Journal of Namibian Studies, 35 S1 (2023): 5263-5281 ISSN: 2197-5523 (online)

A Comparitive Study Of Social Inquality Among Migrant And Non-Migrant Households In Two Villages Of Kasaragod District, Kerala

Dr.Govindaprasad.P.K[1] , Dr.Syam Prasad[2]

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Hindustan Institute of Technology and Science (Deemed to be University), Chennai, Tamil Nadu.
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Central University of Kerala, Periya, Kasaragod, Kerala.

Abstract

Many economists have actively examined the complex relationship between migration, remittances, and inequality. They hardly pay attention to how these events reflect economic inequality in their country of origin. Pervasive inequalities in society are based on the very opportunities available to individuals-complex interactions influenced by their unique circumstances, and the natural and social conditions in which they live. A comprehensive understanding of the effects of migration and remittances on inequality requires a multi-faceted approach. Addressing this research gap, the present study seeks to critically examine the impact of migration and remittances on inequality in two migrant-dominated villages in Kerala. Using the Social Inequality Index as an instrument, this study aims to shed light on this complex relationship. From the study the social inequality index shows that, the prevalence of social inequality is high among the sample households in Ramagiri village than that of among the sample households in Chengala village. It is also showed that, the high social inequality is associated with backwardness in socio-economic and health indicators.

Keywords: Migration, Remittances, Social Inequality, Social Inequality Index, Kerala.

Introduction

The relationship between migration, remittance and inequality have been analysed by several scholars in economics. Most of the studies focused on how the migration and remittances lead to economic inequality in the source country. Among this, a group of scholars such as Garip (2012), Semyonov and Gorodzeisky (2008) and Barham and Boucher (1998) argues that migration and remittances widened economic inequality in the source country. As against this Taylor (1992), Davis (1992), Zhu and Luo (2010) are of the view that migration and remittance has an egalitarian effect in the source country. As mentioned earlier most of these studies focussed on the economic inequalities in the source country. So these studies are single dimensional and not capture all the dynamics of the relationship between migration, remittances and inequality. The economic inequality in a society depends on the real opportunity that different persons enjoy. This in turn influenced by variations of individual’s circumstances and also by natural and the social environment. So that, to have a clear understanding of the impact of migration, remittances on inequality a multidimensional approach is required. To fill this research gap the present study tries to analyse the impact of migration and remittances on inequality in the two villages (having the high density of migration) in Kerala by using social inequality index. This index consists of five core variables such as income, health, education and perceived access to health care and education. Kerala is one of the state in India having a large number of migrants and receiving large volumes of remittances. As per Kerala Migration survey, there are 36.5 lakhs non-resident Keralites in the year 2014. The total remittances contributed in the year 2014 is Rs.71142 crore and the share of this remittances as a percentage of NSDP of Kerala is 36.3. The survey also shows that there is a northward shift in the district-wise origin of emigrants from Kerala. This shows that there is a chance of concentration of economic and social asset in the hands of migrants and their family alone. There is few study has been done to analyse the impact of migration on inequality. John (2016) in his study found that migration causes inequalities in mobility between migrant and non-migrant households and between different types of migrant households. The major limitation of this study is that the analysis based on the asset based Standard of Living Index. The three major components of this Index is house characteristics, consumer durable characteristics and land size. So the present study tries to trace out the impact of migration and remittances on the economic and social inequality in the two villages of Kasaragod District, Kerala based on the social inequality index.

The review of literature on the impact of migration on inequality shows different views. In their study Zho and Luo (2014) opined that migration tends to have egalitarian effects on rural income. Similar view is expressed by Dharmadasa and Weeraheva (2018), who were of the view that income inequality slightly decreased due to internal and international remittances. Remittances from out-migrant workers have definitely played a role in reducing income differentials among rural households. However, at the provincial level, we find some evidence that rich and poor provinces experience quite different effects of rural migration on income inequality. In rich area, rural migration reduces inequality, while in relatively backward area, it appears to increase income inequality, mainly due (we suspect) to the lack of mobility of workers in very low-income households (Shi, 1999). The results of both models show that there is negative and statistically significant relationship between income inequality and foreign remittances. When remittances increase, income inequality decreases (Suleman & Cheema, 2020). Both internal and international remittances have an neutral impact on rural income distribution in Pakistan (Adams,1992). The dynamic framework proposed in this paper demonstrates that the impact of migration and remittances on inequalities in the migrants' origin communities largely depends on the difference in their initial endowments of non-liquefiable capital. Migration and remittances always reduce wealth inequality, through a proportionally larger increase in wealth for the poor. Second, except when the inequality in productivity is sufficiently high, income inequality may decrease continuously over time or be characterized by a ”trickle-down” transition path (Docquier, Rapoport, & She, 2006). Migration and remittances have a strong, positive effect on the alleviation of poverty and distribution of income (Brown & Jimenez, 2007). Impact of migration on Emirdağ's economy is the decreasing of poverty and the income inequality (Dagdemir, Kartal, Tinas, & Gurbuz, 2018).

