

FLOW AND DETERMINANTS OF MIGRANTS' REMITTANCES 3

3. 0: Introduction

Lack of industrialisation, poor performance of agricultural sector, unequal distribution of man-land ratio and overall resources and opportunities, lack of access to resources create massive rural-urban migration in a poor country like India. It is perceived that migration offers better employment opportunities and wages to the migrant. Besides, the massive rural urban migration create a numerous social and economic problems both in the place of origin and destination (Rhoda,1980; Borjas,1983; Kannappan, 1985). The migration process is more dynamic and context specific, consequently the impact of the migration is a contentious issue. As it varies from place to place, the researchers always understand migrants' remittance as the prime impact of the migration. Hence, there is need to acquire and update information on various factors that determine the migrants' remittances in each specific area over a period. However, past studies on internal migration in India cited that young persons in rural areas moved from rural subsistence sector to the urban sector with an expectation to earn more. This expectation of earning more has led to improve their standard of living (Singh and Patel, 1979; Papola, 1981; Oberai and Singh; 1983, Yousuf, 1983; Rathnasamy, 1984; Banerjee,1986; Khan,1986; Joshi,1989; Paul,1989, and Tiwari, 1991). Therefore, migration study in origin will be more purposeful and useful to trace out the flow, determinant and consequences of migrants' remittances rather than the study from the place of destination, because the information is collected from actual beneficiaries and that gives less chances of biasness. Moreover, it will ensure better sampling and wider coverage further to reduce the biasness of sampling error.

This chapter explores the general nature, characteristics, flow and determinants of migrants' remittances and its consequences in rural Odisha. It has been divided into five sections. The first section presents about the background information of migrants; section II: deals with the pattern of migrants' remittances. Reasons for migration and flow of

migrants' remittances are discussed in section III; while determinants of migrants' remittances are discussed in section IV. Chapter concluded in section V.

3.1: Background of migration process and an overview of the migrant households

Essentially, before analyzing the trend and flow of migrants' remittances, it is necessary to know about the basic characteristics of migrants' i.e., age at migration, marital status, social caste, household standard of living, living arrangements and other attributors of migrants' remittances. For comprehensive understanding the background and the attributors of remittances, we discuss the age group classification of migrants' age at the time of migration, household's social caste and possession of land holding, educational status of migrants, and marital status of migrants etc.

Table 3.1.1: Age group-wise classification of age at migration

Age groups	Percentage
Less than 19 years	13.3(40)
20-24 years	36.0(108)
25-29 years	36.7(110)
Above 30	14.0(42)
Mean age at migration	24
Number of sample	300

Source: computed using primary data; Figures in parenthesis is number

Table, 3.1.1 depicts the age group-wise classification of age at migration of the sample households in the study area. Purposefully, the age category of the sample population of the households were clubbed into four broad categories to fulfill the objective and draw the inference such as; to know the age group of the migrants at the time of migration. Moreover, the lower and the upper limit of the above four categories have been chosen considering the prime working age group of the migrants household to better understand the nature and pattern of the migration. It is found that majority of the migrants migrate during prime working age group, i.e., (20-30). Out of the total, 13.3 % of the migrants migrate to the destination at less than 19 years of old. About 36 % of migrants are in the age group of 20-24, another 36.7 % of the migrants are migrating at the age group of 25-29. Rest of the sample population (i.e.,14%) of the migrant household migrate at the age

of more than 30 years at the time of migration. The mean age of the migrants is 24 years of age. This implies that the migration pattern of the study population predominantly found in the younger age cohort rather than older cohort.

Table 3.1.2: Duration of migration

Duration in year	Percentages
Less than four years	33.7(101)
Five to nine years	32.3(97)
Ten or more years	34.0(102)
Number of sample	300

Source: computed using primary data; Figures in parenthesis is number

Migrants' duration of migration at destination presents in Table 3.1.2. This explains since how long migrants have been residing at the place of destination. Duration of migrants' migration at destination will be influencing their flow of remittances and which in to improvement on their child health at the place of origin. It is assumed that longer the duration of migration, the higher would be the flow of remittance, which enable household to spend more on health care, as a result, better position of child health at the place of origin and vice-versa. Purposefully we have clubbed here the duration of migration into three categories to have a better understanding on the flow of remittance by the migrants. In other words, the selection of household of the sample only captured the duration three years or more than three years at the destination with a view to earning more money, as a result the starting category of the duration of migration is categorized less than four years. While designing the study it was assumed that increase the flow of migrants' remittances with the increasing duration of migration. Moreover, an increase in the flow of remittances may have a positive impact on child health at the origin compared to the non-migrants household. It is found that, of total migrant population, 34% of migrants have migrated ten years or more. About, 32% have migrated more than five years as their duration of migration. Another, 33.6% of total sample have a trend of migration having less than four years of duration.

Table 3.1.3: Percentage of migrants' age at migration by duration

Years of migration	Age groups			
	Less than 19 years	20-24 years	25-29 years	More than 30 years
Less than four years	37.5(15)	32.4(35)	35.5(39)	30.0(12)
Five to nine years	35.0(14)	37.0(40)	29.1(32)	22.5(9)
Ten or more years	27.5(11)	30.6(33)	35.5(39)	47.5(19)
Number of sample	40	108	110	40

Source: computed using primary data; Figures in parenthesis is number

It is perceived that migration at younger age motivate migrants to stay longer duration than older age and which may contribute more to the household income through the longer period in workforce. Therefore, the present study has analyzed the duration of migration by age at migration and it is presented in Table 3.1.3. It shows that 37.5 % of the migrants migrate at age less than 19 years for duration of less than four years, 35 % are in duration of five to nine years, 27.5 % are in duration of ten or more than ten years in the same age at migration. Similarly, in the age group of 20-24, 32.4 % migrate having a duration of less than four years, 37 % are in five to nine years, and 30.6% are in the duration of ten or more years. Further, in the age group of 25-29, 35.5 % are migrated in duration of less than four years, 29.1% are migrated in duration of five to nine years, and 35.5% are in the duration of ten or more than ten years. Addition to this, 30% migrate in duration of less than four years, 22.5% are in the duration of five to nine years, 47.5% are in the duration of ten or more years during the age at migration having more than 30 years. It is found that majority of the migrants have migrated at the age group of 20-29 years with a duration of more than five years.

Table 3.1.4 Migrants marital status at the age of migration

Age groups	Marital Status			
	Unmarried	Married	Widower	Divorced/separated
Less than 19 years	13.4 (82)	11.2(88)	11.1(5)	0.0(0)
20-24 years	34.1(209)	37.3(294)	33.3(15)	100.0(3)
25-29 years	38.2(234)	39.2(309)	40.0(18)	0.0(0)
Above 30	14.4 (88)	12.4(98)	15.6(7)	0.0(0)
Number of sample	613	789	45	3

Source: computed using primary data; Figures in parenthesis is number

The importance of migrants' remittance within the prime age category is an important determinant across the marital status of the sample population, hence an attempt has been made to understand in the study. It is expected that ever married person are more exposed to migration because of more responsibilities and under pressure to maintain their family, hence the chances of migration is more in comparison to never married person. Besides, they are getting pressurise from their family side, hence they are also always in search of better opportunity rather than the present one. Therefore, the choice's of the migration is high among former as compared to the latter. Further, the ever-married migrants significantly determine the migrants' remittances. Probable may be they are in better place or to fulfill the requirements of family at origin. It is found that majority of migrants are ever married group as compared to never married group. As we have seen in the Table 3.1.3, the majority of the migrants constitute in the 20-30 age groups. Similarly, by marital category-wise distribution result is observed in the same level. It is clear from the data depicted in Table 3.1.3 that migrants within the category of 20-29 years of age, married migrants constitute 76.5% of the total sample size. On the other hand, around 72 %t of the total sample population belongs to the same category of unmarried.

