

**Working Paper
432**

**IMPACT OF THE GLOBAL RECESSION ON
MIGRATION AND REMITTANCES IN KERALA:
NEW EVIDENCES FROM THE RETURN
MIGRATION SURVEY (RMS) 2009**

K.C. Zachariah
S. Irudaya Rajan

June 2010

Working Papers can be downloaded from the
Centre's website (www.cds.edu)

**IMPACT OF THE GLOBAL RECESSION ON MIGRATION
AND REMITTANCES IN KERALA:
NEW EVIDENCES FROM THE RETURN MIGRATION SURVEY
(RMS) 2009**

**K.C. Zachariah
S. Irudaya Rajan**

June 2010

The Return Migration Survey 2009 is financed by the Department of Non-Resident Keralite Affairs (NORKA), Government of Kerala and executed by the Ministry of Overseas Indian Affairs (Government of India) Research Unit on International Migration at the Centre for Development Studies (CDS) Kerala. We are grateful to Mrs Sheela Thomas, Principal Secretary to Chief Minister and Secretary, NORKA, for her continued support. The draft version of this report was presented at an open seminar on December 1, 2009, chaired by Mrs Sheela Thomas, Secretary, NORKA and Professor D N Narayana, CDS and Dr K N Harilal, Member, State Planning Board, Government of Kerala, as discussants. Comments received from the chairperson, discussants and participants of the seminar are gratefully acknowledged.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Research Unit on International Migration at the Centre for Development Studies undertook this study on the request of Department of Non-Resident Keralite Affairs (NORKA), Government of Kerala. NORKA envisaged that the broad objective of the study should be an assessment of the impact of global recession on the emigrants from Kerala.

Its specific objectives are to provide answers to the following questions:

- How many of Kerala emigrants lost their jobs abroad because of the global recession?
- How many of them returned home due to recession-related factors?
- What are the social and economic impacts of such job losses on the emigrants, their families and the Kerala economy?
- How their subsequent return to Kerala impacted them, their families and the Kerala economy?
- What measures can be adopted to minimise the adverse impact of the recession on the socio-economic situation in the state?
- What measures can be adopted to rehabilitate the emigrants who have returned as a direct consequence of global recession, particularly those in low-wage jobs?

These questions are answered in this study by a comparison of two data panels where information about employment, remittances and other characteristics have been gathered. The first data panel of emigrants and return emigrants for 2008 (before the recession) has been compared with corresponding information for 2009 (eight months into the recession). The difference between the two sets of data is attributed to recession.

The sample for the panel study consists of about 4000 emigrants and 2000 return emigrants identified as such in the fourth Kerala Migration Survey [KMS hereafter] 2008 which was also funded by the NORKA in 2007. Being a panel study, sampling error is well controlled; a relatively small sample, would give robust estimates.

The first question posed by NORKA is: “how many of the Kerala emigrants abroad lost their jobs due to the recession? How many became unemployed?”

The answer varies depending on whether we are considering the number of emigrants who became unemployed or the number of emigrants who had lost their job. The number unemployed may not be the same as the number who lost their job. There is a subtle difference between “how many lost their job” and “how many became unemployed”. To lose a job, one should first have a job. To become unemployed, one need not have a job (persons not in labour force in 2008 might have joined the labour force and subsequently become unemployed in 2009). We answer the NORKA question by estimating increase in unemployment, gross job loss and net job loss during recession months.

- 1 Our estimate of the increase in unemployment during the recession period (the period between the 2008 KMS and 2009 Return Emigration Survey (RMS hereafter) is 37,000.

This number (37,000) is the difference between the number of emigrants (in 2008) who were unemployed in 2009 (about 59,000) and the number unemployed among them in 2008 just before the onset of the recession (22,000).

- 2 Our estimate of gross “job loss” is 54,000. This number is the number of emigrants who were employed in 2008, but became unemployed during the recession period. It reflects the actual job loss during recession.

6

3 Net loss of employment is 22,000. While 54,000 employed emigrants of 2008 lost their jobs during recession months, 32,000 unemployed emigrants in 2008 became employed. Thus, while the gross loss of employment is 54,000, net job loss is only 22,000.

These paragraphs supply the answer to the first question by NORKA.

The significance, or more correctly, the non-significance of this number (37,000 or 54,000) becomes evident when it is compared with:

- (i) the number of emigrants in 2008 (about 2.2 million)
- (ii) the number of unemployed among them before their emigration from Kerala, (about 431,000).

Thus, although both unemployment and job loss among the emigrants have increased due to recession, the increases are relatively small. Their unemployment rate is very much smaller than their unemployment rate in Kerala before their emigration. Employment-wise, the emigrants were perceived to be in a much better position even during the recession period than in relation to what they were in Kerala before emigration.

An analysis of the characteristics of the emigrants would throw more light on the significance of unemployment among them.

One country in the Gulf - United Arab Emirates - contained more than half of the unemployed emigrants (53 per cent). Saudi Arabia accounted for about 14 per cent, Kuwait (6 per cent) and Oman and Bahrain (4 per cent each). Unemployment rate among the emigrants was 3.9 per cent in the UAE and 3.3 per cent in Kuwait, both higher than the rate for all the emigrants combined, which was 2.8 per cent.

Emigrants from Malappuram district contributed most to the pool of the recession-related unemployed in Kerala. However, the ratio of the

unemployed to the total number of emigrants was the highest among those from Kottayam district.

Most of the unemployed emigrants were males, though the unemployment ratio was higher among the females.

A very large number of the unemployed emigrants were educated up to 10th or 12th standard, but there was no systematic relationship between the level of education and the unemployment rate.

More than half the number of unemployed in 2009 comprised those who had earlier worked in the “private sector” in 2008. “Labourers in the non-agricultural sector” made up 28 per cent of this group. About 8 per cent of them were those who were not in the labour force in 2008 (household duties).

The hardship to emigrants and their families caused by the downward movement of employed emigrants to jobs with lower salaries was not among the questions raised by NORKA. Such employment transitions were as important as unemployment in causing hardship to the emigrants and their families. As this question was not raised by the NORKA, no specific data was collected to assess its magnitude in this study. However, with the data available in our survey, using household remittance as a measure, some quantification of the distress caused by such employment transitions has been made possible (see later).

About 58 per cent of the emigrants remained in the same sector of employment in 2009 as in 2008, while the remaining 42 per cent were seen to have shifted to another sector of employment. These figures give a broad measure of the extent of transitions in employment that took place during the recession period.

Specifically, about 87 per cent of those who worked in the private sector before the onset of recession remained in the same sector after the

recession struck. However, 4.8 per cent of those who worked in the private sector moved to the non-agricultural labour sector, 1.5 per cent to Government jobs and 1.5 per cent became self-employed. A very large chunk (about 65 per cent) of self-employed workers moved to the private sector, while 25 per cent stayed self-employed. A large chunk (about 82 per cent) of those who worked in non-agricultural labour sector in 2008 moved to the private sector and 3 per cent became job seekers. Among the Government service personnel, only 29 per cent remained in the services, while 57 per cent moved to the private sector. Similar trends were observed among workers in semi-Government jobs also. Thus, the most significant movements were towards employment in the private sector.

In consequence, major transitions occurred among the employed emigrants in all sectors. Such transitions from one employment to another could be a major means by which a relatively large proportion (42 per cent) of the Kerala emigrants overcame the danger of job loss due to the global recession. This could be one reason why the unemployment rate among the emigrants remained relatively low.

NORKA's second question is: 'how many of the Kerala emigrants have returned to Kerala as a result of the global recession?'

Our Answer is: between 37,000 and 63,000 persons.

This study estimated that a total of 173,000 Kerala emigrants returned home during the months between October 2008 and June 2009 (the recession months). They returned due to a number of reasons, not all of which were recession related.

How many returned due to recession-related reasons? Our conclusion is that most of the return emigration in 2009 was not recession-related. The conclusion is arrived at from the answers that the return emigrants provided to the queries on the reasons for their return. The

reasons stated by them were mostly unrelated to recession. For instance, about 11 per cent of the return emigrants stated that they returned because “conditions at home required their presence back home”. Another 4.6 per cent reported “difficult working conditions” as the reason for their return home. “Personal ill health” was cited as the reason for return by about 8.2 per cent of the return emigrants.

On the other hand, a little more than a fifth (21.4 per cent) of the emigrants reported that they returned home because they lost their jobs due to the financial crisis. This worked out to be about 37,000 emigrants who returned home owing to the economic recession. Another 3.3 per cent (5,700) stated that they were compulsorily repatriated, taking the total number of emigrants who returned home due to recession to 43,000 and the total proportion to 24.7 per cent. Another 11.5 per cent of the emigrants reported that they returned home because their contract had expired and was not renewed. If they were also added to emigrants who returned home owing to the economic recession, the percentage would increase to 36.2 or about 63,000 emigrants. Thus, the number of emigrants who returned to Kerala because of recession could be as low as 21.4 per cent or as high as 36.2 per cent of the total emigrants. Translated into numbers, these percentages implied that the number of return emigrants attributable to the global recession would at most be 63,000 or as low as 37,000.

From the policy perspective, it is important to note that among those who returned to Kerala due to recession-related reasons, not all remained unemployed. Among them, only about 27,000 were unemployed at the time of this study; others had already found employment.

These numbers provide answers to the second question raised by NORKA.

Thus, statistical data indicates that return emigration resulting from global recession has not been much of a calamity at the state level

in Kerala, as the numbers involved are relatively small. Even during the peak of the recession, when some emigrants were returning to Kerala due to job loss, others were going back to the Gulf and other destinations. This study also reveals that among the return emigrants of 2008 (numbering 1,157,127), as many as 97,000 re-emigrated and became emigrants once again. In addition, Kerala sent out about 142,000 new emigrants during the recession period in 2009. These are important developments that have to be taken into account when we consider rehabilitation policies to redress the problems of a relatively small number of returnees.

The second part of the list of objectives of this study is:

What is the social and economic impact of job losses on migrants, their families and Kerala economy? How their subsequent return to Kerala impacted them, their families and Kerala economy?

This study does not include a broad analysis of the socioeconomic impact of the recession on Kerala society. Its objective is limited to the economic impact of job loss. Most of the economic impact (and even some of social-psychological impact) on the returnees, their families and the state was experienced through remittances which the household received from its members abroad. Our analysis of the socio-economic impact of the recession uses household cash remittances as its main tool.

As the sample of households included in this study is not selected at random from among all households in Kerala in 2009, this study cannot make an unbiased estimate of remittances to Kerala in absolute terms. What the study can do is to measure relative change (increases or decreases) in remittances received by the households in 2008. This seems fairly adequate to measure the impact of recession on households and the state.

At the state level, our estimate of household cash remittances does not show a decrease during the recession period. On the other hand, the total cash remittances received by the 3,045 households in the sample point to a modest increase of 7 per cent. This is quite an unexpected result. One would think that the flow of remittances during the recession would decrease and not increase. The increase could, however, be partly explained by the fact that the remittances in 2009 were for a 12-month period which included some non-recession months. Secondly, the recession could, in some cases, actually increase remittances, as some of the emigrants were returning home permanently, bringing with them all their accumulated wealth gathered during prosperous times. As a result, some households could exhibit large increases in remittances and others could suffer large decreases. That this is indeed the case is shown by the analysis below.