Increasing number of international migrants from Sri Lanka or increasing remittances to Sri Lanka generate higher income inequality in the country (Hettige Don, 2012). External remittnace increase expenditure inequality in Pakistan (Shair and Anwar, 2023). Household income and asset accumulation for a source household are higher after migration participation (Redehegn, Dingqiang, Eshete, & Gichuki, 2019).

Migration has not an effect in the income inequality for the short run, but it has a considerable impact in the long run in Albania, which refers to the fact that remittances and income inequality go monotonically together in the long run (Turan & Podo, 2014).

The impact of remittance on the distribution of rural income depends on three factors i) diffusion of migration opportunities, ii) returns to human capital, iii) distribution of skills and education (Stark, Taylor and Yitzhaki, 1988). Source of remittances (domestic or international) and factors like education and household size play essential roles in determining how remittances impact income inequality (Olova and Shittu, 2012).

Objectives of the Study

The main objectives of the study are

1. To compare the socioeconomic conditions of the migrant and non-migrant households in the two villages of Kasaragod district in Kerala.
2. To compare the prevalence of inequality in the two villages using Social Inequality Index in Kasaragod district of Kerala.

Methodology

The present study is descriptive in nature. It is based on primary data. . Structured interview schedule used for data collection. Snow ball sampling technique was used for selecting sample household. As such 100 households were selected for the study. The study conducted in Kasaragod district, which experiences socioeconomic backwardness. The data were collected from two villages namely Ramagiri and Chengala villages. These two villages have the higher number of migrant household in the district. From each village, 25 migrant and 25 non-migrant households were purposively selected. Data were analysed by using percentage, ratio and Social Inequality Index.

Result and Discussion

Household Characteristics

Here the average household size and the average land size were used to compare the household characteristics of migrant and non-migrant household in the Ramagiri and Chengala villages.

Table 1: Household characteristics of migrant and non-migrant household

Household characteristics	Ramagiri Village		Chengala Village	
	Migrant household	Non-migrant household	Migrant household	Non-migrant household
Average Household size	5.56	3.64	6.4	6.04
Average land size (in cent)	48.04	34.32	21.72	27.4

Source: Compiled from field survey data

Table 1 provide the data on household characteristics. It shows that in Ramagiri village the average household size and the average land size of migrant household are greater than that of non-migrant households. It also shows that the average household size of the migrant household is higher than that of the non-migrant household in Chengala village. In the case of average land size, the migrant house hold has a lower average land size than non-migrant household in Ramagiri Village, while for Chengala village, the average land size of non-migrant household is greater than that of migrant households.

Occupational Characteristics

Table 2 provides the data on occupational characteristics of migrant and non-migrant households in Ramagiri village. It shows that in Ramagiri Village 48 percent of the migrant household's major source of income are remittances and 24 percent of the migrant household get the major source of income from cultivation. And 16 percent of the household get their income mainly from non-agricultural enterprises. And only 12 percent of the household depends on wage for their livelihood. On the other hand, 60 percent of the non-migrant household depends on wage for their livelihood. The 28 percent of the household depends on government beneficiary schemes as the major source of income. The remaining three households get income from Cultivation, other agricultural activities and non-agricultural enterprise respectively.

