reasons, which may be voluntary or involuntary, or their mixture. A variety of factors would have involved in taking decision on whether to move, where and how. Rural people used migration as a survival strategy to cope up with financial problem and unemployment. The number of out-migrants from Assam was 6.34 lakhs as per 2011 census. It has been found that there are 8000 Assamese youth working in plywood factories in Perumbavoor, a town in Kerala. The main aim of labor migration around the world is to send money back home. Remittance bears the characteristic of motion and is a crucial factor of change on various economic indicators on both the places, the place of origin and the host. The remittance plays a significant role in developing nations like India. Increase in remittance reduces poverty through increased incomes, allow for greater investment in physical assets, education, health and enables access to a larger pool of knowledge. Inflow of remittances can also enhance the standard and quality of life thereby contributing positively towards

improvement of Human Development Index of a region. Keeping in view, present research study was carried out with following objective :

To assess the amount of remittances and its impact on their families at the place of origin.

To find out the relationship between profile characteristics of respondents with reason of migration and remittance.

Materials and Methods

The state of Kerala comprises of 14 districts among those Ernakulam district was selected purposively for the present study. A multistage sampling design using the snow ball technique was followed in the present study. A total of 120 migrants from Ernakulam district were selected using snowball sampling for the study. Respondents were rural youth migrated from Assam to Kerala for livelihood.

A pretested, structured questionnaire was prepared and interviewed every respondent personally for collecting the data. The collected data were coded, tabulated and analyzed in accordance with the objectives of the study by using appropriate statistical tools like Percentages, frequencies, standard deviation mean, class interval and Chi-square. The quantity ² describes the discrepancy between theory and observation.

It is defined as

$$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$$

Where O is observed frequency and E is expected frequency.

Expected frequency is calculated as

$E = \text{Row total} \times \text{Column} / \text{Grand total}$

Degree of freedom is worked out as follows

$$D.F. = (c-1)(r-1)$$

Where c is total number of columns and r is total number of rows.

Results and Discussion

Amount of remittances and their purpose of utilization

Monthly income at destination : Table-1 shows that, majority (71.66%) of the respondents monthly income was between Rs. 14,000 - Rs. 18,000 followed by 16.66 per cent of the respondents with a monthly income between Rs. 10,000 - Rs. 14,000 and 11.66 per cent of the respondents with a monthly income between Rs. 18,000 - Rs. 22,000 at the destination.

Table-1 : Distribution of respondents according to their monthly income at destination.

| Sl. No. | Amount of money (in Rs.) | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|--------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1. | Rs. 10,000 - 14,000 | 20 | 16.66 |
| 2. | Rs. 14,000 - 18,000 | 86 | 71.66 |
| 3. | Rs. 18,000 - 22,000 | 14 | 11.66 |

Amount of remittance per month : Table-2 shows that 75.83 per cent of the respondents send Rs. 11000 – Rs. 15000 as remittance per month to home, followed by 15 per cent of respondents send Rs. 7,000 – Rs. 11,000 and only 9.16 per cent of respondents send Rs. 15,000 – Rs. 19,000 as remittance per month to home.

Table-2 : Distribution of respondents according to the amount of remittance per month.

| Sl. No. | Amount of money (in Rs.) | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|--------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1. | Rs. 7,000 - 11,000 | 18 | 15.00 |
| 2. | Rs. 11,000 - 15,000 | 91 | 75.83 |
| 3. | Rs. 15,000 - 19,000 | 11 | 9.16 |

Means of sending remittance : The Table-3 shows that majority (80%) of the respondents were using banks for sending remittance followed by 7.5 per cent of respondents, who use mobile transfer to send remittance, 6.66 per cent of the respondents sent remittance through their friends and relatives, and 5.83 per cent of the respondents send remittance through ATM.

Table-3 : Distribution of respondents according to their means of sending remittance.

| Sl. No. | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|---------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1. | Bank | 96 | 80.00 |
| 2. | ATM | 7 | 5.83 |
| 3. | Through relatives/friends | 8 | 6.66 |
| 4. | Mobile transfer | 9 | 7.50 |

Frequency of sending remittance : Table-4 shows that majority (87.50%) of the respondents send remittance monthly followed by 10 per cent of respondents sending remittance bimonthly and 2.5 per cent of respondents sending remittance quarterly.