Evidence supporting an increase in remittances during the recession period comes from the statistics of other South Asian countries such as Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and Nepal (Irudaya Rajan and Narayana, 2010). The statistics of these countries indicate significant increases in remittances in 2009. The all-India statistics on remittances also support an increase in remittances to India*. Therefore the observed increase in remittances in 2009 in the state, although somewhat unexpected, is highly plausible.

*(*Indian Banks mobilised \$2.7 billion during April-September 09 from non-resident Indians (NRIs) against inflows worth \$1.1 billion during the same period last year (Economic Times, 13 November 2009)*

When the data on remittances from this study are disaggregated, all the sub-groups do not show an upward trend. Many sub-groups show very significant decreases in remittances.

All the three major religious groups show increases in cash remittances, although the proportions vary considerably among them.

There is no homogeneity among 14 districts in Kerala in this matter. Five of 14 districts show decreases, varying from 46 per cent in Idukki district to 0.7 per cent in Malappuram district. Nine districts show increases, varying from 48 per cent in Kottayam district to 0.3 per cent in Kozhikode district.

This is one level of disaggregation. For policy matters, however, a more meaningful level of disaggregation is that at the household level. Increases or decreases in household cash remittances give the net effect of unemployment, shift from one job to another with lower or higher wages/salary, and return emigration. Decrease in remittances is the factor underlying most of the socio economic problems of the migrant households.

Forty-four per cent of the households had received more remittances in 2009 than they did in 2008; twenty-five per cent received the same amounts and 31 per cent received smaller cash remittances in 2009 than they did in 2008.

The range of the percentage of households that received smaller remittances in 2009 varies from 44 in Idukki district and 37 in Ernakulam district to 6.6 in Wayanad district. Among the households that received smaller remittances in 2009, about 18 per cent are in Malappuram district, and 11 per cent each in Thiruvananthapuram and Pathanamthitta districts.

Among the households that received smaller remittances in 2009, 29 per cent received less than 25 per cent of what they received in 2008, 44 per cent received less than 50 per cent of what they received in 2008, and 69 per cent received less than 75 per cent of what they received in 2008.

About 90,000 households that received remittances in 2008 (6.4 per cent of the households) did not receive any remittances at all in 2009. Most of these households are in Thiruvananthapuram district

(13,000), followed by Kozhikode district (13,000). Thrissur and Malappuram districts account for a large number of the households that received no remittances in 2009.

If at all there is going to be any rehabilitation, households that did not receive any remittances in 2009 deserve rehabilitation most.

Lastly, we look at policies and programmes to overcome the recession-related problems.

What measures could be adopted to minimise the adverse impact on the socio-economic situation in the state? What measures could be adopted to rehabilitate the emigrants who had returned as a direct consequence of the global recession, particularly those who were employed abroad in low-level jobs?

This study has brought to light some of the broad dimensions of the problems created by the global recession on Kerala emigrants – the number of emigrants who became unemployed, the number who lost jobs abroad, the number who were forced to return to Kerala, the countries in which the returnees had been working, the districts they hailed from, the sector of economic activity they were engaged in before the recession, and their demographic and socio-economic characteristics. The study also gives a rough estimate of the number of households that received smaller amounts as household cash remittances in 2009 compared to what they received in 2008; and the number of households that received remittances in 2008, but not in 2009.

Groups that deserve Special Consideration in Combating The Adverse Impact of the Recession

- Families in Kerala of the 56,000 emigrants abroad who lost their jobs

- Families in Kerala of the unknown number of emigrants abroad who suffered loss of income due to salary cuts and increase in the cost of living
- 173,000 emigrants who returned home during the recession
- 63,000 emigrants who returned in 2009 as a direct result of the recession
- 28,000 return emigrants who are still unemployed
- 431,000 Kerala households that received smaller amounts as remittances in 2009 compared with what they received in 2008
- 90,000 Kerala households that received remittances in 2008, but no remittances in 2009.

This is useful background material for arriving at policies and programmes to minimise the adverse impact of recession on the households of the emigrants or return emigrants in the state. However, they are just background information and do not include policies or programmes. This study recommends that such policies and programmes be put together in consultation with NORKA officials (who have a wider grasp of the migration situation in the state), taking into consideration the results of this study.

While putting together such policies and programmes, this study suggests that the following points also can be taken into consideration.

First, the number of Kerala emigrants who returned due to the recession is not as large as is often reported to be. The number is unlikely to be more than 63,000. Among these returnees, only about 28,000 are unemployed at the time of the survey.

Second, even as emigrants returned to Kerala, new emigrants and former emigrants (who had returned earlier) are going back to the Gulf and other destination countries, thus regaining their emigrant status.

The recession has not been much of a deterrent and has not stood in their way for re-emigration.

Third, household remittances at the state level have increased and not decreased during the recession months, although there are several households whose remittances have decreased. About 6 per cent of the households that received remittances in 2008 did not receive any remittances in 2009.

Fourth, NORKA has recently announced a number of new measures to help emigrants and return emigrants. These include (i) training programme for the prospective emigrants, and (ii) financial assistance to returnees by way of loans from Kerala State Financial Corporation. These measures would go some way in easing the problems of emigrants and return emigrants. The Government could undertake more such measures including one to provide future emigrants with multiple skills that would enable them to move from one employment sector to another according to the need of the day.

Fifth, the present study indicates that the efforts to utilise the expertise which the return emigrants have gained abroad for the state's development are more likely to succeed now than at any time in the past. A concerted effort to utilise the return emigrant's acquired skills abroad for skill up-gradation and industrial development in the state is worth undertaking in the present context. This would be the best rehabilitation package for return emigrants that the Government can offer at present.

Sixth, the global recession has affected not only emigrants but also non-migrants, persons who have never stepped out of the state. The global recession has affected most of the export dependent industries in Kerala: coir, fishing and cashew, to name a few. Not only were the owners of the enterprises affected by the recession, but also the workers, some of whom have lost their jobs. Although these workers themselves do not

bring in any foreign exchange directly, the industries which utilise their labour contribute significantly to the foreign exchange earnings of the country. Should not the package that is being developed to help the return emigrants equally benefit non-migrant workers and others affected by the global recession?

Lastly, the study recommends that the Government should give as much, or much more importance to “problem-preventing measures” aimed at future emigrants as to “problem-solving measures” aimed at returning emigrants.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Research Unit on International Migration at the Centre for Development Studies, Thiruvananthapuram, undertook this study on the impact of global recession on Kerala emigration at the request of the Department of Non-Resident Keralite Affairs (NORKA), Government of Kerala. The objectives of the study were clearly spelt out by NORKA in terms of a framework of questions on emigration from, and return emigration to, Kerala since the beginning of the global recession. Based on these objectives and the specified questions, CDS prepared a proposal for the study which was approved by NORKA soon after.

According to this proposal, the broad objective of this study is to assess the impact of the global economic recession on the employment and economic conditions of emigrants from Kerala. Answers to the following questions would signify the extent of the impact: How many of Kerala's emigrants lost their jobs abroad since the beginning of the global recession and how many have been forced to return home? What are the social and economic implications of such job losses and the subsequent return of the emigrants for their families and for the Kerala economy? What measures can be adopted to minimise the adverse impact of return emigration on the socio-economic scenario of the state? What measures can be adopted to rehabilitate the emigrants who have returned as a direct consequence of the global recession, particularly those who were employed abroad in low level jobs?

A first step in this endeavour would be to obtain a rough estimate of the number and characteristics of the emigrants who lost their jobs abroad; and of those who returned to Kerala either as a result of job loss or due to other factors directly related to the economic recession abroad.

In the last two years, CDS had conducted two large scale migration surveys in Kerala and both were financed by the NORKA, Government of Kerala. The first survey was carried out during March-July 2007. It covered a sample of 10,000 households selected at random from all the 63 taluks in the state. Among these 10,000 households, 1,768 had an emigrant (EMI), 1,065 had a return emigrant (REM) and 2,556 households had either an emigrant or a return emigrant (for more details of the Kerala Migration Survey 2007, see Zachariah and Irudaya Rajan, 2008)

The second study was carried out during August-December 2008, just before the global recession started. It was based on a larger sample of 15,000 households selected at random from all the 63 taluks in the state. About 2,702 of the 15,000 households had an emigrant (EMI) each from their households. Similarly 1,765 of the sample households had a return emigrant (REM) and 3,981 households had either an emigrant or return emigrant (for more details of the Kerala Migration Survey 2008, see Zachariah and Irudaya Rajan, 2009)

The new study (Return Migrants Study 2009 or RMS 2009), is designed to cover 6,537 households (2,556 from the 2007 study and 3,981 from the 2008 study). The households which could not be contacted were 113. Data were collected from the remaining 6,424 households. The field work was carried out during 16 June – 7 September 2009.

The following data were collected through surveys and were used for this report:

- (i) Current information on members of selected households in the 2007 and 2008 studies.
- (ii) Current information from the **(OLD)** EMIs and the REMs identified as such in the 2007 and 2008 studies.
- (iii) Current information on **NEW** EMIs and REMs (those not included in (ii) above).

The data now enables the estimation of the number of emigrants and proportion of those who underwent changes in migration and employment status since the previous survey (2007 or 2008). It is also possible now to study the socio-economic conditions of those who were adversely affected by the global recession with respect to employment.

Although all the 6,537 households which were identified to have an emigrant or return emigrant in the 2007 and 2008 surveys were expected to be visited by an investigator, only 6,424 households could be contacted as others had moved out of the area without leaving any contact address. The necessary information was collected from these households with the help of a structured questionnaire. Data from these 6,424 households form the basis for this report.

The present report makes use of data related to emigrants and return emigrants identified as such in KMS 2008 (not in KMS 2007), new emigrants (emigrants who emigrated after December 2008) and new return emigrants (return emigrants who came back to Kerala after December 2008) in households with an emigrant or return emigrant covered by KMS 2008

The field work for this study was carried out by specially trained investigators under the supervision of the Kerala Statistical Institute.

General information about the sample households

The sample households in this study *are not a random sample* of the 8 million households in Kerala in 2009. The sample includes only

those households with an emigrant or a return emigrant. Therefore, it is not possible to make generalisations from the sample about the total number of migrants from the state, total remittances to the state, etc.,. However, the sample would provide unbiased estimate of parameters directly related to emigrants. An example is the proportion of the 2008 emigrants who returned to Kerala during the time period between the 2008 survey and the 2009 survey. If this proportion is applied to the total number of emigrants from Kerala in 2008 (2,193,412), it is possible to get an unbiased estimate of the number of emigrants who had returned to Kerala since the 2008 survey. As the sampling was done independently in the various districts and as the sampling fraction was different in different districts, estimates were obtained independently for the 14 districts and these estimates have been added up to get the state level estimate.