Table 3.1.5 Age group wise educational status of the migrants

Age groups	Educational Status					
	Illiterate	Up to primary	Up to middle	Up to high school	Up to higher secondary	More than higher secondary
Less than 19 years	29.2(7)	27.3(3)	17.3(14)	10.8(4)	9.8(10)	4.5(2)
20-24 years	20.8(5)	54.5(6)	40.7(33)	29.7(11)	39.2(40)	29.5(13)
25-29 years	33.3(8)	9.1(1)	33.3(27)	40.5(15)	36.3(37)	48.7(22)
Above 30 years	16.7(4)	9.1(1)	8.6(7)	18.9(7)	14.7(15)	16.3(8)
Number of sample	24	11	81	37	102	45

Source: Computed using primary data; Figures in parenthesis is number

An attempt has been made to understand the educational qualification of the migrants at the age of migration in Table 3.1.5. It is expected that, better-educated migrants would be earning more and remitting more, which might be, influenced the health status of sending households, particularly on child health because of higher remittances. It is prudent to analyze the information on educational status of the migrants in broad age groups at age of migration. In the age group less than 19 years, the highest (29.2%) percent of the migrants are illiterate. As the educational status increases, the percent of the migration decreases in the same age group. Similarly, those migrants who have completed primary schooling across the educational status (54.5%) are dominant in the age group of 20-24 years. Further, it reveals that migrants who have completed higher secondary schooling are the highest (48.7%) in the age group of 25-29 years. Moreover, 18.9 % of migrants have completed high school as educational qualification at the age group of more than 30 years.

Table 3.1.6 Migrants social caste distribution by age group

Age group	Social Caste			
	Schedule Caste	Schedule Tribe	Other Backward Categories (OBC)	General
Less than 19 Years	25.5(13)	20.0(4)	15.1(18)	4.5(5)
20-24 Years	29.4(15)	50.0(10)	35.3(42)	37.3(41)
25-29 Years	33.3(17)	15.0(3)	33.6(40)	45.5(50)
Above 30 Years	11.8(6)	15.0(3)	16.0(19)	12.7(14)
Number of sample	51	20	119	110

Source: Computed using primary data; Figures in parenthesis is number

Conventionally, it is believed that people belong to poor and disadvantage group are more in migratory nature as compared to rich and advantage group. To understand and validate the argument, data have been analyzed and the results are depicted in Table 3.1.6. It is found that 45.5 % of General, 33.6 % of OBC, 33.3 % of Schedule caste and 15 % of Schedule tribe were migrate at the age of 25-29. Similarly, in the age group of less than 19 years, 25.5 % of the sample population are belonging to schedule caste, 20 % are schedule tribe, 15.1% are OBC and 4.5 % are in the General category. Further, in the age group 20-24, 50 % are belongs to schedule tribe, 37.3 % are in general category, 35.3

% are in OBC and 29.4 % are in schedule caste. Similarly, 11.8 % are schedule caste, 15 % are schedule tribe, 16 % are OBC and 12.7 % are General as their social caste in the age group of more than 30 years. Therefore, the empirical evidences show that migration at the early age is common among the disadvantage groups where later age is the choice of General category of migrants.

Table 3.1.7: Age group-wise migration by household possession of land in percent

Age group	Land size (in acre)	
	Less than one acre	More than one acre
Less than 19	10.4(13)	20.7(17)
20-24	39.2(49)	35.4(29)
25-29	37.6(47)	36.6(30)
Highest thru 30	12.8(16)	7.3(6)
Number of sample	125	82

Source: computed using primary data

Household possession of land is an important factor that determines the migration decision at the origin. It also acts as a push factor for migration as many past studies have probed this reality. It also plays a very important role to determine the choices of migrants' remittances. Hence, the study administrated two questions among respondents like if this households have possession of any own land in binary code of response like yes or no code. If responses is yes then, what is the size of land and the results are shown in Table 3.1.7. It was found that in prime working age group majority of the migrants migrated because of households having low amount of possession of land. For instances, nearly four (39.2%) out of every ten migrated household migrated at the age group 20-24 years having land possessed less than one acre compared to 35.4% households posses more than one acres of land in the same age at migration. Similarly, 37.6% of migrate household at the age group of 25-29 possess less than one acre of land as compared to 36.6 % of household having more than an acre.

Table 3.2.8: Percentage of migration in age group wise by household member

Age groups	Household member	
	Household three members	Household more than three members
Less than 19 years	15.4(10)	12.8(30)
20-24 years	38.5(25)	35.3(83)
25-29 years	26.2(17)	39.6(93)

Above 30 years	20.0(13)	12.3(29)
Number of sample	65	235

Source: computed using primary data

It is comprehended that household having more members the incidence of migration and remittances would be more because of strong family network influences both at destination and at origin. It is found that 15.4% of the migrants in the household having three or less than three members fall under the age category of less than 19 years compared to around 13% of the total households having more than three members. Similarly, around 65% household having three or less than three members are under the prime age category at the age of migration as compared to around 75% of household having more than three members. Overall, it is observed that, migrants' household having less members, the chances of migration is less likely in comparison to the households having more members.

3.2: Pattern and differential of migrant and non-migrant households

The pattern and difference of migrant and non-migrant households by their background characteristics are analyzed in this section. The background characteristics are such as; social caste, household possession of assets, wealth quintile, possession of health insurance etc. It is expected, the differences of migrant and non-migrant households by background characteristics would be visible at the end of this section.

Table 3.2.1: Social caste wise distribution of household

Indicators	Migrants	Non-migrants
Schedule Caste (SC)	16.0(48)	18.7(56)
Schedule Tribe (ST)	7.0(21)	10.0 (30)
Other Backward caste (OBC)	38.7(116)	23.7 (71)
General	38.3(115)	47.7 (143)
Number of sample	300	300

Source: computed using primary data

To understand the distribution of sample house across social groups by migration status the study has analysed and presented in Table 3.2.1. It is found that 16 % of the migrant

households belong to schedule caste as compared to 18.7 % of non-migrant households. Moreover, 7 % of migrant households are in schedule tribe as compared to 10 % who belong to the non-migrant households. Further, 38.7 % and 38.3% of the migrant households are in OBC and general category respectively as their social caste among migrant households as compared to around 24% and 47.7 % of non- migrant households.