Table-4 : Distribution of respondents according to their frequency of sending remittance.

| Sl. No. | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|------------|-----------|------------|
| 1. | Monthly | 105 | 87.50 |
| 2. | Bi-monthly | 12 | 10.00 |
| 3. | Quarterly | 3 | 2.50 |

Utilization pattern of remittance : The Table-5 shows the different purposes of utilization of the remittances earned by the family of migrant. Majority of the respondents (94.16%) had utilized their remittance for household consumption, followed by health care (61.66%), children education (40.83%), clearing of debts (32.5%), saving for future (30.83%), house construction (27.5%), social function expenditure (20.83%) and agricultural investment (12.5%).

Table-5 : Distribution of respondents according to their utilization pattern of remittance at source.

| Sl. No. | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|-----------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1. | Household consumption | 113 | 94.16 |
| 2. | Children education | 49 | 40.83 |
| 3. | Agricultural investment | 15 | 12.5 |
| 4. | Health care | 74 | 61.66 |
| 5. | House construction | 33 | 27.5 |
| 6. | Clearing off debts | 39 | 32.5 |
| 7. | Social function expenditure | 25 | 20.83 |
| 8. | Saving for future | 37 | 30.83 |

Impact of remittance : Impact of remittance was studied by accessing the impact in fulfillment of different basic needs of migrant's family. Table-6 gives the overview of impact of remittance on the basic needs of migrant's family. It is clear from the table that highest impact was seen on the increase in family income (mean score: 2.80). With the increase in income, there was increased consumption of better food (mean score: 2.32). Other improvements were observed in clothing (mean score: 2.25), medical treatment (mean score: 2.18), improvement in housing (mean score: 2.16) and children's education (mean score: 2.08).

Table-6 : Distribution of respondents according to the impact of remittance on migrants' families.

| Sl. No. | Category | Mean score | Rank |
|---------|--------------------------|------------|------|
| 1. | Increased income | 2.80 | I |
| 2. | Better food | 2.32 | II |
| 3. | Better clothing | 2.25 | III |
| 4. | Better medical treatment | 2.18 | IV |
| 5. | Improvement in housing | 2.16 | V |
| 6. | Better education | 2.08 | VI |

1 - Disagree, 2 - Partially agree, 3 - Agree

Relationship between profile characteristics and perception on push determinants of out migration :

Table-7 shows that, the calculated chi-square values between push determinants of migration and profile characteristics like family size, land holding, annual family income, purpose of migration, and remittance is greater than table chi-square value at 5 per cent level of significance and for marital status, it is greater than table chi-square value at 1 per cent level of significance.

Relationship between profile characteristics and perception on pull determinants of out migration : It is revealed from the Table-8 that, the calculated chi-square values between pull determinants of migration and profile characteristics like no. of migrants in the family, motivation for migration and income at destination is greater than table chi square value at 5 per cent level of significance. The chi-square values between pull determinants of migration and profile characteristics purpose of migration is greater than chi square values at 1 per cent level of significance.

From the table-1, it is revealed that respondents were earning a good monthly income. Some people work extra hours and some engaged in more than one activity to earn more money. These people engaged in skilled jobs and they are working in Kerala for more than 10 years. This is in conformity with the results of (1).

The family income of the respondents were very less at the source and the family depends mainly on migrant's income and migrants are getting good salary in the destination. So, the respondents use less money for their day to day activities and food, and they try to send 70 to 85 per cent of their income as remittance (Table-2).

From table-3, majority (80%) of the respondents use bank for transfer of remittance. This may be due to the fact that bank transfer was less complicated and more credible. Some educated respondents utilize other means to send remittance. Whereas, 6.66 percent respondents send money through relatives and friends so that their family gets money directly without going to bank. This is in conformity with the results of (2,3).

From table-4, majority (87.5%) per cent of the respondents sent remittance monthly. The probable reason may be that the income of the respondent's families were less at the source and the family depends mainly on the migrant's income for household consumption. However, 10 per cent of the respondents were sending remittance bimonthly. These respondents were having agricultural land and their family depend less on the migrants remittance. They sent remittance mainly for medical expense and educational expense. About 2.5 per cent of respondents send remittance quarterly. These respondent's family members have other jobs for livelihood and don't depend on migrant's remittance for livelihood. This is in conformity with the results of (4).