Against this background, the various questions raised by NORKA are addressed below

II UNEMPLOYMENT AMONG EMIGRANTS DUE TO THE RECESSION

How many of the emigrants from Kerala who continue to stay abroad have lost their jobs in recent months as a result of the global recession? How many have become unemployed?

Employment Before and After Recession

We start this analysis by comparing the employment situation of emigrants before the recession period (October-December 2008) with the same set of emigrants after the recession (June-August 2009) see Table 1 and Annex Table I.

A total of 3,953 emigrants from the KMS 2008 survey were included in the RMS 2009 survey. Of them, 3,456 were employed in 2008, 39 were unemployed, and 458 were not in the labour force. The

employed constituted 87.4 per cent of the total number of emigrants and the unemployed were 1.0 per cent. About 11.6 per cent were not in the labour force.

Table 1: Emigrants by Employment Status in 2008 and 2009

Status in 2009	Status in 2008			
	Employed	Unemployed	Not in LF	Total
Employed	3301	27	30	3358
Unemployed	98	2	10	110
Not in LF	57	10	418	485
Total	3456	39	458	3953
<i>Status in Percentage.</i>				
Employed	95.5	69.2	6.6	84.9
Unemployed	2.8	5.1	2.2	2.8
Not in LF	1.6	25.6	91.3	12.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<i>Percentage of each class</i>				
Employed	98.3	0.8	0.9	100.0
Unemployed	89.1	1.8	9.1	100.0
Not in LF	11.8	2.1	86.2	100.0
Total	87.4	1.0	11.6	100.0

By the time of the 2009 survey (June-August 2009), the number of employed emigrants had decreased to 3,358, and the number of unemployed emigrants had increased to 110. Thus between 2008 and 2009, the number of unemployed emigrants increased by 71. The increase could be attributed to the recession.

Unemployment during the Recession

An estimate of the numbers unemployed among the emigrants in 2008 was 22,610 (Table 2). The corresponding number among the same number of emigrants in 2009 was 60,099. Thus, the increase in the number of unemployed emigrants was 37,489. This was an estimate of the number of emigrants who became unemployed during 2008-09 (the recession period).

Table 2: Estimate of Unemployed among the 2008 Emigrants in 2009

Districts	Unemployed		Emigrants 2008		Unemployed	
	2008	2009	Sample	Kerala	2008	2009
Thiruvananthapuram	3	12	427	308481	2167	8669
Kollam	4	7	328	207516	2531	4429
Pathanamthitta	3	12	360	120990	1008	4033
Alappuzha	5	5	199	131719	3971	3310
Kottayam	1	7	191	89351	468	3275
Idukki	0	0	20	5792	0	0
Ernakulam	3	2	181	120979	2005	1337
Thrissur	2	12	438	284068	1297	7783
Palakkad	1	8	292	189815	650	5200
Malappuram	8	21	616	334572	4345	11406
Kozhikode	4	7	325	199163	2451	4290
Wayanad	1	0	75	13996	187	0
Kannur	2	8	233	119119	1022	4090
Kasaragode	2	9	268	67851	506	2279
Kerala	39	110	3953	2193412	22610	60099
No of Unemployed 2008					22610	
No of Unemployed 2009					60099	
Increase					37489	

Thus about 37,000 additional emigrants became unemployed during the 8-month period between November 2008 and June 2009 (recession period). This, however, was not the same as the number of emigrants who lost their job.

Loss of jobs during the Recession

In order for a person to lose a job, he/she must first be employed. Table 3 gives the distribution of emigrants by employment status in 2008 and 2009 (state level estimate)

Table 3 Emigrants by Employment Status, Kerala, 2008 and 2009

Status in 2009	Status in 2008			
	Employed	Unemployed	Not in LF	Total Emigrants
Employed	1831635	14982	16646	1863263
Unemployed	54378	1110	5549	61036
Not in LF	31628	5549	231937	269113
Total	1917640	21640	254132	2193412


Among the 1,917,640 emigrants who were employed in 2008, 54,378 became unemployed by 2009, that is, during the recession months. This is an estimate of the job losses abroad among Kerala emigrants during recession months. Job loss is much higher than the increase in unemployment. However the net job loss is very much lower.

At the time when 54,378 employed emigrants lost their job, 14,982 unemployed emigrants and 16,646 emigrants who were not looking for a job in 2008 got employment during the recession months. Thus, net employment loss is only 22,750 (54378-14982-16646).

How significant is this estimate of the number of emigrants who became unemployed or the number of employed emigrants who lost their job due to the recession? There were more than 2 million emigrants

from Kerala in 2008. Fifty four thousand emigrants who lost their job or 37,000 emigrants who became unemployed are by no means very huge numbers in relation to the total emigrants. The unemployed or those who lost their job are less than 3 per cent of the total number of emigrants. It is also instructive to compare the unemployment due to the recession with unemployment among these same emigrants in Kerala before emigration.

The number of unemployed emigrants in the sample in 2008 was 39. The number of unemployed emigrants in the sample following the recession is 110. The number of unemployed among them in Kerala before their emigration is 805, more than 7 times the number unemployed after the recession. Thus, although unemployment has increased considerably (relatively speaking) the unemployment among Kerala emigrants after the recession is very much lower than the unemployment among them in Kerala before emigration. In spite of the impact of recession, from the point of view of employment, the emigrants are in a much better position than they were before they left Kerala.



Are all these job losses due to the global recession? It is certainly not unusual for employed persons, migrants or non-migrants, to become unemployed even in 'normal' times (when there is no recession). Every year some emigrants lose their jobs in the normal course of events. Only when such job losses are much larger than is expected in normal course of events, we can conclude that all the job losses among the emigrants in 2008 was due to the global recession during the first half of 2009. Unfortunately, comparable data for a non-recession year are not available. Some approximations are however, are possible.

The unemployment rates (as a percentage of the labour force) among emigrants in some non-recession years are available from KMS 1998, 2003 and 2008. They are given below:

1998	0.73
2003	1.89
2008	1.12
2009	3.17 (recession period)

The rates for the non-recession years are much lower than the rate for 2009 (the recession months). That is indicating that the global recession could indeed have played a major role in raising the unemployment rate in 2009.

A second source suggestive of the role of recession is the panel data from KMS 2003, which gives the sector of employment of about 4,000 persons in 1998 and 2003. The relevant data are given below:

	Employed	Unemployed
Emigrants in: 1998	958	6
Emigrants in: 2003	878	15
Increase	-80	+9

Increase in number unemployed as percent of employed in 1998
 = 0.94

Thus, the percent increase in unemployment among the emigrants during a 5-year non-recession period is relatively very small when compared to the corresponding increase during the 8-month period of the global recession.

A logical conclusion from these analyses is that global recession had an effect on the employment situation among Kerala emigrants abroad. About 54,000 employed emigrants lost their job and 37,000 additional emigrants became unemployed during the first half of 2009. It would not be very far from the truth to attribute almost all of this additional unemployment to global recession.

Our answer to the first question raised by NORKA is that there was a net increase in unemployment of 37,000 among Kerala emigrants; and that 54,000 employed emigrants lost their job during the recession.

Transition to the Unemployment

It was mentioned that the number of unemployed emigrants in the sample had increased by 71 persons. From which sectors of economic activity did they come from? Table 4 (sample data) shows that 2 persons came from the Government service category, 2 from semi-government services, 33 from the private sector, 3 from the self-employment sector and 31 from the non-agricultural labour sector. These numbers add up to 71. The changes in the sectors outside the labour force cancel each other out

Thus, most of the newly unemployed turned up from the private sector and from among the labourers in the non-agricultural sector.

Table 4: Sector of Economic Activity of the Unemployed in 2008-2009

Activity status	2008*	2009**
Employed in Central/State Govt.	2	4
Employed in Semi Govt / Aided organizations	-	2
Employed in Private sector	23	56
Self employment	1	4
Unpaid Family work	-	-
Labour in agricultural sector	1	1
Labour in Non agricultural sector	-	31
Job seekers	2	2
Job not required	-	-
Students	2	1
Household work	6	9
Pensioners	2	-
Total	39	110

* Economic Activity in 2009 of those unemployed in 2008

**Economic Activity in 2008 of those unemployed in 2009

Transition of the Employed

While increase in unemployment during the recession is the principal focus of this study, transitions in the employment sector (movement from one sector of the economy to another) throw additional light on the impact of the recession on the migrant's employment status. How have the emigrants manoeuvred themselves through the various employment avenues to avoid potential job loss? This is an important aspect of the impact of recession on employment of the emigrants.

A person faced with imminent job loss would attempt to shift to another job (if possible), sometimes even when the new job is paid a lower salary, to avoid becoming unemployed. Information about such transitions is highly instructive in measuring the adverse impact of

recession and devising policies to deal with them. Information on such movements is more significant than that on job losses.

Between 2008 and 2009, the number of employed persons decreased by 98 (Table 5), the number of unemployed persons increased by 71 and the number of those not in labour force increased by 27. As a result, some employment sectors gained and some others lost. Which were the sectors that gained and which were the ones that lost?

Table 5 indicates that, the number of emigrants working in the private sector **increased** by about 38 per cent. At the same time, the number of emigrants working as labourers in the non-agricultural sector has **decreased** by 100 per cent. There were also significant losses (relatively) in employment in Government and semi-Government sectors.

Table 5: Economic Activity in 2008 and 2009 of Emigrants of KMS 2008

Activity status	2008	2009	Difference
Employed in Government Sector	79	74	-5
Semi-Government Sector	65	12	-53
Private Sector	2135	2938	803
Self Employment	129	90	-39
Unpaid Family Worker	8	15	7
Agriculture Sector Labourer	7	228	221
Non-Agriculture Sector Labourer	1033	1	-1032
Job Seekers	39	110	71
Job not Needed	4	4	0
Students	218	218	0
Household Work	122	135	13
Pensioners	4	7	3
Others	110	121	11
TOTAL	3953	3953	0
Employed	3456	3358	-98
Unemployed	39	110	71
Not In Labour force	458	485	27
Total	3953	3953	0

At the same time, some persons who were not in the labour force in 2008 (those engaged in household duties) got employment during the recession period.

Cross-Classification

A broader understanding of such transitions in employment is gained from a cross-classification of the of the employment sector of the emigrants in 2008 by their employment sector in 2009. Such a classification (Annex Table I) indicates that 2,304 emigrants (58.1 percent) have remained in the same sector of employment in 2009 as they were in 2008. They did not change their sector of economic activity. The remaining 41.9 per cent of emigrants changed their sector of economic activity.

Out of the 2,135 persons who worked in private sector in 2008, 1862 (87.2 per cent) remained in the same sector, 1.5 per cent moved to Government jobs, 4.8 per cent moved to non-agricultural labour sector and 1.5 per cent moved to self employment. Out of the 129 persons in the self employment sector 84 (65 per cent) moved to the private sector, while 25 per cent remained in self employment. Thus, while 79 moved out of the private sector, 27 others moved into the private sector. Out of the 1,033 persons who worked as non-agricultural labour in 2008, 81.5 per cent moved into private sector employment and 3 per cent became job seekers. Out of the 79 in Government services, only 29 per cent continued in the same services, while 57 per cent moved to the private sector. A similar pattern of movement occurred also among workers in semi-Government jobs.