Table 2: Occupational characteristics of migrant and non-migrant households

Occupation	Ramagiri			Chengala		
	Migrant household	Non Migrant Household	Total	Migrant household	Non Migrant Household	Total
Cultivation	6	1	7	0	1	1
Other agricultural activities	0	1	1	0	0	0
Non-agricultural enterprise	4	1	5	2	9	11
wage/salaried employment	3	15	18	0	14	14
others	12	7	19	23	1	24
Total	25	25	50	25	25	50

Source: Compiled from field survey data

Table 2 shows the occupational classification among the households in the Chengala village. It shows that 92 percent of the migrant households are getting their major source of income from the remittances and only 8 percent of the migrant household depends on the non-agricultural enterprise for their livelihood. Among the non-migrant household, 56 percent of the household depends on wage and salaried employment for their livelihood. And 36 percent of the household depends on non-agricultural enterprise for their livelihood. Only one household depends on cultivation as their major source of income and only one household get their major source of income from Government Beneficiary Scheme.

The analysis shows that the remittance is the major source of income of migrant households in Chengala as compared to migrant households in Ramagiri village.

Occupational Mobility

Table 3 shows that in Ramagiri village 48 percent of the migrants were engaged in construction activity before emigration. And 16 percent of them engaged in activities in the professional scientific and technical sector. The 12 percent of them engaged in the activities in the whole sale and retail trade sector and transportation and storage sector. The 4 percent of migrant engaged in Manufacturing, education and other economic activity before emigration. While outside Kerala 40 percent of the migrant remained in the construction activity. And 28 percent of them engaged in whole sale and retail trade activity. And 12 percent of them engaged in the professional scientific and technical activities. Though there is a reduction in the number of migrants engaged in construction activity, this sector remains to be the major economic activity of the emigrant in outside Kerala.

Table 3: Occupational mobility of migrant households, Ramagiri

Economic Activity before Migration (code)	Economic activity in the destination (code)								
	Manu (3)	Con (6)	WH & Ret (7)	T & S (8)	A & C (9)	P &T(13)	P & D (15)	Other (19)	Total
Manu (3)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Con (6)	0	8	2	0	1	0	1	0	12
Wh& Ret(7)	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
T& S (8)	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
P & T (13)	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	4
Edu (16)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Othr (19)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Total	1	10	7	1	1	3	1	1	25

Source: Compiled from field data

Code: Agriculture/forestry and fishing-1, Manufacturing-3, Construction-6, Whole sale and Retail Trade-7, Transportation and storage-8, Accommodation and food service activities-9, Professional scientific and technical activity-13, Public administration and defence-15 Education-16,Human Health and social service activity-17, Other services-19

Table 4 shows that in Chengala village 32 percent of the migrants were engaged in education before emigration.

And 25 percent of them engaged in activities in the transportation and storage sector. And 12 percent of them engaged in the activities in the agriculture sector and construction sector. The 8 percent of migrant engaged in whole sale and trade sector activities before emigration.

Table 4: Occupational mobility of migrant households, Chengala

Economic Activity before Migration (code)	Economic activity in the destination (code)							
	Manu (3)	Con (6)	WH &Ret (7)	T&S (8)	A&C (9)	P &T(13)	H&H (17)	Total
Agri (1)	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
Manu (2)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Con (6)	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
Wh& Ret (7)	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Tra& S (8)	1	0	0	4	2	0	0	7
A & C (9)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Edu (16)	0	0	3	0	0	4	1	8
Total	2	2	4	9	3	4	1	25

Source: Compiled from field data

Only 4 percent of the migrant was engaged in manufacturing, accommodation and food service activity before emigration. While outside Kerala 36 percent of the emigrant gets a job in the transportation and storage sector. And 16 percent of them engaged in whole sale and retail trade activity and professional scientific and technical activity. And 8 percent of them engaged in the construction and manufacturing sector. Only 4 percent of the emigrant engaged in the human health and social service activity. In Chengala, those who were previously engaged in education got employment in various sectors in the destination country. Among them 50 percent work in professional scientific and technical activity and 37.5 percent work in the whole sale and retail trade activity.

In both the villages the majority of the emigrant choose the same economic activity in the destination place. While comparing to Ramagiri village, emigrant in the Chengala engaged in more remunerative economic activity outside Kerala.