Table 3.2.2 Structure of house by migration status

Structure of house	Migrants	Non-migrants
Kuchha	12.0(36)	23.7(71)
Pucca	69.3(208)	63.6 (191)
Semi-Pucca	18.7(56)	12.6 (38)
Number of sample	300	300

Source: computed using primary data

Structure of house provides key information to understand the economic position and status of the household. It is believed that having pucca houses would have in a better economic status compared to a kuchha houses. In order to capitalize the economic differences among sample households the study collates through observation during field study and analysed it. It is found that 12 % of the migrant households living in Kuccha houses as compared to 23.7% of non-migrant households. Further, it is found that 69.3 % of the migrant households living in pucca houses as compared to 63.6 % of non-migrant households. Moreover, 18.7 % of migrant households living in semi-pucca house as compared to 12.6% in non- migrant households. To sum up, the empirical evidence suggests that migrants are living better houses in comparison to the non-migrant household.

Table 3.2.3: Percentage of the sample household possessing BPL/APL/Antodaya/Annapurna Cards by migration status

Household possession status	Migrants	Non-migrants
Yes	51.0 (183)	49.0 (176)
No	48.5 (117)	51.5 (124)
Number of sample	300	300

Source: computed using primary data

Even so, Government at different levels has launched several programmes to alleviate poverty and mitigate migration. Moreover, to uplift the poor and to bring them into the main stream of economic development, among different programmes, Below Poverty Line (BPL), Antodaya and Annapurna Yojana etc. are prominent schemes/programmes in this regard. In order to get a sense of understanding about the benefit of the programmes across the sample population, the study captured information whether the sample household is a beneficiary of BPL/APL/Annapurna/Antodaya Yojana. It was found that more than half of the study population both migrant and non-migrant households benefit from these programmes. Although, the migrant households slightly more (51 %) than (49%) non-migrant households.

Table 3.2.4 Percentage of the household having health insurance

Indicators	Migrants	Non-migrants
Yes	27.3(82)	19.0(57)
No	72.7(218)	81.0(243)
Number of sample	300	300
Mann-Whitney 'U' Test 0.016		

Source: computed using primary data

Numerous researches indicate that health insurance among household members is a protective strategy for better health outcome of household members. It also provides opportunity to the household to save income in two ways i.e., through unpredictable income by claiming policy insurance and saving the predictable household health expenditure. It also facilitates households to liberate from poverty trap through changing predictable health expenditure to unpredictable insurance claims. Many past studies cited that households having health insurance are better in their economic position in comparison to do not have health insurance. It is also an indicator of to understand the level of household health knowledge and awareness assuming economic position constant. It is found that more than one quarter (27.3 %) of the migrant households having health insurance as compared to less than one quintile (19 %) of non-migrant households. The difference of the possession of health insurance among migrant and non-

migrant households is statistically significant at 95 % confidence level (Mann-Whitney ‘U’ Test of statistics significance value (0.016)). The result reveals in the Table 3.2.4.

Table 3.2.5: Percentage of the household by Standard of Living Index (SLI)

Level of Indicators	Migrants	Non migrants
Low	20.3(61)	46.7(140)
Medium	51.0(153)	41.3(124)
High	28.7(86)	12.0(36)
Number of sample	300	300

Source: computed using primary data

Standard of Living Index (SLI) is a composite index, which comprises sum of the composite weighted index value of the household durable assets. It also reflects household’s economic status. In view of this, an attempt has been made in this study to analyze the data to comprehend households’ economic status across the sample population. This result is shown in the Table 3.2.5. It is found that one fifth (20.3 %) of the migrant households fall under the low standard of living category as compared to 46.7 % of non-migrant households. More than half (51%) of the migrant households belongs to medium category of standard of living as compared to 41.3 % of non-migrant households. Three (28.7%) in every ten migrant households are under the high standard of the living category as compared to 12 % of non-migrant households.

Table 3.2.6: Percentage of household by wealth quintile

Indicators	Migrants	Non migrants
Poorest quintile	24.0(72)	15.0(45)
Second Poorest Quintile	17.3(52)	24.3(73)
Middle Quintile	22.3(67)	13.3(40)
Second Richest Quintile	21.0(63)	19.3(58)
Richest Quintile	15.3(46)	28.0(84)
Number of sample	300	300

Source: computed using primary data

Wealth quintile is widely used to compare and measure income inequality among different population groups. It represents actual percentage of population unlike the percentage of households living with poverty status. Household wealth quintile by migration status is presented in Table 3.2.6. It is found that 24 % of the migrant people belonging to the poorest quintile as compared to 15 % of non-migrant people. It is clear

from the past studies that people belonging to the poorest household are more migratory in nature with an aspiration to get better economic opportunity than richer. In customary fashion, we found that people belong to the poorer class are more clustered in migration category obviously would be economic opportunities. Around 17% of migrant people belong to second poorest quintile as compared to 24% of non-migrant. Another, 22.3 %, 21%, and 15.3% are in middle, second richest, and richest quintile against 13.3%, 19.3%, and 28% are in of non-migrant people respectively.

Table 3.2.7 Household possession of different assets by migration status in percent

Particulars	Migrant	Non migrant	Particulars	Migrant	Non migrant
Cows	63.7(191)	49.0(147)	Electric Fan	53.3(160)	40.3(121)
Camels	3.3(10)	0.7(2)	Radio or transistor	29.3(88)	19.7(59)
Goats	7.0(21)	7.0(21)	Black and white T.V.	67.0(201)	67.0(201)
Sheep	4.7(14)	0.7(2)	Colour T.V.	37.3(112)	23.0(69)
Chickens	6.0(18)	3.0(9)	Sewing machine	26.3(79)	15.7(47)
Piggery	6.3(19)	2.0(6)	Mobile phone	77.7(233)	79.7(239)
Electricity	97.0(291)	80.0(240)	Other type of telephone	20.7(62)	14.0(42)
Mattress	19.3(58)	22(7.3)	Computer	22.3(67)	13.0(39)
Pressure cooker	79.0(237)	77.7(233)	Refrigerator	16.7(50)	7.7(23)
Chair	81.0(243)	82.3(247)	Washing machine	26.7(80)	15.3(46)
Sofa set	34.0(102)	18.3(55)	Watch clock	37.3(112)	29.0(87)
Cot or bed	35.3(106)	21.7(65)	Watch clock	83.0(249)	82.3(247)
Table	85.7(257)	81.0 (243)	Motor cycle	24.7(74)	17.0(51)
Tractor	11.7(35)	4.3(13)	Animal Drawn-Car	23.3(70)	11.0(33)
Water pump	17.7(53)	8.7(26)	Car	15.0(45)	7.0(21)

Thresher	72.7(218)	70.0(210)			
Number of sample	300	300	Number of sample	300	300

Source: computed using primary data

Household possession of assets (living and non-living) would enable us to measure the household economic status and understand the impact of economic wellbeing of the internal migration in study population. More elaborately households received more remittances through migration may possess more assets and may have improved their economic well-being. In addition to this, probing these series of questions also facilitates to compute the better indicators like wealth index and standard of living index for comparison of economic differential of migrant and non-migrant households. Household possessed the list of item results is presented in Table 3.2.7. It is found that 67.3 % of migrant households having cows as compared to 49% in non-migrant households. Similarly, the other livestock depicts in table. This table also reveals that more than 97% of the migrant household having electricity as compared to 80 % of non-migrant households. Nearly one-fifth (18.7%) of migrant households possessing water pump as compared to 8.7% of non-migrant households in sample population.