Thus, several significant transitions occurred among the employed emigrants in all the sectors. Such transition from one employment sector to another could have been a major means by which a relatively large proportion (42 per cent) of the Kerala emigrants withstood the impending job loss due to the global recession. This could be one reason why the unemployment rate among the emigrants remained relatively low.

Characteristics of the Unemployed

Data on the characteristics of the unemployed provides important additional information needed to formulate policies to redress their problems. Those characteristics could be gathered from answers to selected questions such as: From which district of Kerala did they hail? In which countries did they live? How many are males and how many, females?

Country of Residence of the Unemployed

More than half the number of the unemployed (in 2009) among the emigrants of 2008 is from the United Arab Emirates (53 per cent). About 14 per cent are from Saudi Arabia. Kuwait is the country of residence of the third largest number of the unemployed emigrants. Relatively fewer emigrants became unemployed in other destination countries.

Table 6: Country of Residence of Emigrants who became Unemployed in 2009

Country	Unemployed	Percent Unemployed*	Emigrants	Unemployed/100 Emigrants
United Arab Emirates	58	52.7	1469	3.9
Saudi Arabia	15	13.6	867	1.7
Kuwait	7	6.4	214	3.3
Oman	4	3.6	279	1.4
Qatar	3	2.7	202	1.5
Bahrain	4	3.6	186	2.2
Maldives	1	0.9	7	14.3
USA	1	0.9	186	0.5
Others	17	15.5	543	3.1
Total	110	100.0	3953	2.8

* Percent unemployed in relation to total unemployed in all countries.

District of Origin

The largest number of the unemployed emigrants hailed from Malappuram district. A considerable number of emigrants also hailed from Thiruvananthapuram, Kollam and Thrissur districts.

Table 7: Unemployment: Percent and Rate by District, 2009

Districts	Unemployed	EMI	Unemployed	
			Percentage*	Rate
Thiruvananthapuram	12	376	10.9	3.2
Kollam	7	300	6.4	2.3
Pathanamthitta	12	301	10.9	4.0
Alappuzha	5	173	4.5	2.9
Kottayam	7	160	6.4	4.4
Idukki	0	16	0.0	0.0
Ernakulam	2	140	1.8	1.4
Thrissur	12	377	10.9	3.2
Palakkad	8	228	7.3	3.5
Malappuram	21	567	19.1	3.7
Kozhikode	7	296	6.4	2.4
Wayanad	0	70	0.0	0.0
Kannur	8	213	7.3	3.8
Kasaragode	9	251	8.2	3.6
Kerala	110	3468	100.0	3.2

* Percentage in relation to the total number of emigrants from all districts.

The unemployment ratio (the number of unemployed emigrants as a percentage of the total number of emigrants), however, is highest among emigrants from Kottayam district (4.4 per cent). In this regard, Pathanamthitta and Kannur districts rank second and third respectively. Malappuram is only the fourth from the top. The average unemployment ratio is about 3.6 per cent.

Sex

More than 85 per cent of the unemployed among the emigrants in 2008 were males. Females constituted 14.5 per cent of the total. However, the unemployment rate is higher among females, 5.93 per cent compared with 2.94 per cent among males. The overall unemployment rate is 3.2 per cent.

Table 8: Unemployment in 2009 among Males and Females of 2008 Emigrants

Sex	Unemployed	Labour Force	Percentage*	Rate (%)
Males	94	3198	85.5	2.9
Females	16	270	14.5	5.9
Total	110	3468	100.0	3.2

* Percentage in relation to the total number of unemployed of both sexes.

Age

The largest number of the unemployed emigrants is in the 25-29 age group among all the age groups. This group also has the highest unemployment rate, i.e., 4.72 per cent compared to the overall average of 3.2 per cent.



Levels of Schooling

Nearly one-third (32.7 per cent) of the unemployed emigrants are from among those with 10th standard education. A fairly large number of the unemployed emigrants (18.2 per cent) are those with 12th standard education. However, there is no systematic upward or downward relation between the unemployment ratio and years of schooling. This relation between the years of schooling and unemployment rate among emigrants is given in Table 9.

Table 9: Unemployment Percent and Rate by Level of Schooling, 2009

Education	Unemployed	Labour force	Unemployment	
			Rate	% *
Less than class 6	8	190	4.2	7.3
Class 6-9	14	686	2.0	12.7
Class 10-12	57	1574	3.6	51.8
Classes 12+	29	1006	2.9	26.4
Others	2	12	16.7	1.8
Total	110	3468	3.2	100.0

* Percent unemployed in relation to total unemployed

III RETURN EMIGRATION DUE TO THE RECESSION

How many of the Kerala emigrants returned to Kerala in the recent months in 2009 as a consequence of the global recession?

Emigrants of 2008 by Migration Status in 2009

The 2009 survey has collected information on the current migration status of all the **3,953** emigrants identified in the 2008 survey. How many of them have remained emigrants (EMI) and how many have returned to Kerala as REM? The data are given below:

Table 10: Emigrants of 2008 by Migration Status in 2009 in the RMS, 2009

	Number	Percent
EMI	3649	92.3
REM	304	7.7
Total	3953	100

Of the 3,953 emigrants (sample) in KMS 2008, 304 or 7.7 per cent have returned to Kerala by the time of the 2009 survey (during the recession period).

Return Emigration: State level Estimate

At the state level, about 7.7 per cent of the EMI of 2008 became REM by 2009. If district-wise ratios are applied to the total EMI in 2008, the number of emigrants who returned to Kerala in 2009 would be 173,339. This is for the period between 2008 KMS and 2009 RMS, roughly November 2008 to June 2009. This period coincides with the recession months. Thus, an estimate of recession-related return emigration among Kerala emigrants is 173,000 (roughly for a period of 8 months).

District-wise data

The districts of origin of emigrants and of the return emigrants are given in Table 11. The table shows the estimated number of emigrants who returned to Kerala by district of origin in Kerala.

About 29,000 emigrants who returned were originally from Thiruvananthapuram district. The corresponding number for Malappuram district was 24,000 and 23,000 for Thrissur district.

Table 11: Distribution of 2008 Emigrants by Migration Status in 2009

Districts	Percent of Total		Number in the state	
	EMI	REM	REM	Percent
Thiruvananthapuram	90.6	9.4	28897	16.7
Kollam	94.2	5.8	12021	6.9
Pathanamthitta	94.4	5.6	6722	3.9
Alappuzha	92.0	8.0	10590	6.1
Kottayam	94.2	5.8	5146	3.0
Idukki	100.0	0.0	0	0
Ernakulam	94.5	5.5	6684	3.9
Thrissur	91.8	8.2	23348	13.5
Palakkad	89.7	10.3	19502	11.3
Malappuram	92.7	7.3	24441	14.1
Kozhikode	90.5	9.5	18997	11.0
Wayanad	93.3	6.7	933	0.5
Kannur	90.6	9.4	11247	6.5
Kasaragode	92.9	7.1	4810	2.8
Kerala	92.3	7.7	173339	100.0

In a non-recession period, i.e., 1998-2003, 2137 of the 2,824 emigrants in the KMS 1998 remained emigrants and 522 became REMs, 60 became OMI and 105 became ROMs. Thus, a total of 687 (sum of REM, OMI, ROM) of the EMI became REM. This is 24.3 per cent of the emigrants in 1998. When this ratio is applied to return emigration among a total of 1,361,919 emigrants of 1998, the return migrants would be 330,946 during the 5-year period 1998-2003 or about 66,189 per year.

Another method used to calculate return emigrants per year during a non-recession period is based on distribution of return emigrants by year of return in 1998, 2003 and 2008. This method gives the following estimate of return emigration.

Table 12: Average Return Emigrants per Year, 1996-2008

Three year Average (per year) 1996-98	102876*
Three Year Average (per year)2001-03	70005**
Three Year Average (per year)2006-08	139363***

* Based on 1998 Survey

** Based on 2003 Survey

*** Based on 2008 Survey

Thus, the average return emigration for a year varies from 102,876 during 1996-08 to 70,005 per year during 2001-03 and to 139,363 per year during 2006-08. Taking the estimate for the latest year, for an 8-month period, return emigration during 2006-08 would be 93,000.

We have thus the following results:

Return emigration during:

Recession Period November-June 2009 (8 months) = 173,000

Non-Recession Period average 2006-08
(average for 8 months) = 93,900

Return emigration has indeed accelerated since the beginning of the global recession. An estimate of the number of emigrants who returned to Kerala during November 2008 to June 2009 is 173,000.

This answers the second question: how many of the emigrants have returned to Kerala during the recession period. The answer is 173,000.

But can we conclude from this analysis that 173,000 emigrants returned to Kerala as a result of global recession? Have they all returned as a result of the global recession?

Return Emigration Due to the Recession

The present survey can provide an answer to this question to a

large extent. This survey included a question on the reasons for the migrant's return. The answers are given in Table 13.

Table 13 indicates that emigrants generally return to Kerala due to a number of reasons. Expiry of contract is one reason for return. This was a major reason cited by the return emigrants in 1998 and 2008 (the non-recession years). Similarly, many emigrants return because conditions back home are such that their presence is required here. This is so particularly in the case of female return emigrants. Their return has nothing to do with the recession. Another case is when emigrants return because they cannot withstand the hostile climatic conditions in some Gulf countries. This too has nothing to do with the recession. Others return because they fail to get the salary or wages which they were promised.

Thus, a large number of the emigrants could have returned home in 2009 for reasons not related to the global recession.

In 2009, the largest number of emigrants returned to Kerala because they lost their jobs due to financial crisis. Twenty one per cent of the REM (or 37,000) returned because of they lost their jobs due to the recession. Another 3.3 per cent underwent compulsory retirement. If they are also added, about 24.7 per cent or about 43,000 emigrants returned due to the recession. About 11.5 per cent returned because their contracts had expired and were not renewed. This is a common experience among emigrants in the Gulf region and not very much related to the recession. Emigrants cited this as the reason for their return in 2003 and 1998 too. However, for argument's sake, if such returnees are also added, the number would increase to 36.2 per cent or 63,000 persons. The number of return emigration attributable to the global recession would at most be 63,000.

Thus, the number of emigrants who returned home due to recession-related reasons could be in the range between a minimum of 37,000 and a maximum of 63,000.