Remittances

This session analyses the average amount of remittance sent by the emigrant to their household during the last year. This also analyse the major use of remittances by the migrant household

Table 5: Spending of remittances by Migrant households during 2015-16, Ramagiri

Sl.no	Purpose	Average Amount (in Rs)	Percentage Share
1	For day to day household expense	40680.00	24.49
2	Education of children/relatives	17400.00	10.48
3	To pay back debt	12760.00	7.68
4	Purchase /Build Houses/Apartment	15416.67	9.28
5	Renewal of existing house	25680.00	15.46
6	Purchase /improve land	6320.00	3.81
7	Dowry payment	0	0.00
8	Start new business/expand or enlarge existing business	400.00	0.24
9	Deposit in bank/stock market, equity etc	8240.00	4.96
10	Donation	1360.00	0.82
11	Purchase of vehicles	12440.00	7.49
12	Medical expenses	19200.00	11.56
13	Purchase of gold	4400.00	2.65
14	Cash in hand	2400.00	1.45
15	Others (specify)	0.00	0.00
16	Total	166080.00	

Source: Compiled from field survey data

Table 5 shows that in the Ramagiri village emigrant send an average amount of Rs.166080 to their household during the period 2015-2016. The major share (24.5 percent) of this remittance spend on the day to day household expense. And 15.5 percent of the remittances were used for the renewal of their houses. The other major use of the remittance found to be the medical expense (11.5 %) and educational expenditure (10.48 %). The other major use of remittance is for the construction of houses (9.28%), Pay back debt (7.68 %), purchase of vehicle (7.49 %), deposit in the bank (4.96 %) and Purchase of land (3.81%).

Table 6: Spending of remittances by Migrant household during 2015-16, Chengala

Sl.no	Purpose	Average Amount (in Rs)	Percentage share
1	For day to day household expense	77480.00	31.15
2	Education of children/relatives	34600.00	13.91
3	To pay back debt	14880.00	5.98
4	Purchase /Build Houses/Apartment	12500.00	5.03
5	Renewal of existing house	48760.00	19.60
6	Purchase /improve land	0	0.00
7	Dowry payment	0	0.00
8	Start new business/expand or enlarge existing business	0	0.00
9	Deposit in bank/stock market, equity etc	29840.00	12.00
10	Donation	1600.00	0.64
11	Purchase of vehicles	10000.00	4.02
12	Medical expenses	19560.00	7.86
13	Purchase of gold	0	0.00
14	Cash in hand	0	0.00
15	Others (specify)	0	0.00
16	Total	248720.00	

Source: Compiled from field survey data

Table 6 shows that in the Chengala village emigrant send an average amount of Rs.248720 to their household during the period 2015-16. The major share (31.15 percent) of this remittance spend on the day to day household expense. And 19.60 percent of the remittances were used for the renewal of their houses. The other major use of the remittance found to be the spending on education (13.91 %) and for bank deposit (12 %). They spend 7.86 percent of the remittances on medical expenses. The other major use of remittance is for the construction of houses (5 %), Pay back debt (5 %), purchase of vehicle (4 %), and donation (0.64 %).

The comparison of two village clearly shows that on an average the migrant household in the Chengala village receives a larger amount of remittances than the migrant households in the Ramagiri village. The major share of these remittances used for the household daily expense, education of their children, renewal of houses and for medical expenses.

Monthly household consumption expenditure

This session analyses the average monthly household consumption expenditure of migrant and non-migrant households in the Ramagiri and Chengala village.

Table 7: MHCE by Migrant and Non-migrant Household, Ramagiri

Sl.No	Item	Mean Value of Consumption (Rs)		
		Migrant	Non-Migrant	Total
1	Food	5465.20	3200.00	4332.60
2	Pan, tobacco & intoxicants	0	40	20
3	Fuel & light	1136.00	1026.00	1081.00
4	Entertainment (includes cinema, picnic, sports, club fees, video cassettes, cable charges, etc.)	532.00	8.00	270.00
	Personal care and effects, toilet articles and other sundry articles	500.00	344.00	422.00
6	Consumer services and conveyance	992.00	740.00	866.00
7	medical expenses (non-institutional)	3100.00	2900.00	3000.00
8	Tuition fees & other fees, school books & other educational articles	2359.0400	728.6656	1543.8528
9	clothing, bedding and footwear	2594.5464	355.3040	1474.9252
10	Durable goods	1279.9864	309.9864	794.9864
11	Total	17958.7700	9651.95	13805.36

Source: Compiled from field survey data

Table 7 shows that the total mean value of the monthly household consumption expenditure of migrant household (Rs.17958) is higher than that of non-migrant household (Rs.9651) in the Ramagiri village. The share of Food on the total MPCE of migrant household is 30.4 percent. Next, to food, the migrant household spends more on medical expense (17.26%), clothing, purchase of bedding and footwear (14.45%), education (13.14%), durable good (7.13%) and on fuel and light (6.33%).