From table-5, majority of the respondents spent remittance money on household consumption. The probable reason may be that the income of the respondent's families were less at the source and the family depends mainly on the migrant's income. The remittance was also used for health care of their parents and other family members. After migration, they used to go to better hospitals for health care. They also used the remittances for children education and clearing off debts. They sent their children to good schools and cleared debt which they took previously for different reasons. It was also noticed during the study that some respondents saved some portion of remittances for future use, this reflected that the family of migrants had received surplus income after meeting their family requirements. In the future, they are planning to invest this saved money for some productive purpose in their native place. Some of the respondents were using the remittance for house construction and for social function expenditure like marriage to increase their status of living. Very few of the family members of the migrants used remittances for agricultural purposes because only few had got agricultural land and also it was non remunerative, so they preferred to save the money for future use instead of spending for agricultural purposes. The result is in conformity with the results of (5,6,7).

The main impact of remittance was visible in overall increase in family income. This helped them to live a better life in their native place. Migration had also improved the quality and quantity of food by increasing the variety and intake of different food groups in their diet which has improved the health status of migrants and their families. Health status also improved due to increase intake of supplements and awareness to visit better health care centers and take medicine when necessary. Improvement in clothing was due to the modernization of clothing pattern as clothes of new trend were sent by the migrated members to the families. With the remittance

sent by respondents, family members were able to avail the facility of health check-ups from a reputed hospital near to their village. Using the remittance, some respondent's family shifted to owned house from the rented one. The kuchha houses were renovated with pucca houses, the number of rooms increased due to additional construction, furniture and furnishing items also increased which lead to the improvement of house. Using the remittance, children were either shifted to better schools or were provided with extra tuitions which improved their grades. So, there was an overall increase in the standard of living of respondent's family in their native place. These findings are similar with the results of (8,9).

From the table-7, it is evident that there is a significant association between marital status, family size, land holding, annual income, purpose of migration and remittance with perception on push determinants of migration. Marital status has a significant association with perception on push determinants of migration. This may be because, as most of the respondents were married, so, they need more money to look after their family. Thus, they migrate in search of money. Hence, a significant association found. Similar findings were reported by (10, 11). Family size has a significant association with perception on push determinants of migration. The probable reason behind this may be, as the number of family members increased, the expenditure has also increased. This may have forced them to migrate. This is in line with findings of (10, 12). Most of the respondents were having marginal land holdings and this may have forced them to have a high perception towards push factors. So, there is significant association between landholding size and perception on push factors of migration. Similar findings were reported by (13). Annual income of most of the respondents was very low. With the existing annual income, they couldn't make their living. Hence, they migrate. This might be the reason for the association between annual income and perception on push determinants of migration. This is in line with findings of (13). Most of the respondent's migrated for doing unskilled jobs which were easily available in Kerala and they can earn more money within a short span of time. This may be the reason for the association between purpose of migration and perception on push determinants of migration. Similar findings were reported by (11). The remittance send by the respondents were used by the households for their livelihood activities. So perception on push determinants has association with remittance. This is in line with findings of (11, 12).

Table-7 : Relationship between the profile characteristics and perception on push determinants of migration.

| Sl. No. | Profile Character | Chi-square value |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. | Age | 8.81 NS |
| 2. | Education | 6.52NS |
| 3. | Marital status | 19.57** |
| 4. | Family size | 13.25* |
| 5. | Family type | 1.25NS |
| 6. | Landholding size | 14.09* |
| 7. | Annual income | 15.66* |
| 8. | No. of migrants in the family | 2.47NS |
| 9. | Purpose of migration | 12.99* |
| 10. | Nature of work | 6.18NS |
| 11. | Motivation for migration | 4.33NS |
| 12. | Duration of stay at source | 5.34NS |
| 13. | Remittance | 10.54* |
| 14. | Income at destination | 9.17NS |
| 15. | Economic motivation | 7.05NS |

*Significant at 5 per cent level of significance.

**Significant at 1 per cent level of significance.

From the table-8, it is evident that there is a significant association between number of migrants in the family, purpose of migration, motivation for migration and income at destination with perception on pull determinants of migration. If one of the family members migrated for getting employment, other family members are also willing to migrate. So, there is association between number of migrants in the family and perception on pull determinants of migration. This is in line with findings of (14). The migrants were more interested in

Table-8 : Relationship between the profile characteristics and perception on pull determinants of migration.

| Sl. No. | Profile Character | Chi-square value |
|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. | Age | 7.52 NS |
| 2. | Education | 4.61 NS |
| 3. | Marital status | 5.00 NS |
| 4. | Family size | 3.09 NS |
| 5. | Family type | 0.14 NS |
| 6. | Landholding size | 7.68 NS |
| 7. | Annual income | 6.19 NS |
| 8. | No. of migrants in the family | 17.68* |
| 9. | Purpose of migration | 29.82** |
| 10. | Nature of work | 3.42 NS |
| 11. | Motivation for migration | 16.55* |
| 12. | Duration of stay at source | 2.83 NS |
| 13. | Remittance | 6.43 NS |
| 14. | Income at destination | 16.46* |
| 15. | Economic motivation | 4.83 NS |

* Significant at 5 per cent level of significance.