Table 13: Reasons for Return of Return Emigrants among Emigrants of 2008 in 2009

Reasons for the Return	Sample			Percent				
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Cumulative	Number
Lost job due to financial crisis	65	0	65	25.4	0.0	21.4	21.4	37022
Expiry of Contract	30	5	35	11.7	10.4	11.5	32.9	56940
Compulsory Repatriation	10	0	10	3.9	0.0	3.3	36.2	62631
Low wages or not getting promised wages	49	1	50	19.1	2.1	16.4	52.7	91085
Poor working condition	14	0	14	5.5	0.0	4.6	57.3	99052
Harsh behaviour of Employer	3	0	3	1.2	0.0	1.0	58.2	100759
Ill health	22	3	25	8.6	6.3	8.2	66.5	114986
Problems at home	24	9	33	9.4	18.8	10.9	77.3	133765
Others	39	30	69	15.2	62.5	22.7	100	173032
Total	256	48	304	100.0	100.0	100.0	100	173032

From Return Emigrants to Emigrants

Some of the return emigrants identified in KMS 2008 re-migrated out of the country to become an emigrant once again. They were about 9.55 percent of the total return emigrants or about 110,494. Thus, in the first half of 2009 (the recession period), 173,000 emigrants returned to Kerala and 110,000 former return emigrants became emigrants once again. The net change is the return of 63,000 former emigrants back to Kerala.

Characteristics of the Return Emigrants

Country of Residence of Emigrants

The largest number of return emigrants came from the United Arab Emirates, 46.4 per cent. But the return emigration rate (= return emigrants /emigrants * 100) was highest among emigrants in Kuwait at 15.0 per cent followed by the UAE with 9.6 per cent. Saudi Arabia contributed 23 per cent and Kuwait 11 per cent to the flow of return emigrants to Kerala. Together with the UAE, these countries account for about 80 per cent of the return emigrants from among the 2008 emigrants.

Table 14: Percent and Rate by Country of Origin of Return Emigrants, 2009

Countries	Return Emigrants	Emigrants	Percent	Rate/100 Emigrants
United Arab Emirates	141	1469	46.4	9.6
Saudi Arabia	69	867	22.7	8.0
Kuwait	32	214	10.5	15.0
Oman	21	279	6.9	7.5
Qatar	16	202	5.3	7.9
Bahrain	8	186	2.6	4.3
USA	3	186	1.0	1.6
Maldives	3	7	1.0	42.9
Others	11	543	3.6	2.0
Total	304	3953	100.0	7.7

Among the countries listed in the table the lowest rate of return was for the emigrants in the United States of America.

District of Origin of Return Emigrants

The majority of return emigrants hailed from Malappuram district, i.e., 14.8 per cent. But return emigration as percentage of total emigrants




Table 15: Return Emigrants: Rate and Percent by Districts, 2009

District	Return Emigrants	Emigrants	Return Emigrants/ 100 Emigrants	Return Emigrants (%)
Thiruvananthapuram	40	427	9.4	13.2
Kollam	19	328	5.8	6.3
Pathanamthitta	20	360	5.6	6.6
Alappuzha	16	199	8.0	5.3
Kottayam	11	191	5.8	3.6
Idukki	0	20	0.0	0.0
Ernakulam	10	181	5.5	3.3
Thrissur	36	438	8.2	11.8
Palakkad	30	292	10.3	9.9
Malappuram	45	616	7.3	14.8
Kozhikode	31	325	9.5	10.2
Wayanad	5	75	6.7	1.6
Kannur	22	233	9.4	7.2
Kasaragod	19	268	7.1	6.3
Total	304	3953	7.7	100.0

is highest among emigrants from Palakkad district at 10.3 per cent. Malappuram, Thiruvananthapuram, Thrissur and Kozhikode each had more than a tenth of the total return emigrants in the state. Palakkad, Thiruvananthapuram, Kannur also have a relatively high return emigration ratio.

Sex Composition

As the emigrants are mostly males, the vast majority of those who returned are also males, i.e., 84 percent of the total. However, the ratio of return emigrants is higher among females. While 7.6 per cent of male emigrants returned, as much as 8.5 per cent of female emigrants returned.

Table 16: Sex Composition of Return Emigrants among 2008 Emigrants in 2009


SEX	EMI	REM	Percent	Rate (%)
Males	3390	256	84.2	7.6
Females	563	48	15.8	8.5
Total	3953	304	100.0	7.7

Age Composition

The largest number of return emigrants is in the 25-35 age span which accounts for 42.5 per cent of the total. However, the ratio of return emigrants is highest in the 15-19 age group and among those over 55 years of age. More than 11 per cent of the youngsters in the 15-19 age group have returned. Similarly, more than 10 per cent of the elderly have also returned during the recession. Children and the elderly were more prone to return during the recession than persons in the prime working ages.

Table 17: Age Distribution among Return Emigrants, 2009

Age group	Percent	Ratio REM/100 EMI
0-4	3.0	8.7
5-9	1.3	4.5
10-14	0.7	2.8
15-19	1.6	11.4
20-24	6.9	7.2
25-29	21.4	8.2
30-34	21.1	8.2
35-39	14.5	6.6
40-44	9.2	6.1
45-49	8.6	8.3
50-54	5.3	8.8
55-59	4.3	11.8
60-64	2.0	16.2
65+	0.3	6.7
Total	100.0	7.7




Educational Attainment

Emigrants with educational level up to the 10th standard contributed the largest number of return emigrants (29.3 per cent). Those with 12 years of schooling constituted 17.4 per cent. However, the rate per emigrant is not the highest in these groups.

The rate of return emigration from among the 2008 emigrants is relatively high among emigrants with less than 6 years of schooling. On the whole, the rate decreases with years of schooling, but seems to reach the highest point at the very fag end.

Table 18: Education: Percent of total and percent of Emigrants

	Rem	Emi	Rem/100Emi	Percent
less than class 6	45	417	10.8	14.8
Class 6-9	48	745	6.4	15.8
Class 10-12	144	1654	8.7	47.4
Classes 12+	62	1119	5.5	20.4
Others	5	17	29.4	1.6
Total	304	3952	7.7	100.0



Economic Activity

Among the emigrants who returned during the recession months, the largest proportion, i.e., 32 per cent were unemployed. About 20.4 per cent of the returnees were those working in private sector, 15.5 were non-agricultural workers and 9 per cent were engaged in household work. Thus, about 46.1 per cent were working, 21.6 per cent were not in the labour force and 32.2 per cent were unemployed.

Table 19: Return Emigrants and Emigrants: Percent and Ratio by Employment Sector, 2009

	REM	EMI	Percent	Ratio
Government	0	74	0	0
Semi-Government	0	12	0	0
Private sector	62	2938	20.4	2.1
Self Employed	23	90	7.6	25.6
Agricultural Labour	8	15	2.6	53.3
Non-Agricultural Labour	47	228	15.5	20.6
Unpaid Family Worker	0	1	0.0	-
Job seekers	98	110	32.2	89.1
Job not required	2	4	0.7	50.0
Students	11	218	3.6	5.0
Household Work	28	135	9.2	20.7
Pensioners	1	7	0.3	14.3
Too old to Work	2	3	0.7	66.7
Too Young to school	9	95	3.0	9.5
Disabled	2	3	0.7	66.7
Others	11	20	3.6	55.0
Total	304	3953	100.0	7.7

IV IMPACT OF UNEMPLOYMENT AND RETURN EMIGRATION

The second set of questions raised by NORKA relates to the impact of recession on emigrants, their families, and the state, and to policies to minimise their adverse consequences of their return.

What is the social and economic impact of job loss on Kerala emigrants, their families and the Kerala economy?

What is the social and economic impact of the subsequent return of Kerala emigrants on their families and the Kerala economy?

What measures can be adopted to minimise the adverse impact of their return on the socio-economic situation in the state? and

What measures can be adopted to rehabilitate the emigrants who returned as a direct consequence of the global recession, particularly those in low-level jobs?

The impact of the global recession on emigrants is not only through job losses and return emigration, but also through reduction in salaries or wages.

Return Emigration due to Recession

The number of emigrants who lost their jobs in the destination country and yet remained there is estimated to be about 37,000. Among the emigrants, those who returned to Kerala as a result of recession-related reasons are estimated to be a maximum of 63,000. Of them, only 28,000 were unemployed at the time of the 2009 survey. It is these who actually need to be rehabilitated more than any other group (Table 20). However, to these return emigrants, we have to add the number of emigrants who have undergone salary cuts. This is a largely unknown number. But a good estimate of their magnitude could be gauged on the basis of their impact on the remittances that they send back home (see below).

Table 20: Number of Return Emigrants in Kerala who would need help in Rehabilitation, 2009

	Sample	Kerala
Total EMI, 2008 *	3953	2193412
REM among the EMI of 2008 (1)	304	168681
From among (2) those who returned		
Those Returned Due to Recession Reasons (1-3)	110	61036
From among (3) those who were:		
Employed in 2008	106	58817
Unemployed in 2008	1	555
Not in LF in 2008	3	1665
Total	110	61036
Of the 107 employed EMI (2008) who returned		
employed in 2009	54	29963
Number of unemployed	50	27744
Not in LF	2	1110
Total	106	58817

NUMBER WHO WOULD REQUIRE HELP BECAUSE OF UNEMPLOYMENT = 27744

Impact of the Recession at the State level

While recession could affect the household of the return emigrant in many ways – social, psychological and economic – this study is confined to the economic impact only. We assume that most of the other consequences come about through economic factors. Much of the economic impact occurs through the remittances which the households receive from their members working abroad.

In KMS, a distinction was made between **Household Remittances** and **Total Remittances**. Studies like the KMS or RMS can at best measure

household remittances. Fortunately, it is household remittance that matters most as far as the impact of the recession on households is concerned.

Before proceeding further a word of clarification is necessary. As the sample of households included in this study has not been selected at random, it cannot provide an absolute measure of household remittances or any other kind of remittances in Kerala in 2009. What this study can do at best is to measure the **relative change** (per cent increase or decrease) in the remittances received by the emigrant households between 2008 and 2009. Such a measure of relative change, however, is fairly adequate to measure the impact of the global recession on household remittances.

Table 21 shows the total **cash remittances and the district-wise cash remittances per household in 2008 and 2009**. The table indicates that for the state as a whole, the cash remittances increased by 5.9 per cent between the two 12-month periods, November 2007 to October 2008 (the non-recession period) and October 2008 to September 2009 (the recession period)*

- *KMS and RMS included questions about remittances received by any member of the household during the 12-month period prior to the survey.*

This is quite an unexpected result. The recession is supposed to have decreased remittances, not increased them. The increase could, however, be partly explained by the fact that the remittances in 2009 are for a 12-month period which includes some non-recession months also. Secondly, the recession could, in some cases, actually increase remittances. Emigrants who chose to return home permanently as a result of the recession brought all their accumulated wealth with them, with the result that some households show very large increases in remittances and others show decreases. That this is indeed the case is shown by the subsequent analysis.