The non-migrant household in the Ramagiri village spends more on the food consumption. Out of the total MHCE, they spend 33.15 percent on food consumption, which is higher than the migrant household. Similarly, they spend more on the medical expense, around 30 percent of the total MHCE they spend on the medical expense. This share is much more than that of the migrant household. This is due to the prevalence of both short term and major disease among the non-migrant household compared to that of the migrant household. They spend the very little amount on the education of the children. The share of education in total MHCE of non-migrant household is 7.5 percent. This is lower than their consumption expenditure on fuel and light (10.63%) and on their consumption expenditure on consumer service and conveyance (7.67%). It can be inferred from the above table is that the non-migrant household's status in the society is lower than that of migrant household in terms of their ability to spend.

Table 8: MHCE by Migrant and Non-migrant Household, Chengala

Sl. No	Item	Mean Value of Consumption (Rs)		
		Migrant	Non-Migrant	Total
1	Food	12480.00	10080.00	11280.00
2	Pan, tobacco & intoxicants	40.00	0.00	20.41
3	Fuel & light	2072.00	2162.00	2117.00
4	Entertainment (includes cinema, picnic, sports, club fees, video cassettes, cable charges, etc.)	56.00	40.00	48.00
	Personal care and effects, toilet articles and other sundry articles	644.00	600.00	622.00
6	Consumer services and conveyance	1652.00	1240.00	1446.00
7	medical expenses (non-institutional)	3200.00	2680.00	2940.00
8	Tuition fees & other fees, school books & other educational articles	2056.6628	2691.9976	2374.3302
9	clothing, bedding and footwear	3473.3300	2803.3316	3138.3308

10	Durable goods	1346.6660	300.0000	823.3330
11	Total	27020.65	22597.32	24808.99

Source: Compiled from field survey data

Table 8 shows the monthly household consumption expenditure by the migrant and non-migrant household in the Chengala village. The total average MHCE of migrant household (Rs.27020.65) is higher than that of non-migrant household (Rs.22597.32) in the Chengala village. Out of the total MHCE, the migrant household spends 46.19 percent on food. The other major items of consumption expenditure are; clothing, bedding footwear (12.85%), medical expenses (11.84 %), consumption of fuel and light (7.67 %), consumption of consumer service and conveyance (6.1 %) and on consumption of durable goods (4.98 %).

Non-migrant households exhibit distinctive consumption patterns, allocating a significant portion of their total average household consumption expenditure (MHCE) towards food (44.61 per cent) compared to migrant households. Moreover, non-migrant households tend to allocate a greater proportion of their expenditure to education (11.91 per cent) and fuel and light (9.57 per cent) in contrast to their migrant counterparts.

As compared to migrant household the share of consumption expenditure of non- migrant household is less in the consumption of durable goods (1.33%), clothing, bedding and footwear (12.41%) and the consumption of consumer service and conveyance (5.49%).

Though the consumption share of non-migrant household in the average total MHCE is high in the consumption of food, education and fuel and light than migrant household, in terms of the absolute amount the migrant household were able to spend more than that of the non-migrant house hold.

The comparison of the two villages Ramagiri and Chengala shows that on an average the households (both migrant and non-migrant) in the Chengala village able to spend more on both food and non-food item than the households of Ramagiri village.

This is evident from the figure of the total mean value of MHCE. The Total Mean value of MHCE of Ramagiri village is Rs.13805, which is lower than that of Chengala village Rs.24808.

Morbidity

This session analyses the analyses the prevalence of morbidity among migrant and non-migrant household in the Ramagiri and Chengala villages. Here, it should be noted that, all the households not reported morbidity. So the analysis is made based on the data provided by the morbidity affected households.