Table 3.2.8 Percentage of household increases possession of assets in last three years

Possession of assets	Migrant	Non migrant
Yes	44.3(133)	25.3(76)
No	55.7(167)	74.7(224)
Number of sample	133	76
Mann-Whitney U Test 0.00		

Source: computed using primary data

Several past studies cited that rural-urban out migration has significant positive impact at origin. More details the positive impact is much more pervasive in rural-urban migration stream than other form of migration. In the same way to comprehend the economic impact of internal migration on study population, the study probed the possession of assets in last three years, because we used three years as our reference period for selection of sample household. Further, in order to quantitative measure of economic impact in household level through migration the study probed that whether this household possess any household assets in last three years by household migration status. Of course,

the limitation of the question is other thing remains same over the last three years between migrant and non-migrant households. It is found that 44.3 % of migrant households showed their improvement in their assets possession in comparison to 25.3 % in non-migrant households. To compare the difference between the possession of assets by migrant and non-migrant households the study used non-parametric Mann-Whitney ‘U’ statistical test. The statistical result of assets possession between migrant and non-migrant households reveals significant at 0.001 level of significance. The empirical evidence shows that, net economic gain among the migrant households is stronger at origin owing to migration process over non-migrant counterparts.

Table 3.2.9 percentage of household possession of assets by standard of living index

Standard of living index	Yes	No
Low	0.0(0)	100.0(12)
Medium	15.2(42)	84.8(234)
High	53.5(167)	46.5(145)
Number of sample	209	391

Source: computed using primary data

In order to assess the economic impact of household by different economic strata, the study analyzed the possession of household’s assets by household Standard of Living Index (SLI). Table 3.2.9 depicts that, increasing the household possession of assets with increasing household standard of living. It is found that household belongs to high standard of living index possession of assets is more (53.5%) in comparison to medium standard of living index 15.2%. Probable explanation would be household belongs to low standard of living index would have spend more income in their current consumption expenditure than saving. More importantly, their current requirement would have been more as compared to household belongs to medium and high standard of living index. In view of explanation, possession of assets is zero percent, in household belongs to low standard of living category.

Table 3.2.10 Possession of assets in last three years preceding the survey by standard of living index in percent

Standard of living index	Migrant	Non- Migrant
Low	0.0(0)	0.0(0)
Medium	22.4(24)	10.7(18)

High	57.4(109)	47.5(58)
Number of sample	133	76
Mann-Whitney U Test 0.00		

Source: computed using primary data

More elaborately to know the economic impact at household level through migrants' remittances study analysed the possession of assets in last three years by standard of living and the results is presented in Table 3.2.10. It is found that 22.4 % of migrant households improve their possession of assets in comparison to 10.7% of non-migrant household's and medium standard of living index as their household economic status. Further, 57.4 % of migrant households in comparison to 47.5% of non-migrant households improve their possession of assets in last three years in high standard of living index. The difference of possession of assets in last three years between migrant and non-migrant households is statistically significant at 99 % of confidence level.

3.3: Reason for migration and flow of remittances

There are many questions regarding why migration happens among human population. In this regard, many advocates and concludes according to their observation in different context, time and geographical phenomenon. Broadly, these factors are classified in two groups, i.e., 'push' and 'pull' factors as we have explained in previous chapters. Similar attempt has made through this study to find out the factors or the reasons for the internal migration from rural Odisha. Although, the study has its own limitations in sample biasness (selection of only economic migrants for the study), still to better understand the flow of remittances and other attributors on remittances, study on reason for migration is a unique approaches.

Table 3.3.1 Reason for migration

Indicators	N	Percent
Employment	198	28.4
Education	19	5.9
Like the place	115	2.0
Friends/relatives	81	7.8
Employer decision	65	4.3
Fascinated of city life	41	8.9
Higher wage	112	6.5
Low agricultural production	113	20.3
Insufficient of land size	80	15.9
Number of sample	824	100

Source: computed using primary data

The results of reason for migration findings indicate that, employment (28.4 %) is the major reason for migration in the rural Odisha, followed by 20.3% are due to low agricultural production and 15.9% said insufficient of land size. Further, one tenth (8.9%) are reported fascinated to city life, 7.8% were said friends/ relatives are staying at the destinations as a result they migrate the current place, 6.5% said higher wage as their reason for migration. Moreover, very few (4.3%) said employer decision is the reason for migration to current place and 2% said like the place as the reason for migration.

Table 3.3.2 Age group wise reason for migration

Reason for migration	Age groups			
	Less than 19	20-24	25-29	More than 30
Employment opportunity	7.5(3)	1.9(2)	0.9(1)	0.0(0)
Like the place	5.0(2)	4.6(5)	10.9(12)	11.9(5)
Friends/relatives at destination	12.5(5)	9.3(10)	8.2(9)	16.7(7)
Employer decision	7.5(3)	12.0(13)	4.5(5)	9.5(4)
Fascinated of city life	0.0(0)	7.4(8)	10.0(11)	7.1(3)
Higher wages	22.5(9)	20.4(22)	14.5(16)	19.0(8)
Low agricultural production	22.5(9)	13.9(15)	26.4(29)	9.5(4)
Insufficient size of land holding	22.5(9)	30.6(33)	24.5(27)	26.2(11)
Number of sample	40	108	110	42

Source: computed using primary data

To identify the purpose of the migration at different age groups, the study analyzed the reasons for migration by age group-wise age at migration. Moreover, to identify the push or pull factors motivating at the time of migration in different age group. The result of age group-wise different reason for migration is depicted in Table 3.3.2. It is found that higher wages, low agricultural production and insufficient size of landholding are the major reasons for migration in the age group less than 19 years. Similarly, in the age group 20-24 years insufficient size of land holding is the major (30.6%) reason for migration followed by 20.4% for higher wages and 13.9% are for low agricultural production. More than one-fourth (26.4 %) are reported low agricultural production, followed by 24.5% are for insufficient size of land holding in the age group of 25-29 years. Add to this 14.5% are migrate for the higher wages, 10.9% are migrate for liking

the place and another 10 % are reported fascinated of city life. Moreover, 26.2% are migrated insufficient size of land holding as the cause of migration, 19% for higher wages, 16.7% are migrate for friends /relatives at place of migration followed by 11% are liking the place as cause of migration in the age group of more than 30 years. By and large, finding indicates that low agricultural production, insufficient land holding and higher wage rates are the main reasons for migration in rural Odisha. To sum up, findings of the reasons for migration among the study population reveals in a mixed of both pull and push factors i.e., low agricultural production and insufficient land holding act as push factors while higher wage rate is treated as pull factor.