** Significant at 1 per cent level of significance.

doing unskilled works because it was easy to find and most of the respondents were unskilled. So there is association between purpose of migration and perception on pull determinants of migration. Most of the migrants know about the employment opportunities in other States through their friends or family members. The remittance send by other migrants will attract others to migrate. So, there is association between motivation for migration and perception on pull determinants of migration. This is in line with findings of (14). The increased amount of income at destination also increased the attraction of migrants towards the destination area. So, there is association between income at destination and perception on pull determinants of migration.

Conclusions

The study revealed that majority (71.66%) of the respondent's monthly income was in the range of Rs. 14,000 to Rs. 18,000 at the destination. Majority (75.83%) of the respondents send Rs. 11000 to Rs. 15000 as remittance per month to home. However, 80 per cent of the respondents were using banks for sending remittance to home. Majority (87.5%) of the respondents sent remittance monthly. Majority of the respondents (94.16%) had utilized their remittance for household consumption followed by health care (61.66%). The migration phenomenon has gained a huge global importance in recent years, this is because many number of people are leaving their place of origin and migrating to other places in search of better living options, nationally and internationally. As the road infrastructure and telecommunication improved, cost of transportation and communication declined. This led to the increase in information flow and reduced the cost of migration. The state of Assam is facing the problem of migration of rural youth. If this trend continues, it will pave way for long term problems like decreasing the production in every sector, because they are losing human assets. In order to retain them in their own state providing skill based trainings will help. Government can support individuals to start their own enterprises and start ups and become job providers. Immense market potential for bamboo products can be utilized by rural youth with the help of government support and finding proper markets. Helping migrants to setup their own enterprise by using their remittance will help to retain them in their own State.

References

1. Deka J.K. (2019). Factors responsible for out-migration in Assam. *International Journal of Academic Research and Development*, 4(5): 59-63
2. Shameer M.K. and Kasim M.C. (2017). Determinants of wage rate of inter-state migrant workers in Kerala. *Labour and Development*, 24(2): 121-145.
3. Narayana D. and Venkiteswaran C.S. (2013). 'Domestic Migrant Labours in Kerala', A Report submitted to the Labour and Rehabilitation Department, Government of Kerala.
4. Sinha K.A. (2018). Socio-economic implications of migration from Bihar. *Ph.D. thesis, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana*.
5. Katz E. (2003). The changing role of women in the rural economies of Latin America. In Davis, B.(Ed.), *Current and emerging issues for economic analysis and policy research*, 1: 31-66.
6. Srivastava R. (2012). An overview of its features, trends and policy challenges. In National Workshop on Internal Migration and Human Development in India; 6-7 December 2011; *Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR)*, New Delhi, India.
7. Tumbe C. (2011). Remittances in India: facts and issues. *IIM Bangalore Research Paper No.331. Indian Institute of Management, Bangalore*.
8. Kafle S. (2016). Role of remittance in rural poverty reduction: a case study of Barre VDC, Udayapur district, *M.Sc. Thesis, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu*.
9. Venu B.N., Umesh K.B. and Gaddi G.M. (2016). Agricultural labour migration and remittances in Karnataka state of India. *International Journal of Agriculture Sciences*, 8(58): 3227-3230.
10. Deshingkar P. (2006). Internal migration, poverty and development in Asia: Including the excluded. *IDS Bulletin*, 37(3): 88-100.
11. Arya N. (2015). Rural out migration in uttarakhand in the changing agrarian scenario. *M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, Professor JayashankarTelangana State Agricultural University, Hyderabad*
12. Singh N.P., Singh R.P., Kumar R., Padaria R.N., Singh A. and Varghese N. (2011). Labour migration in Indo-Gangetic plains: Determinants and impacts on socio-economic welfare. *Agricultural Economics Research Review*, 24: 449-458.
13. Bhushan V. (2014). Migration of labour in north Bihar- Socio-economic factors and impact. *M.Sc. Thesis, Rajendra Agricultural University, Pusa*.
14. DeBrauw A., Huang J., Rozelle S., Zhang L. and Zhang Y. (2002). The evolution of China's rural labor markets during the reforms. Working Paper No.02-003, *Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, University of California Davis*.