Table 9: Prevalence of Morbidity among migrant and non-migrant household

Morbidity	Ramagiri			Chengala		
	Migrant houehold	Non Migrant Household	Total	Migrant houehold	Non Migrant Household	Total
Short term	8	12	20	9	12	21
Majour Morbidity	13	13	26	8	5	13

Source: Compiled from field survey data

Table 9 shows the prevalence of morbidity among the migrant and non-migrant household in the Ramagiri and Chengala village. The short term morbidity is higher among the non-migrant household than among the migrant household. While the number of major morbidities affected household is equal among both migrant and non-migrant household in Ramagiri village. Major short term disease prevalent among the household is fever. Among the non-migrant household, most of them affected Asthma, High BP and TB, while among the migrant household five of them are heart patient, three of them are affected asthma and three of them suffer due to High BP. Since more number of non-migrant household vulnerable to both short term and major morbidity, it has more consequence on the economic and social well-being of the non-migrant household.

Table 9 also shows the prevalence of morbidity among the migrant and non-migrant household in the Chengala village. The short term morbidity is higher among the non-migrant household than the migrant household. While the number of major morbidities affected household is higher among the migrant household. Major short term disease prevalent among the household is fever. Among the non-migrant household most of them suffering from Asthma, heart disease and diabetic. While among the migrant household four of them are suffering from heart disease and others suffered from cancer, asthma and other diseases.

Compared to the non-migrant households the migrant households are suffering from life style disease in both the village. Both the migrant and non-migrant household in the Ramagiri village is more vulnerable to the major morbidity than the migrant and non-migrant household in the Chengala village.

Social Inequality Index

This session deals with the Social Inequality Index. The Social Inequality Index shows the inequality among the migrant and non-migrant households in the Ramagiri and Chengala village.

Table 10: Social Inequality Index

Village	Migrant	Non-Migrant	Total
Ramagiri	0.17	0.22	0.21
Chengala	0.16	0.14	0.15

Source: Computed from the primary data

The table 10 shows that the social inequality between the migrant and non-migrant household is higher among the households in the Ramagiri village than in Chengala village.

Social Inequality: A Discussion

This paper focussed on analysing social inequality in the two villages of Kasaragod district, Kerala. Along with that it also analysed the socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of sample households. The analysis shows that, household size of migrant household in both the villages are higher than that the socio-economic and health status of sample household in Ramagiri village is lower than that of the sample households in Chengala village. The social inequality index shows that, the social inequality is high among the sample households in Ramagiri village. It is also find out that, the social inequality is high among the sample non-migrant households in Ramagiri village, but in Chengala village social inequality is high among the sample migrant households than that of among non-migrant households. It is summed up that, the higher social inequality in Ramagiri village is associated with backwardness in socioeconomic and health status in Ramagiri village as compared to Chengala village. The analysis of occupation showed that, the occupational status of migrant and non-migrant household in Chengala village is better than that of among the migrant and non-migrant household in Ramagiri village.

Conclusion

This paper tries to analyse the social inequality in the two villages in Kasaragod district. The study conducted among the migrant and non-migrant households in Ramagiri and Chengala village for the period 2015-16.Through snow ball sampling 100 households were selected for the study. The analysis of socioeconomic characteristics of the sample household showed that, the average household size of migrant household are greater than that of non-migrant households in the two villages. The comparison of two village clearly shows that on an average the migrant household in the Chengala village receives a larger amount of remittances than the migrant households in the Ramagiri village. The major share of these remittances used for the household daily expense, education of their children, renewal of houses and for medical expenses. The comparison of the sample households in the two villages Ramagiri and Chengala shows that on an average the households (both migrant and non-migrant) in the Chengala village able to spend more on both food and non-food item than the households of Ramagiri village. The Total Mean value of MHCE of sample households in Ramagiri village is Rs.13805, which is lower than that of Chengala village Rs.24808. Regarding health status; as compared to the non-migrant households the migrant households are suffering from life style disease in both the village. Both the migrant and non-migrant household in the Ramagiri village is more vulnerable to the major morbidity than the migrant and non-migrant household in the Chengala village. Finally the social inequality index shows that, the prevalence of social inequality is high among the sample households in Ramagiri village than that of among the sample households in Chengala village. It is concluded that, the high social inequality is associated with backwardness in socio-economic and health indicators. Though inequality more visible in income, the inequality is also seen in the access to education and health, level of education and health status. Along with lower income, the backwardness in socio-economic and health status has caused high social inequality among the sample households in Ramagiri village. From this it is concluded that, social inequality index provides a more comprehensive picture of inequality and to reduce inequality, multidimensional measures should be used.