Table 3.3.3 Destination places of migration among rural Odisha migrants

Place of destination	Sample size	Percent
Surat	136	45.3
Mumbai	93	31.0
Others	71	23.7
Number of sample	300	100

Source: computed using primary data

As we know from literature migrants of Ganjam district migrate Java, Sumetra, and Rengunu (presently in Indonesia and Burma respectively) in past. To understand the present migrants' destinations the study has collected and analyzed the information of place of destination and result shows in Table 3.3.3. It is found that majority (45.3%) of migrants are migrated to Surat city of Gujarat followed by 31.0% are in Mumbai metropolitan city and another 23.7% are migrated to some other urban places in India.

Table 3.3.4: Accompanying at the time of migration

Indicators	N	Percent
Alone	232	53.2
With family members	30	6.9
With wife	42	9.6
With friends of native place	71	16.3
With friends from working site	48	11.0
None	13	3.0
Number of sample	436	100

Source: computed using primary data

Accompanying with migrants at the time of migration is a very important factor to determine the decision on sending remittances. For instances; the decision on remitting

the remittances to origin would be more if some of the family members accompany during the migration, but the companion of migrant is not relative the remittances may would be low. The result is presented in Table 3.3.4. Majority (53.2%) opined that they were migrated, alone themselves, followed by 16.3% are with friends of native place and 11% are migrant migrated with friends from working site. Another one-tenth (9.6%) are said they were migrated with their wife, and 6.9% said they are migrated with family members. Another, 3% are said they were migrated but none of them accompanying at the time of migration.

Table 3.3.5 Migrants work status at destination

Indicators	N	Percent
Construction	123	21.4
Hired labour	134	23.3
Agriculture	18	3.1
Service	55	9.5
Business	27	4.7
stone quarry	48	8.3
Brick-kiln	16	2.8
Textile	131	22.7
Earth cutting and road lying	22	3.8
Others	1	0.2
Do not Know/ Cannot Say	1	0.2
Number of sample	576	100

Source: computed using primary data

Work status of the migrants or the type of work at destination they are involved are main determinant of migrants' income and remittances at destination. Many past studies found that migrants at destination are doing some odd type of jobs resulting risk is always associated with them at destination. They are always living with uncertainty and insecure life with discrimination at destination in terms of wage and labour hours. The nature of job they involved is always exposing to various risk factors. Comprehending the importance of migrants work status, the study probed the respondent that, what type of work they are doing at destination and the result shows in Table 3.3.5. Nearly equal number of respondent i.e., (23.3%, 22.7% and 21.4%) said they are in hired labour, working in textile or engaged in garment industry and construction work respectively at destination. More on, every nine out of ten (9.5%) and eight out of ten (8.3%) migrant household reported they are engaged in service and stone query sector at destination

respectively. Another five (4.7%) said they are doing business, 3.8% said they are working in the earth cutting and road lying at destination and 3.1% migrants working in the agricultural sector at destination. Finally, 0.2 % of the respondent said they were not aware or cannot say the migrants work status at destination and similar percent of the people said they are working in the destination in other types of work.

Table 3.3.6 Age group wise migrants work status at destination

Type of work	Age group			
	Less than 19	20-24	25-29	More than 30
Construction	10.0(4)	1.9(2)	1.8(2)	0.0(0)
Hired labour	12.5(5)	24.1(26)	13.6(15)	38.1(16)
Agriculture	5.0(2)	3.7(4)	1.8(2)	7.1(3)
Service	2.5(1)	13.9(15)	16.4(18)	11.9(5)
Business	0.0(0)	3.7(4)	3.6(4)	4.8(2)
stone quarry	7.5(3)	2.8(3)	7.3(8)	2.4(1)
Brick-kilns	5.5(2)	0.0(0)	2.7(3)	0.0(0)
Textile	50.0(20)	38.9(42)	44.5(49)	26.2(11)
Earth cutting and road lying	7.5(3)	9.3(10)	8.2(9)	0.0(0)
Others	0.0(0)	0.0(0)	0.0(0)	0.0(0)
Do not Know/ Cannot Say	0.0(0)	1.9(2)	0.0(0)	9.5(4)
Number of sample	40	108	110	42

Source: computed using primary data

Migration at early age and longer duration at destination, the probability of getting good opportunity would be very high and earning as well as remittances also. Keeping in mind the study analyzed the age group wise age at migration and their work status at destination and result is depicted in Table 3.3.6. It is found that 50% of the migrants in the age group less than 19 years are working in textile industry, 12.5% are working as hired labour, 10 % are working as a construction worker, 7.5% are working in stone quarry sector and so on. Similarly, 38.9% of migrants are working textile industry, 24.1% are working as hired labourer at destination, 13.9% are working in service sector, 9.3% are working as earth cutting and road lying and so on in the age group of 20-24 years. Similarly, 44.5% are working in textile industry, 16.4% are working in service sector, 13.6% are working as hired labour at destination, and 8.2% are working as earth cutting

and road lying and so on in the age group of 25-29 years. The similar pattern is observed in age group of more than 30 years.

Table 3.3.7: Monthly income earning, spending, and remitting to origin

Monthly income in rupees	Earning at destination	Consumption at destination	Remitting to origin
Less than 2,000 rupees	2.3(7)	34.2(102)	28.9(86)
2,000-5,000 rupees	25.8(77)	60.4(180)	53.0(158)
More than 5,000 rupees	71.8(214)	5.4(16)	18.1(54)
Mean	8873.7	3205.3	3836
Number of sample	298	298	298

Source: computed using primary data

Amount of monthly income earning and spending for consumption purpose at destination is the most important indicator to understand the level of migrants' remittances that able to remit. Table 3.3.7 shows that more than seventy percent (71.8%) of the migrant are earning more than 5,000 rupees per month, 25.8% are earning more than 2,000 but less than 5,000 rupees per month and very few percentage i.e., 2.3% are earning less than 2,000 per month at destination. The study also found that the mean monthly income of the migrants at destination is 8,873 rupees, which is on an average a migrants earning approximately 300 rupees per day at destination. It also finds that migrants' monthly consumption expenditure at destination. More than sixty (60.4) percent of the migrants spending more than 2,000 and less than 5,000 thousand rupees for consumption at destination, 34.2 % are spending less than 2,000 thousand per month and 5.4% are spending more than 5,000 rupees per month at destination. And the mean consumption expenditure of the migrants at destination is 3,205 rupees per month. As we mentioned the amount of earning and consumption expenditure is determine the migrants level of remittances. It is found that, 53.0% of the migrants are remitting more than 2,000 and less 5,000 rupees per month, 28.9% are remitting less than 2,000 and 18.1 % of the migrants remitting more than 5,000 per month at origin. The average monthly remittance, remitting by migrants is 3,836 rupees per month.