Table 21 Household CASH Remittances, 2008 and 2009

District	Number of Households		Remittances		Per Household		Per cent Increase 2008-09
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	
Thiruvananthapuram	337	337	15570000	15824800	46202	46958	1.6
Kollam	283	283	17582000	18214999	62127	64364	3.6
Pathanamthitta	255	255	17471600	16830999	68516	66004	-3.7
Alappuzha	155	155	8601500	12350000	55494	79677	43.6
Kottayam	129	129	11429995	16957000	88605	131450	48.4
Idukki	18	18	1300000	705000	72222	39167	-45.8
Ernakulam	142	142	10718000	11081000	75479	78035	3.4
Thrissur	329	329	22866997	22905000	69505	69620	0.2
Palakkad	199	199	13029000	12902000	65472	64834	-1.0
Malappuram	477	477	28652500	28458000	60068	59660	-0.7
Kozhikode	274	274	16504996	16548000	60237	60394	0.3
Wayanad	61	61	6250999	7700000	102475	126230	23.2
Kannur	165	165	11277500	13492999	68348	81776	19.6
Kasaragode	221	221	9826000	8438999	44462	38186	-14.1
Kerala	3045	3045	191081087	202408796	62752	66473	5.9

That there has been an increase in remittances during the recession period is supported by the statistics of South Asian countries such as Pakistan, Malaysia, Sri Lanka, etc. which indicate significant increases in remittances in 2009. The all-India statistics on remittances also support an increase in remittances to India*. Therefore, the observed increase in remittances in Kerala in 2009, although somewhat unexpected, is highly plausible.

Thus, the economic impact of recession at the state level is not a matter that merits much concern. Remittances to the state during the recession months seem to have increased by about 6 per cent.

*(*Indian Banks have mobilised \$2.7 billion during April-September 09 from non-resident Indians (NRIs) against inflows worth \$1.1 billion in the past one year period (Economic Times, 13 November 2009)*

Impact of the Recession by Religious Groups

All the three religious groups exhibit increase in remittances per household, the highest increase being among the Christians. Remittances per household increased by 17 per cent among the Christian households compared to a mere 1.9 per cent among the Muslim households and 5.4 per cent among the Hindu households.

Table 22: Average Remittances per Household, by Religion, 2008 and 2009

Religion	2008	2009	% Increase 2008-09
Hindus	59622	62812	5.4
Christians	59738	69742	16.8
Muslims	67038	68331	1.9
Total	62752	66473	5.9
Adjusted Total			7.1

Impact of the Recession at the District Level

The state-level trend hides variations by districts and by households. Although there was an increase in household remittances for the state as a whole, several districts show decreases. The increase in remittances between 2008 and 2009 was the highest in Kottayam district at 48 per cent. The neighbouring Alappuzha district also experienced a significant increase at 44 per cent. However, Kottayam two other neighbours, Idukki district in the north and Pathanamthitta district in the south, experienced significant decreases. In all, five of the 14 districts, namely, Pathanamthitta, Idukki, Palakkad, Malappuram and Kasseragod, had varying degrees of diminution.


Table 23: Average Remittances per Household by Districts, 2008 and 2009

District	2008	2009	% Increase 2008-09
Thiruvananthapuram	46202	46958	1.6
Kollam	62127	64364	3.6
Pathanamthitta	68516	66004	-3.7
Alappuzha	55494	79677	43.6
Kottayam	88605	131450	48.4
Idukki	72222	39167	-45.8
Ernakulam	75479	78035	3.4
Thrissur	69505	69620	0.2
Palakkad	65472	64834	-1.0
Malappuram	60068	59660	-0.7
Kozhikode	60237	60394	0.3
Wayanad	102475	126230	23.2
Kannur	68348	81776	19.6
Kasaragode	44462	38186	-14.1
Kerala	62752	66473	5.9
Corrected for Inter district variation in sampling fraction			7.1

Impact of the Recession at the Household Level

Heterogeneity in the relative change in remittances becomes more evident when the analysis is done at the household level.

Earlier analysis indicated that not all districts experienced increase in remittances. Even in districts with positive growth in remittances, not all households experienced positive expansion in remittances. Some households received smaller remittances in 2009 compared to 2008. Some households received larger remittances in 2009 than in 2008. A detailed analysis by households for the 14 districts is given in Table 24.



About 1.383 million (18.3 per cent) out of a total of 7.566 million households in Kerala in 2008 had received some amount of remittances in 2008. Among them, 605,000 households (43.7 per cent) received larger remittances in 2009 as compared to what they received in 2008. About 347,000 (25.1 per cent) households received the same amount in 2009 as they did in 2008. The remaining 431,000 households (31.1 per cent) received smaller amounts as remittances in 2009 vis-à-vis 2008.

These percentages vary considerably by districts. In Alappuzha district, for example, the remittances for the district as a whole had increased by 43.7 per cent. However, 28.4 per cent of the households

Table 24: Number of Households in Kerala in Which Remittances in 2009 is Larger, Equal or Smaller than Remittances in 2008

District	Number				Percentage			
	Larger	Equal	Smaller	Total	Larger	Equal	Smaller	Total
Thiruvananthapuram	83479	60933	60933	205345	40.7	29.7	29.7	100.0
Kollam	63841	29693	46520	140054	45.6	21.2	33.2	100.0
Pathanamthitta	28156	12848	28702	69706	40.4	18.4	41.2	100.0
Alappuzha	41436	9668	20258	71362	58.1	13.5	28.4	100.0
Kottayam	33934	4552	14898	53385	63.6	8.5	27.9	100.0
Idukki	1215	1215	1945	4376	27.8	27.8	44.4	100.0
Ernakulam	37213	13532	29320	80065	46.5	16.9	36.6	100.0
Thrissur	66559	60655	49383	176597	37.7	34.3	28.0	100.0
Palakkad	45917	24955	28448	99320	46.2	25.1	28.6	100.0
Malappuram	77262	63466	78642	219370	35.2	28.9	35.8	100.0
Kozhikode	60638	38982	32244	131864	46.0	29.6	24.5	100.0
Wayanad	7517	1599	640	9756	77.0	16.4	6.6	100.0
Kannur	40543	11138	21831	73512	55.2	15.2	29.7	100.0
Kasseragod	17226	14174	16790	48190	35.7	29.4	34.8	100.0
Kerala	604937	347410	430553	1382901	43.7	25.1	31.1	100.0

had received smaller amounts as remittances in 2009 compared with what they received in 2008. Similarly, in Pathanamthitta district, where the remittances for the district as a whole had decreased by 3.7 per cent, 40.4 per cent of the households had received larger amounts in 2009 as compared to 2008. The analysis at the household level gives a better understanding of how the flow of remittances impacted households during the recession period.

Table 25: Percent of Households with Larger, Equal and Smaller Remittances in 2009 than in 2008 by Districts


Districts	Larger	Equal	Smaller	Total
Thiruvananthapuram	10.2	13.3	10.5	11.1
Kollam	9.6	8.0	9.8	9.3
Pathanamthitta	7.7	6.3	11.0	8.4
Alappuzha	6.7	2.8	4.6	5.1
Kottayam	6.1	1.5	3.8	4.2
Idukki	0.4	0.7	0.8	0.6
Ernakulam	4.9	3.2	5.4	4.7
Thrissur	9.3	15.1	9.6	10.8
Palakkad	6.9	6.7	6.0	6.5
Malappuram	12.5	18.4	17.9	15.7
Kozhikode	9.4	10.8	7.0	9.0
Wayanad	3.5	1.3	0.4	2.0
Kannur	6.8	3.3	5.1	5.4
Kasaragode	5.9	8.7	8.1	7.3
Kerala	100	100	100	100

The proportion of households that had received relatively smaller remittances in 2009 varied from 6.6 per cent in Wayanad district to 44.4 per cent in Idukki district and 41.2 per cent in Pathanamthitta district.

About 18 per cent of the households in Malappuram district, 11 per cent in Pathanamthitta district and 10.5 per cent in

Thiruvananthapuram district in Kerala received smaller remittances in 2009. Idukki and Wayanad districts had very few households that received smaller remittances in 2009.

It was mentioned in Table 24 above that 31.1 per cent of the households experienced decline in remittances, with the decrease being minimal in some cases, but quite significant in others. How large was the decline?



As given in Table 24, the proportion of households that received smaller remittances in 2009 was 31.1 per cent. Among these households, 68.7 per cent received in 2009 less than 75 per cent of what they received in 2008, 44.1 per cent received in 2009 less than 50 per cent of their 2008 remittances, and 29.4 per cent received in 2009 less than 25 per cent of their 2008 remittances.

Households with Remittances in 2008 but no Remittances in 2009

Out of a total of 1.383 million households that received remittances in 2008 about 89,000 (6.4 per cent) households did not receive any remittances in 2009. These were the households that were the most adversely affected by the recession.

Table 26: Number of Households where remittances in 2009 is 75 %, 50% and 25% of the Remittances in 2008, by District

District	As % of Total No. of HHs			As % of HH with smaller remittance		
	0.75	0.5	0.25	0.75	0.5	0.25
Thiruvananthapuram	21.4	14.2	10.4	72.0	48.0	35.0
Kollam	23.0	14.1	9.9	69.1	42.6	29.8
Pathanamthitta	26.7	12.9	6.3	64.8	31.4	15.2
Alappuzha	20.0	11.6	10.3	70.5	40.9	36.4
Kottayam	19.4	8.5	3.9	69.4	30.6	13.9
Idukki	44.4	33.3	22.2	100.0	75.0	50.0
Ernakulam	30.3	22.5	12.0	82.7	61.5	32.7
Thrissur	18.8	13.4	9.7	67.4	47.8	34.8
Palakkad	17.6	13.1	9.0	61.4	45.6	31.6
Malappuram	21.8	13.8	8.4	60.8	38.6	23.4
Kozhikode	17.5	12.4	10.9	71.6	50.7	44.8
Wayanad	6.6	4.9	4.9	100.0	75.0	75.0
Kannur	22.4	12.7	7.3	75.5	42.9	24.5
Kasaragode	24.9	18.1	11.3	71.4	51.9	32.5
Kerala	21.6	13.9	9.2	68.7	44.1	29.4

Table 27: Number of Households that Received no Remittances in 2009

District	Sample	Rate*	Percent	Kerala
Thiruvananthapuram	23	6.8	11.7	10446
Kollam	18	6.4	9.2	8175
Pathanamthitta	13	5.1	6.6	5904
Alappuzha	11	7.1	5.6	4996
Kottayam	3	2.3	1.5	1362
Idukki	3	16.7	1.5	1362
Ernakulam	10	7.0	5.1	4542
Thrissur	22	6.7	11.2	9991
Palakkad	13	6.5	6.6	5904
Malappuram	25	5.2	12.8	11354
Kozhikode	26	9.5	13.3	11808
Wayanad	2	3.3	1.0	908
Kannur	10	6.1	5.1	4542
Kasaragode	17	7.7	8.7	7721
Kerala	196	6.4	100.0	89014
* Denominator is the number of HHs that received remittances in 2008			1382901	

Among the districts, Kozhikode had the largest number of such households, about 12,000 or 13.3 per cent of the total for the state. The other districts with a large number of such households were Malappuram (11,000), Thiruvananthapuram (10,000) and Thrissur (10,000).

Remittances as Gifts

Besides cash on a regular basis, Kerala households with emigrants received gifts from their relatives abroad. These could be treated as part of the remittances. Table 28 provides a district-wise picture of the cash value of such gifts in 2008 and 2009.