References

Barham, B., & Boucher, S. (1998). Migration Remittances and Inequality: estimating the net effects of migration on income distribution. Journal of Development Economics, 307-331.

Binelli, C., Loveless, M., & Whitefield, S. (2015). What is Social Inequality and Why Does it Matter? Evidence from Central and Eastern Europe. World Development, 239-248.

Garip, F. (2012). Repeat Migration and Remittances as Mechanisms for Wealth Inequalities in 119 Communities from the Mexican Migration Project Data. Demography, 1335-1360.

James, B. D., & Wooten, I. (1992). Income Inequality and International Migration. The Economic Journal, 789-802.

John, R. (2016). A Panel Data Analysis of Relationship Between Migration and Inequality. IIM Kozhikode Society And Management Review, 1-12.

K, C., & S.Irudayarajan. (2015). Dynamics of Emigration and Remittances in Kerala.Thiruvananthapuram: State Planning Board. The government of Kerala.

Mckenzie, D., & Rapoport, H. (2007). Network effects and the dynamics of migration and inequality: Theory and evidence from Mexico. Journal of Development Economics, 1-24.

Semyonov, M., & Gorodzeisky, A. (2008). Labor Migration, Remittances and Economic Well-being of Households in the Philippines. Population Research and Policy Review, 619-637.

Taylor, J. (1992). Remittances and inequality reconsidered: Direct, indirect, and intertemporal effects. Journal of Policy Modeling, 187-208.

Zhu, N., & Luo, X. (2010). The impact of migration on rural poverty and inequality: a case study in China. Agricultural Economics, 191-204.

Adams, R. H. (1992). The Effects of Migration and Remittances on Inequality in Rural Pakistan. The Pakistan Development Review , 1189-1206.

Brown, R. P., & Jimenez, E. (2007). Estimating the net effects of migration and remittances on poverty and inequality: Comparison of Fiji and Tonga. Helsinki: The United Nations University World Institute for Development Economics Research.

Dagdemir, O., Kartal, Z., Tinas, R., & Gurbuz, H. (2018). The Impact of migration on Poverty and Income Distribution in a Rural Region in Turkey. REmittances Review , 151-176.

Dharmadasa, R., Weerahewa, J., & Samarathunga, P. (2018). Labor migration and impact of remittances on poverty and incomeinequality: evidence from estate sector of Sri Lanka. Tropical Agricultural Research , 69-83.

Docquier, F., Rapoport, H., & She, I.-L. (2006). Remittances and Inequality: A Dynamic Migration Model. London: Centre for Research and Analysis of Migration, Department of Economics, University College, London.

Hettige, D. (2012). International Labour Migration, Remittances and Income Inequality in a Developing Country : The Case of Sri Lanka. Retrieved from http://archive.cmb.ac.lk:8080/xmlui/handle/70130/2233

Olowa, O. W., & Shittu, A. M. (2012). Remittances and income inequality in rural Nigeria . International Journal of Finance and Accounting , 162-172.

Redehegn, M. A., Dingqiang, S., Eshete, A. M., & Gichuki, C. N. (2019). Development impacts of migration and remittances on migrant-sending communities: Evidence from Ethiopia. PLos ONE , 1-20.

Shair, W., & Anwar, M. (2023). Effect of internal and external remittances on expenditure inequality in Pakistan. Cogent Economics & Finance , 1-27.

Shi, L. (1999). Effects of Labour Out- Migration and Income Growth and Inequality in Rural China. Development and Society , 93-114.

Stark, O., Taylor, E., & Yitzhaki, S. (1988). MIgration, Remittances and Inequqlity: A Sensitivity Analysis Using the Extended Gini Index. Journal of Development Economics , 309-322.

Suleman, S., & Cheema, A. R. (2020). Foreign remittances and income inequality in Pakistan: A Pooled Regression Analysis. Journal of Applied Economics and Business Studies , 237-250.

Turan, G., & Podo, J. (2014). The Effect of Migration on Inequality:Case of Albania. Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies , 314-324.

Zhu, N., & Luo, X. (2014). The Impact of Migration on Rural Poverty and Inequality: A Case Study in China. CIRANO - Scientific Publications 2014s-08 , 1-46.