Table 3.3.8: Monthly income earning by migrants at destination by broad age group

Monthly income in rupees	Less than 15 years	16-35 years	Above 36 years
Less than 2,000	7.1(1)	2.2(6)	50.0(3)
2,000-5,000	35.7 (5)	25.9(72)	33.3(2)
More than 5,000	57.2 (8)	71.9(200)	16.7(1)
Number of sample	14	278	6

Source: computed using primary data

As we know migrants' monthly income at destination is the main determinant and is strongly associated with migrants' decision on remittances. The amount of earning also depends on the age at migration of migrants because younger age at migration would have better opportunity and earn more at destination. In view of this, the study analysed the amount of earning by age group and result presents in Table 3.4.7. It is observed that earning at destination is more by increases age at migration especially in comparison to younger age group (less than 15 years) and older age group, i.e.,(more than 35years) in the study population. Majority, of the migrants are earning average approximate monthly income at destination in rupees more than 5,000. It is observed that migrants in prime working age group (16-35years) are earning more than the younger age (less than 16years) and more than 36 years. The probable answer would have, in the prime working age group migrants would be able to work hard and they would have in well settle at the destination in formal sector. They are also familiar with the job market situation at destination by own gaining experiences, which would have opposite to the younger and older age groups.

Table 3.3.9: Monthly remittances remitting by migrants in broad age group

Monthly amount in rupees	Less than 15 years	16-35 years	Above 36 years
Less than 2,000	28.6 (4)	28.4(79)	50.0(3)
2,000-5,000	28.6 (4)	55.1(153)	16.7(1)
More than 5,000	42.8 (6)	16.5(46)	33.3(2)
Number of sample	14	278	6

Source: computed using primary data

The most important and formative objective of the study is to determine the migrants remittances and its impact on household consumption expenditure on health, nutrition and, education etc. at origin. Realising the importance of remittances the study probed that the approximation monthly amount of money remitting by migrants to origin. The Table 3.3.9 shows that the approximation monthly remittances remitting by the migrants to origin by age group. Migrant age group less than 15 is the highest (42.8%) remitting (more than 5,000 rupees) per month as compare to the less than 5,000 rupees per month. In the age group of 16-35 years, 55.1% of the migrants remitting up to 5,000 rupees as compared to 16.5% in the more than 5,000 rupees. Migrants belongs to age group more than 36 years, 33.3% are remitting more than 5,000 rupees per month as compared to 50% remitting less than 2,000 rupees per month.

Table 3.3.10: Monthly income spending by age groups

Income per month	Less than 15 year	16-35 years	Above 36 years
Less than 2,000	57.2 (8)	33.8(94)	0.0(0)
2,000-5,000	42.8 (6)	60.4(168)	100.0(6)
More than 5,000	0.0 (0)	5.7(16)	0.0(0)
Number of sample	14	278	6

Source: computed using primary data

The monthly consumption expenditure by broad age group at destination would be gives us to understand the amount of migrants' remittances by different age groups. The consumption expenditure by age group wise reveals in Table 3.4.9. This shows that 57.2% of the migrant spend less than 2,000 per month at destination as compared to 42.8% in more than 2,000 and less than 5,000 thousand in the age group less than 15 years. Further, 60.4 % are spending in the range of 2,000-5,000 in comparison to 33.8% are in the less than 2,000 per month and 5.7% spend more than 5,000 per month in the age group 16-35years. Very few people are migrate after their age is more than 35 years. The study account only six people migrate at age of 36 or more years of old. Their monthly consumption expenditure at destination is 2,000-5,000 per month.

Table 3.3.11: Average monthly income earning and remitting

Remitting /Earning	Less than 2,000 rupees	2,000-5,000 rupees	More than 5,000 rupees
Less than 2,000 rupees	83.2 (12)	33.8(94)	0.0(0)
2,000-5,000 rupees	16.8 (6)	60.4(168)	100.0(6)
More than 5,000 rupees	0.0 (0)	5.7(16)	0.0(0)
Number of sample	14	278	6

Source: computed using primary data

The primary focus of this chapter is to find out the factors determine the remittances and its impact on health. Of course, needless to mention, these remittances also depends on the amount of earning at destination. Moreover, more income at destination by migrants assumed that more remittances by migrants. Nevertheless, it is not always true, even though migrants earning a lesser amount at destination would have able to remitting more as compared to higher income earning migrants. To validate this argument the data are analyzed and presents in Table 3.3.11. It is found that migrants earning 2,000-5,000 rupees per month at destination 60% are able to remit monthly 2,000-5,000 rupees at origin. In similar way migrants earning less than two thousand rupees only, 16.8% able to remit monthly up to 2,000-5,000 rupees per month. Therefore, the study evidences suggest that higher income at destination by migrants enable to them higher amount of remittances.

Table 3.3.12 Average monthly income earning by duration of migration

Amount of yearning	Less than 4 years	5-9 years	More than 10 years
Less than 2,000 rupees	7.1(7)	0.0(0)	0.0(0)
2,000-5,000 rupees	20.2(20)	33.0(32)	24.5(25)
More than 5,000 rupees	72.7(72)	67.0(65)	75.7(77)
Number of sample	99	97	102

Source: computed using primary data

Duration of migration also play an important role to determine the amount of earning of migrants at destination and on remittances as we discussed above. Attempt has been made to analyze the duration of migration with average monthly income. Table 3.3.12 reveals the amount of earning by duration of migration. It is found that 72.7 percent of the migrants earning more than 5,000 per months at destination whose duration of migration is more than four years in comparison to 20.2 percent earning rupees 2,000-

5,000 and 7.1 % are earning less than 2,000 per month. Similarly, it is found that 67.0 % are earning more than 5,000 per month in comparison to 33.0 % in range of 2,000-5,000 rupees per month whose duration of migration is more than five years and less than 9 years. Further, it also reveals that 75.7 % are earning more than 5,000 rupees per month in comparison to 24.5 % in the range of 2,000-5,000 rupees per months whose duration of migration is more than ten years.

Table 3.3.13: Monthly income earning by duration of migration in broad age group

Amount of income earning	Less than 24 age			More than 25 age		
	Less than 4 years	5-9 years	More than 10 years	Less than 4 years	5-9 years	More than 10 years
Less than 2,000 rupees	2.0(1)	0.0(0)	0.0(0)	12.2(6)	0.0(0)	0.0(0)
2,000-5,000 rupees	32.0(16)	38.9(21)	36.4(16)	8.2(4)	26.8(11)	15.5(9)
More than 5,000 rupees	66.0(50)	61.1(33)	63.6(28)	79.6(39)	73.2(30)	84.5(49)
Number of sample	50	54	44	49	41	58

Source: computed using primary data

Migrants who migrate at early age and their duration of stay at destination is high so they may would have good job and earn more. Therefore, the average monthly income earning by duration of migration in broad age group essential to understand and the result is shows in Table 3.3.13. It is found that 66% of migrants less than age 24 years are earning more than 5,000 rupees per months in comparison to 32% in range of 2,000-5,000 in duration of migration less than four years. Similar pattern and trend is observed in the other duration of migration i.e., 5-9 years and more than 10 years in the age group less than 24 years. Study also found almost similar pattern in the age group more than 25 years.