Table 28: Cash Value of Remittances Received as Gifts in 2008 and 2009

Districts	No HHs	Total Amts of Gifts		% Increase 2008-09
		2008	2009	
Thiruvananthapuram	337	1028988	236291	-77.0
Kollam	283	1386997	444998	-67.9
Pathanamthitta	255	75494	62993	-16.6
Alappuzha	155	499994	862998	72.6
Kottayam	129	433998	110997	-74.4
Idukki	18	100000	9999	-90.0
Ernakulam	142	226499	585000	158.3
Thrissur	329	774995	1148497	48.2
Palakkad	199	1034700	4479996	333.0
Malappuram	477	1375294	998981	-27.4
Kozhikode	274	355489	502981	41.5
Wayanad	61	731499	434000	-40.7
Kannur	165	1203999	249893	-79.2
Kasaragode	221	1127993	271986	-75.9
Kerala	3045	10355939	10399610	0.4

The table shows that at the state level, the cash value of gifts had neither decreased nor increased. The cash value of gifts in 2009 was more or less the same as that in 2008. However, this was not the case in several of the districts. Very significant decreases in the cash value of gifts were noticed in Idukki, Kannur, Kasseragod and Thiruvananthapuram districts. The cash value of gifts had gone up in other districts with Palakkad and Ernakulam showing large increases.

Remittances for buying a house or land

Remittances received by households for buying land or buying/building houses showed a drastic decline of nearly 50 per cent. The district-wise trend in this case was also similar, with Thiruvananthapuram, Malappuram and Wayanad districts being exceptions.

Table 29: Remittances for House/Land Purchase in 2008 and 2009

Districts	2008	2009	% Increase 2008-09
Thiruvananthapuram	876998	1724999	96.7
Kollam	3300000	204999	-93.8
Pathanamthitta	270000	0	-100.0
Alappuzha	561998	225000	-60.0
Kottayam	2150000	40000	-98.1
Idukki	-	-	-
Ernakulam	4287999	750000	-82.5
Thrissur	2500000	200000	-92.0
Palakkad	751998	300000	-60.1
Malappuram	1480996	2589998	74.9
Kozhikode	2510999	1700000	-32.3
Wayanad	2200000	3450000	56.8
Kannur	965999	270000	-72.0
Kasaragode	2115000	930000	-56.0
Kerala	23971987	12384996	-48.3

Remittances for Other Purposes

Besides receiving remittances for the purchase of a house or land, households also received remittances specifically for other purposes such as the purchase of a car/scooter, starting new enterprises and education of family members. These had all declined very much during the recession period. Exceptions were remittances for investments in shares, payment of dowry and medical expenses.

Table 30: Remittances Received for Specific Purposes in 2008 and 2009

Purpose	2008	2009	% increase 2008-09
Cash Remittances	191081087	202408796	5.9
As Gifts	9905939	10399610	5.0
Buying house/land	23971987	12384996	-48.3
Buy Car/Scooter, etc	2185050	1655000	-24.3
Invest in Shares, Bonds	250000	282000	12.8
To Start Enterprises	146000	20000	-86.3
Pay Dowry	1018000	1850000	81.7
For Education	907000	605000	-33.3
Medical Expenses	977000	1620000	65.8
Pay back Debt	2220000	2128000	-4.1

In brief, remittances meant for some basic needs - subsistence, medical services, dowry payment – had not been affected by the recession. In fact, remittances for these purposes showed an increase between 2008 and 2009. However, remittances for other purposes such as buying land, house, vehicles, etc., had decreased.

V. POLICIES TO REHABILITATE RETURN EMIGRANTS

Lastly, we look at policies and programmes to overcome the recession-related problems. This again is in response to the set of questions raised by NORKA:

What measures could be adopted to minimise the adverse impact on the socio-economic situation in the state? What measures can be adopted to rehabilitate the emigrants who have returned as a direct consequence of the global recession, particularly those who were employed abroad in low-level jobs?

This study has brought to light broad dimensions of some of the problems created by the global recession on Kerala emigrants, such as the number of emigrants who became unemployed, the number who lost jobs abroad, the number who were forced to return to Kerala, the countries in which the returnees had been working, the districts they hailed from, the sector of economic activity they were engaged in before the recession and their demographic and socio-economic characteristics. The study also gives a rough estimate of the number of households that received smaller amounts as household cash remittances in 2009 compared to what they received in 2008 and the number of households that received remittances in 2008, but not in 2009.

**Groups that deserve Special Consideration in Combating
The Adverse Impact of the Recession**

- Families in Kerala of the 56,000 emigrants abroad who lost their jobs
- Families in Kerala of the an unknown number of emigrants abroad who suffered loss of income due to salary cuts and increase in the cost of living
- 173,000 emigrants who returned home during the recession
- 61,000 emigrants who returned in 2009 as a direct result of the recession
- 28,000 return emigrants who are still unemployed
- 431,000 Kerala households that received smaller amounts as remittances in 2009 compared with what they received in 2008
- 90,000 Kerala households that received remittances in 2008, but no remittances in 2009.

This is useful background material for arriving at policies and programmes to minimise the adverse impact of recession on the households of the emigrants or return emigrants in the state. However,

they are just background information only and are not included as policies or programmes. This study recommends that such policies and programmes be put together in consultation with NORKA officials (who have a wider grasp of the migration situation in the state), taking into consideration the results of this study.

While putting together these policies and programmes, this study suggests that the following aspects also be taken into consideration.

First, the number of Kerala emigrants who returned due to the recession is not as large as is often reported to be. The number is unlikely to be more than 63,000. Among these returnees, only about 28,000 are unemployed at the time of the survey.

Second, even as emigrants returned to Kerala, new emigrants and former emigrants (who had returned earlier) are going back to the Gulf and other destination countries, thus regaining their emigrant status. The recession has not been much of a deterrent and has not stood in their way for re-emigration.

Third, household remittances at the state level have increased (and have not decreased) during the recession months, although there are several households whose remittances have decreased. About 6 per cent of the households that received remittances in 2008 did not receive any remittances in 2009.

Fourth, NORKA has recently announced a number of new measures to help emigrants and return emigrants. These include (i) training programme for the prospective emigrants, and (ii) financial assistance to returnees by way of loans from KSFC. These measures would go some way in easing the problems of emigrants and return emigrants. The Government could undertake more such measures including one to provide future emigrants with multiple skills that would enable them to move from one employment sector to another according to the need of the day.

Fifth, the present study indicates that the efforts to utilise the expertise which the return emigrants have gained abroad for the state's development are more likely to succeed now than at any time in the past. A concerted effort to utilise the return emigrant's acquired skills abroad for skill up-gradation and industrial development in the state is worth undertaking in the present context. This would be the best rehabilitation package for return emigrants that the Government can offer at present.

Sixth, the global recession has affected not only emigrants but also non-migrants, persons who have never stepped out of the state. The global recession has affected most of the export dependent industries in Kerala: coir, fishing and cashew, to name a few. Not only were the owners of the enterprises affected by the recession, but also the workers, some of whom have lost their jobs. Although these workers themselves do not bring in any foreign exchange directly, the industries which utilise their labour contribute significantly to the foreign exchange earnings of the country. Should not the package that is being developed to help the return emigrants equally benefit non-migrant workers and others affected by the global recession?

Lastly, the study recommends that the Government should give as much or more importance to "problem-preventing measures" aimed at future emigrants as to "problem-solving measures" aimed at returning emigrants.

K.C. Zachariah is Honorary Fellow at the Centre for Development Studies, Thiruvananthapuram and former Senior Demographer, The World Bank, Washington D.C.

Email: zachke@vsnl.com

S. Irudaya Rajan is Professor at Centre for Development Studies, Thiruvananthapuram. Currently he is Chair Professor of the Research Unit on International Migration set up by the Ministry of Overseas Indian Affairs. His main areas of research interests are Aging, Migration and Kerala Studies.

Email: rajan@cds.ac.in

References

- Irudaya Rajan, S 2004. 'From Kerala to the Gulf: Impacts of Labour Migration,' *Asia Pacific Migration Journal*, Volume 13, No.4, Pp. 497-509.
- Irudaya Rajan, S 2006. 'Remittances,' In Lal, Brij V., ed., *The Encyclopedia of The Indian Diaspora*. Editions Didier Millet. Singapore/Paris, pp. 75-77.
- Irudaya Rajan, S and Nair, Gopinathan P. R. 2006. 'Saudi Arabia, Oman and the Gulf States'. In Lal, Brij V., ed. *The Encyclopedia of the Indian Diaspora*. Editions Didier Millet. Singapore/Paris, pp. 222-233.
- Irudaya Rajan and U S Mishra. 2007. 'Managing Migration in the Philippines: Lessons for India,' Centre for Development Studies (Thiruvananthapuram) Working Paper No.393. www.cds.edu.
- Irudaya Rajan, S and Prabha, Remya G. 2008. 'India'. *Asia Pacific Migration Journal*. 17 (3/4), pp.277-86.
- Irudaya Rajan, S and Prakash B. A. 2009. 'Migration and Development Linkages Re-Examined in the Context of the Global Economic Crisis.' Invited paper for the Civil Society Days of the 3rd Global Forum on Migration and Development, 2-3 November, Athens.
- Irudaya Rajan, S, Varghese, V.J and Jayakumar, M.S. 2010. *Dreaming Mobility and Buying Vulnerability: Overseas Recruitment Practices and its Discontents in India* (forthcoming). Routledge India, New Delhi.
- Irudaya Rajan, S and D Narayana. 2010. 'The Financial Crisis in The Gulf and Its Impact on South Asian Migrant Workers.' Report Submitted to the Asian Development Bank and the Ministry of Overseas Indian Affairs, Government of India.
- Irudaya Rajan, S (ed). 2010. *Governance and Labour Migration: India Migration Report 2010*. Routledge India, New Delhi.

- Zachariah, K.C, ET Mathew and S Irudaya Rajan.1999. 'Impact of Migration on Kerala's Economy and Society,' Centre for Development Studies, Working Paper No.297. www.cds.edu, also published in International Migration. Volume 39, No.1, 63-88.
- Zachariah, K.C, ET Mathew and S Irudaya Rajan.2000. 'Socio-economic and Demographic Consequences of Migration in Kerala,' Centre for Development Studies, Working Paper No.303. www.cds.edu, also published in International Migration. Volume 39, No.2, 43-72.
- Zachariah, K.C and S Irudaya Rajan. 2001a. 'Gender Dimensions of Migration in Kerala: Macro and Micro Evidences,' Asia Pacific Population Journal, Vol. 16, No.3, Pp. 47-70.
- Zachariah, K.C and S Irudaya Rajan. 2001b. 'Migration Mosaic in Kerala: Trends and Determinants.' Demography India, Volume 30, No.1, Pp. 137-165.
- Zachariah, KC, PR Gopinathan Nair and S Irudaya Rajan. 2001. 'Return Emigrants in Kerala: Rehabilitation Problems and Development Potential,' Centre for Development Studies, Working Paper No.319. www.cds.edu
- Zachariah, KC, BA Prakash and S Irudaya Rajan. 2002. 'Gulf Migration Study: Employment Wages and Working Conditions of Kerala Emigrants in United Arab Emirates,' Centre for Development Studies, Working Paper No.326. www.cds.edu
- Zachariah, K.C, K.P. Kannan and S. Irudaya Rajan (eds.). 2002. Kerala's Gulf Connection: CDS Studies on International Labour Migration from Kerala State in India. Thiruvananthapuram: Centre for Development Studies.
- Zachariah, K.C, ET Mathew and S. Irudaya Rajan.2003. Dynamics of Migration In Kerala. Dimensions, Determinants and Consequences. Hyderabad: Orient Longman Private Limited.