Table 3.3.14: Average monthly remitting by migrants' duration of migration

Amount of monthly remittances	Less than 4 years	5-9 years	More than 10 years
Less than 2,000	25.3(25)	35.1(34)	26.5(27)
2,000-5,000	60.6(60)	45.4(44)	52.9(54)
More than 5,000	14.1(14)	19.6(19)	20.6(21)
Number of sample	99	97	102

Source: computed using primary data

Keeping in mind duration of migration and monthly income is most crucial determinant of migrants' amount of remittances. Generally, it is believed that increasing the migrants' duration at destination they would be able to earn more money in comparison to short duration migrants. It is always not true, short duration migrants or seasonal migrants are also earning much more than the long duration or permanent migrants as many past studies reveal in this regards. The study analysed the duration wise amount of monthly remittances and the result shows in Table 3.3.14. It is found that increasing duration of migration the amount of remitting capacity of migrants also increases. For instance, 14.1 % of migrants are remitting more than 5,000 per month as their duration of migration is less than four years in comparison to 20.6 % of migrants remitting same amount but their duration of migration is more than ten years.

Table 3.3.15: Average monthly remittances by duration of migration by age groups

Amount of yearning	Less than 24 age			More than 25 age		
	Less than 4 years	5-9 years	More than 10 years	Less than 4 years	5-9 years	More than 10 years
Less than 2,000	26.0 (13)	44.4(24)	31.8(14)	24.5(12)	24.4(10)	22.4(13)
2,000-5,000	62.0(31)	38.9(21)	47.7 (21)	59.2(29)	56.1(23)	56.9(33)
More than 5,000	12.0(0)	16.7(9)	20.5(9)	16.3(8)	19.5(8)	20.7(12)
N	50	54	44	49	41	58

Source: computed using primary data

As we found in Table 3.3.14 duration of migration is a determinant of migrants' remittance i.e., increases the duration of migration the amount of remitting capability of the migrants also increases. This study made an attempt to comprehend whether the remitting amount and duration makes an significant difference between broad age groups. The study analysed duration wise amount of remittances, remitting by broad age group and it is presented in Table 3.3.15. Result reveals that increasing duration of migration the amount of remitting is also increases with increasing age at migration from less than 24 years to more than 25 years old.

Table 3.3.16: Household received amount of remittance last year

Indicators	Total number	Percent
Household received remittances in last year	275	92.3
Does it increases as compared to previous year	116	42.2
Approximate amount of remittance household received in last year		

Less than 30000	107	38.9
30000-5,0000	104	37.8
More than 5,0000	64	23.3
Mean amount of remittance received 46687 Rupees		

Source: computed using primary data

The Table 3.3.16 shows that the result of the household received amount of remittance last year, and the increased amount of remittances received as compared to previous year. It also reveals that approximate amount of remittances household received in last year. It is found that 92.3 % of the migrant households opined that they received remittances last year, among them 42.2% said their received amount increases as compared to previous year. Further, the result also depicts that among the remittances received households in last year 38.9 % household received less than 30,000 rupees, 37.8 % household are received 30,000-50,000 and 23.3% household received more than 50,000 rupees last year. More on it, the study also found that the average amount of monthly remittances household received in last year is 46,687 rupees.

Table 3.3.17: Last year received remittance by duration of migration

Amount of remitting	Less than 4 years	5-9 years	More than 10 years
Less than 30000 rupees	36.3(33)	42.5(37)	38.1(37)
30000-5,0000 rupees	45.1(41)	37.9(33)	30.9(30)
More than 5,0000 rupees	18.7(17)	19.5(17)	30.9(30)
Number of sample	91	87	97

Source: computed using primary data

Comprehend the increasing duration of migration, the household amount of remittances also increases. Therefore, the last year received amount of remittances by duration of migration depicts in Table 3.3.17. It is found that the duration of the migration increases from four years to ten years the percentage of yearly remittances amount more than 50,000 rupees also increases from 18.7 % to 30.9%. However, the percentage of amount 30,000-50,000 rupees of remittances decreases 45.1% to 30.9% while the duration of migration increases from less than four years to more than 10 years. However, the finding

of the study indicates that the amount of remittances received household in the previous year is increased with the increases of the duration of the migration.

Table 3.3.18: Household previous year received remittance by broad age groups in percent

Amount of remitting	Less than 19 years	20-24 years	25-29 years	More than 30 years
Less than 30,000 rupees	47.2(17)	39.1(36)	32.4(35)	51.4(19)
30,000-50,000 rupees	27.8(10)	37.0(34)	41.7(45)	40.5(15)
More than 50,000 rupees	25.0(9)	23.9(22)	25.9(28)	8.1(3)
Number of sample	36	92	108	37

Source: computed using primary data

Migrants at working age (20-30) groups would be able to send more remittance than any other age groups. Realizing the above argument the data analyzed with household received amount of remittances in last year by broad age groups of age at migration and shows in Table 3.3.18. It is found that household received amount of remittances decreases with increased the age at migration. For instance, 25% in age less than 19 years migrants household received more than 50,000 rupees last year as compared to 8.1% in the age group more than 30 years. However, the amount received last year range of 30,000-50,000 decreases (40.5 %t to 27.8%) while the increase the age group from less than 19 years to more than 30 years. Similar observation also is made the amount of remittances received in less than 30,000 rupees in a year.

Table 3.3.19 Reason for sending of money to home

Indicators	Sample number	Percent
Family at home	266	28.4
Excess income	55	5.9
Not secure at destination to save	19	2.0
Repayment of loan	73	7.8
Purchase of assets	40	4.3
Future saving	83	8.9
Daughter's marriage	61	6.5
Children education and health	190	20.3
Family required urgently	149	15.9
Number of sample	936	100

Source: computed using primary data

To comprehend the importance of push and pull factors to operate on remitting internal migrants' remittances and trace out the determinant and causes of sending the money through internal migration in rural Odisha, the study probed several reasons for sending money. Table 3.3.19 depicts the reasons for sending money at destination. Among the reasons, more than one-fourth (28.4%) of the study population said family at home is major reason for sending money home and one-fifth (20.3%) percent said to meet the children's education and health expenditure. Again, 15.9 % reported to meet urgent family requirements, 8.9 % reported on future saving, 7.8% said on repayment of loan, 6.5% on daughters marriage, 5.9% said an excess income at destination and 4.3% responded for purchase of assets as the cause of remitting money.

Table 3.3.20: Means of sending money

Indicators	Sample number	Percent
Bank	210	44.0
Post office	35	7.3
Friends	67	14.0
Informal sources	165	34.6
Number of sample	477	100

Source: computed using primary data

Means of the sending of money is another factor that determines the migrants' choice on remitting the amount of money. If the sending and receiving region is well connected in all respects, then the choice of remittance increases. Further, it is also expected that migrants having better and convenient means of the sending of the money at destination then household would have received more remittances, remitted by migrants. More than four out of each ten (44 %) person reveals that bank is the first among the means sending of remittances. Further, more than three out of ten persons (34.6%) sending their money through informal sources, 14% using friends or relatives as medium of remitting money, while less than ten percent (7.3%) sending their remittances through post office.

3.4: Determinants of migrants' remittances

The purpose of this chapter is to find out the determinants of migrants' remittances. That is closely associated with some demographic, social and economic factors in migrants

and their households. Besides these, also there are some factors from migrants' destination also playing very dominant role to determine the migrants' remittances. An attempt has been made to make an enquiry the factors that determining the migrant remittances using liner regression model. The liner regression models wider the scope of understating the probability of remitting by migrants remittances from rural Odisha. It also extended to find out the factors determines the remittances and their quantitative estimation. The probability of remittances by migrants is estimated with a metric dependent variable, i.e., household received amount of remittances last year in a logarithm form.

The ordinary least square regression model has been specified as follows

The ordinary least square (OLS) regression Equation: The regression equation is an equation which can be written in a general form as :

$$\hat{Y} = a + bx$$

Where, \hat{Y} is the estimated (predicted) value of the dependent variable, x is the value of the independent variable, 'a' and 'b' are regression coefficients, where the coefficient (parameter) 'b' is the slope of the line and 'a', the y-intercept of the line (the value of y when x=0). The dependent variable is the variable whose values are to be predicted, or explained, given the values of the independent (or predictor) variable.

There for our model is

$$Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + b_5X_5 + b_6X_6 + b_7X_7 + b_8X_8 + b_9X_9 + b_{10}X_{10} + b_{11}X_{11} + b_{12}X_{12} + u_i$$

Where, Y- Household received amount of remittances in last year in logarithm form

a-Constant

b₁:b₁₂-liner regression coefficients

X₁: Age at migration

X₂: Educational Status of migrants

X₃:Social caste of the household

X₄: Marital status of the migrants

X₅: Migrants approximately monthly income at destination

- X₆: Migrants approximately monthly consumption expenditure at destination
 X₇: Household possession land holding at origin
 X₈: Any reason/s for remitting money
 X₉: Household any children suffering at-least one diseases two weeks prior to the survey
 X₁₀: Households standard of living index
 X₁₁: Accompanying during migration
 X₁₂: Total member in the household

Table 3.4: Ordinary least square regression results

Dependent variable (Household received amount of Remittance last year in log form)

Covariates	Specification	
	B	't' test
Age at migration	-0.006	-0.028
Marital status	-0.417**	-2.5
Educational status	-0.014	-0.095
Caste of the household	0.11***	1.93
Total member in the house hold	-0.23**	-2.54
Possession of size of land holding	0.22***	1.9
Who accompanying at the time of migration	0.31	0.28
Amount earning at destination	0.04	0.25
Amount of consumption expenditure	-0.21***	-1.9
Household standard of living Index	-0.04	-0.36
Reason for sending money	-0.014	-0.52
Household any child suffered from at-least one diseases	0.21**	2.1
Constant	10.02*	11.9
R ²	0.33	
Adjusted R ²	0.27	
Standard Error of the estimate	0.73	
Number of sample	300	

***0<P<0.1, **0<P<0.05, *0<P<0.001; Source: computed using primary data

The liner regression result shows in Table 3.4. In this table, the dependent variable (Y) is amount of remittances received last year in logarithm form. The amount of remittances received household is non-normally distributed or non-linear hence, to bring out in a normal form, the study used the logarithm function to make the amount of remittances

received household in last year. The covariates X_i are the list of variables mentioned in above. The ordinary regression model used with the dependent variable amount of remittances household had received in last year with covariates; age at migration, migrants educational status, marital status, household belong to social caste, household possession of land, duration of migration, anybody accompanying during migration, work status of migrant at destination. More on, household possession of cultivated land, household standard of living index, wealth index of household, migrants approximate monthly income earning at destination, migrants monthly approximate consumption expenditure at destination, migrants approximate monthly income remitting to origin. Further, the study identified some of push and pull factors, may effect to determine the migrant remittances hence the study included that variables in the covariates list. These are reasons for migration of migrant, reason for sending money and total member in the household and household any children suffered from at-least one diseases in last two weeks prior to the survey etc.

It is found that migrants marital status, household social caste, total members in the household, household possession of land, migrants approximate monthly income sending to origin and migrants consumption expenditure at destination, household any children suffered from any diseases last two weeks prior to the survey are playing significant role to determine the amount of migrants remittances in rural Odisha. On the other hand, household standard of living, any one accompanying with migrants during migration and any reason for sending money are not playing any role to determine the migrant remittances. More on the personal characteristics of migrants like age at migration, educational qualification and amount of monthly income earning at destination are also not shaping any role to determine the migrant remittances in rural Odisha. More elaborately household any children suffered from at-least one diseases in last two weeks prior to the survey the amount of migrant remittance also increases in 0.21 rupees and it is statistically significant at 95% of confidence level. Similar way, the never married migrant households are receiving 0.417 less rupees than ever-married migrant. Increased one person in household the amount of migrant remittances decreases in 0.23 rupees and it is statistically significant at 5% of level of significance.

3.5: Conclusion

To sum up, the study found that majority of the migrants are belonging to prime working age group (20-30years), completed education up to secondary school, medium as their household standard of living index, and the poorest wealth quintile. Further, Other Back Ward Categories (OBC) as their social caste, possession of size of land holding is less than one acre and household having more than three members. Majority of migrants are migrate more than five years as their duration of migration, Surat city of Gujarat and Mumbai metropolitan is their destination places. Nevertheless, majority of them are working in textile industry, followed by hired and construction labour at destination. To identify the shed of push and pull factors operating in the reasons for migration in rural Odisha the study probed the reasons for migration. It is found that, to get employment opportunities, insufficient land for cultivation, low agricultural production and higher wages at urban places are the main reasons to motivate among migrants for migration from rural Odisha to urban areas. On an average, it is estimated that migrant from rural Odisha earning approximate 8,874 rupees per month. Of total income monthly rupees 3,205 spending for consumption purposes and 3,836 rupees remitting respectively. The study also found that in rural Odisha approximate average amount of remittances received by the migrants' households in last year is 46,687 rupees. Probing the reasons for sending money as remittances to origin, it is found that family requirement at origin and a child well being (health and education requirements) is the major reasons for remitting money to rural Odisha. Nevertheless, majority of migrants used the informal sources (Friends, relatives and unregistered money transfer agents etc.) for remitting the money to origin as their means of sending. More on to, compare with the non-migrant households the study found that the economic position of the migrant households are better off due to migrant remittances over non-migrant counterparts. Of course majority of the migrants belongs to the poorest wealth quintile than non-migrants. Finding of the study also indicates that the possession of assets in last three years increases significantly among migrant households than non-migrant households. Therefore, it is concluded that the impact of migrants remittances has significantly improves the economic and well-being status of migrant households in rural Odisha. Thus, migration process in rural Odisha is treated as brighter side rather than darker side. The finding of the study also

indicates that migrants' marital status, household possession of land, migrants' approximate monthly income sending to origin and migrants' approximate consumption expenditure at destination are strongly determined the migrants' remittances in Odisha. Study also found that demographic variables such as social caste and total household member playing vital role to determine the migrants' remittances. More importantly, household's any child suffered from at-least one diseases in the last two weeks prior to the survey the flow of migrant remittances has increased. It also a crucial factor to motivate migrants' to determine the amount of remittances in rural Odisha.