- Zachariah, K.C, B. A Prakash and S. Irudaya Rajan. 2003. 'The Impact of Immigration Policy on Indian Contract Migrants: The Case of the United Arab Emirates,' *International Migration*, Volume 41. No.4, Pp. 161-172.
- Zachariah, K C, B A Prakash and S Irudaya Rajan. 2004. 'Indian Workers in UAE: Employment, Wages and Working Conditions,' *Economic and Political Weekly*, Volume XXXIX, No. 22, May 29 2004, Pp.2227-2234.
- Zachariah, K.C. and S. Irudaya Rajan. 2004a 'Gulf Revisited: Economic Consequences of Emigration from Kerala. Emigration and Employment,' Centre for Development Studies, Working Paper No.363. www.cds.edu
- Zachariah, K C and S Irudaya Rajan. 2004b 'Gulf Emigration of Women in Kerala,' *Samyukta*, a Journal of Women's Studies, Volume IV, No.2, Pp. 41-52.
- Zachariah, KC and S Irudaya Rajan. 2005. 'Unemployment in Kerala at the Turn of the Century: Insights from CDS Gulf Migration Studies,' Centre for Development Studies, Working Paper No.374. www.cds.edu
- Zachariah, K.C, P.R. Gopinathan Nair and S. Irudaya Rajan. 2006. *Return Emigrants in Kerala: Welfare, Rehabilitation and Development*. Manohar Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi.
- Zachariah, K C, B. A Praksah and S. Irudaya Rajan. 2007. 'Aspects of Indian Labour Diaspora in the United Arab Emirates,' Chapter 9, Pp. 205-236 in Prakash C Jain (ed). *Indian Diaspora in West Asia: A Reader*. Manohar Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi.
- Zachariah, K.C and S. Irudaya Rajan. 2007a. 'Economic and Social Dynamics of Migration in Kerala, 1999-2004: Analysis of Panel Data,' Centre for Development Studies, Working Paper No.384. www.cds.edu

- Zachariah K.C. and S. Irudaya Rajan. 2007b 'Migration, remittances and Employment: Short-term Trends and Long-term Implications,' Centre for Development Studies, Working Paper No. 395., www.cds.edu
- Zachariah K.C. and S. Irudaya Rajan. 2008 'Costs of Basic Services in Kerala: Education, Health, Childbirth and Finance (Loans),' Centre for Development Studies, Working Paper No. 406, Thiruvananthapuram. www.cds.edu
- Zachariah, K C and S Irudaya Rajan.2009a. Migration and Development: The Kerala Experience. Daanish Publishers, New Delhi.
- Zachariah, K.C and S Irudaya Rajan. 2009b. 'Migration as a New Demographic Transition in Kerala's Development,' Chapter 12, Page 221-238 in Gopal K Kadekodi and Brinda Viswanathan., eds., Agricultural Development, Rural Institutions and Economic Policy. Oxford University Press, New Delhi.
- Zachariah, K.C and S. Irudaya Rajan. 2009c A Decade of Kerala's Gulf Connection: Migration Monitoring Study 2008. Centre for Development Studies. www.cds.edu
- Zachariah, K.C and S. Irudaya Rajan. 2010. Role of Diaspora in Kerala's Development. Daanish Publishers, New Delhi (forthcoming).
- Zachariah, K.C and S Irudaya Rajan. 2010. 'Migration Monitoring Study, 2008: Emigration and Remittances in the Context of Surge in Oil Prices,' Centre for Development Studies, Working Paper No. 424, www.cds.edu

FSU		<i>Schedule Number</i>	
<p>RETURN MIGRATION RESURVEY 2009</p> <p>STATE OF KERALA - INDIA</p> <p>GOVERNMENT OF KERALA AND CENTRE FOR DEVELOPMENT STUDIES (CDS), THIRUVANANTHAPURAM</p>			
Survey source code - Sample Household of KMS [Code: 2007 – 1, 2008 – 2]		<input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	
Household Identification Number		<input 4"="" style="padding: 10px;" type="text" value="M/N</input></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="/> <p>CURRENT STATUS: Write the number of Migrants (REM, EMI) [Refer present migration status code of 'Block 3' and 'Block 4']</p> <p>1. Return migrants from outside India (REM) <input style="width: 30px; height: 20px;" type="text"/></p> <p>2. Emigrants living outside India (EMI) <input style="width: 30px; height: 20px;" type="text"/></p>	

RETURN MIGRATION RESURVEY

Schedule 1

BLOCK - 1

Identification Particulars

District..... Taluk

City/Panchayat.....Locality (rural-1, urban-2).....

Ward Number..... Ward Name.....

House No. / House Name..... Name of Informant

Details about visits to the household	1	2
Date (s) of Interview		
Name of Investigator		
Name of the Supervisor		
Time Taken		

Notes: The respondent should be the Head of the household. If the head of the household is not present, the information should be collected from the immediate responsible person.

Block - 2: HOUSEHOLD DETAILS - Enumerate all normal resident members of the household as on the date of the survey										
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Serial No.	Name of members of Household (Head of the HH first)	Relation with the Head (Code)	Sex (Male - 1, Female - 2)	Date of Birth (Month and Year) MM/YYYY	General Educational Status (Code)	Activity status (Code)	For working persons only		Marital Status (Code)	Married women whose husband residing outside India (Yes-1, No-2)
							Industry (code)	Occupation (code)		
01										
02										
03										
04										
05										
06										
07										
08										

Codes:
Column - 03
 Head of the HH
 Husband/Wife
 Unmarried children
 Married children
 Son-in-law/Daughter-in-law
 Grand child
 Father/Mother/Mother-in-law
 Brother/Sister/Brother-in-law/Sister-in-law
 Servant
 Others

Column - 06
 Pre primary - 0
 Class 1 - 1
 Class 2 - 2
 Class 3 - 3
 Class 4 - 4
 Class 5 - 5
 Class 6 - 6
 Class 7 - 7
 Class 8 - 8
 Class 9 - 9
 Class 10 - 10
 Class 11 - 11
 Class 12 - 12

ITI, Certificate course
 Diploma
 Degree (BA, BSc, BCom, BLISe etc)
 PG Diploma (PGDCA etc)
 Professional Degree (BTech, LLB, MBBS, BDS,
 BSC (N), BPHARM, BHMS, BAMS, BPT etc.) - 17
 PG (MA, MSc, MCom etc)
 Professional PG (M.Tech, MBA, MCA, MLISE, MSW, MCI, BEd, MEd, LL.M, MD, MS, Medical PG Diploma, MDS, MLT, MSC (N) etc.)
 M.Phil, Ph.D etc
 Others
 Illiterate
 Literate without school education

Column - 07
 Employed in State/ Central Govt. school/ colleges, co-operative/ local admin bodies etc
 Employed in private sector
 Self employed
 Agricultural labour
 Non Agricultural labour
 Unpaid family work
 Job seeker
 Job not required
 Student
 Household works (Housewife)
 Pensioner
 Too old to work
 Too young to attend school
 Disabled
 Others

Column - 10
 Never married
 Married
 Widow / Widower
 Divorced
 Separated

Block - 3: Return emigrants of 2007 / 2008 Survey: Fill in columns 13 and 14 from the earlier enumeration before going to the field.

12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	
Sl. No	Name	Sl. No in the earlier enumeration	Present migration status (Code)	Date of birth MM/YYYY	Sex (Male-1, Female-2)	Marital status (code)	Educational status (code)	Current status			If the person ever stayed outside India then			If the person is currently staying outside Kerala then			When did he go to Kerala after the earlier enumeration? MM/YYYY	When did he come back to Kerala? MM/YYYY	Reason for return (Code)		
								Activity (code)	Industry (code)	Occupation (code)	Activity (code)	Industry (code)	Occupation (code)	Name (State / Country)	Name (State / Country)						
REM from the 2007 and 2008 Surveys																					
1																					
2																					
3																					
4																					
5																					
6																					
7																					
8																					
9																					
10																					
Other than the REM s listed above, Is there anybody else (including women and children) in the Household who lived outside India																					
11																					
12																					
13																					
14																					
15																					

Present status code : REM -1, EMI-2, OMI-3, ROM -4, EMI to OMI -5, EMI to REM -6, OMI to ROM -7, OMI to EMI - 8, Others - 9.
Reason for return :Codes: Lost job and returned due to financial crisis-1; Expiry of contract 2; Compulsory repatriation -3; Low wages or not promised salary at the time of emigration -4; Poor Working Conditions -5; Harsh behavior of employer-6; Personal Ill health -7; Problems at home -8; Hostile climate -9; Others -10.

Block - 4: Emigrants of 2007 / 2008 Survey: Fill in columns 34 and 35 from the earlier enumeration before going to the field.																						
33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53		
Sl. No	Name	Sl. No in the earlier enumeration	Present migration status (Code)	Date of birth MM/YYYY	Sex (Male-1, Female-2)	Marital status (code)	Educational status (code)	Current status			Where was the person living before returning to Kerala			Prior to return			If the person is currently staying outside Kerala then		When did he /she go out of Kerala after the earlier enumeration? MM/YYYY	When did he /she come back to Kerala MM/YYYY	Reason for return (Code)	
								Activity (code)	Industry (code)	Occupation (code)	Name (State / Country)	Code	Activity (code)	Industry (code)	Occupation (code)	Name (State / Country)	Code					
EMI from the 2007 and 2008 Surveys																						
41																						
42																						
43																						
44																						
45																						
46																						
47																						
48																						
49																						
50																						
Other than the EMI s listed above, Is there anybody else (including women and children) who were members of this Household and now living outside India																						
51																						
52																						
53																						
54																						
55																						

Present migration status code : REM -1, EMI-2, OMI-3, ROM -4, REM to OMI -5, REM to EMI -6, OMI to ROM -7, OMI to EMI - 8, Others - 9.
Reason for return : Codes: Lost job and returned due to financial crisis-1; Expiry of contract 2; Compulsory repatriation -3; Low wages or not promised salary at the time of emigration -4; Poor Working Conditions -5; Harsh behavior of employer-6; Personal Ill health -7; Problems at home -8; Hostile climate -9; Others -10.

Block – 5: Questions to the members of the Household

54. Did anyone in your family receive money or goods or gifts other than cash from persons residing abroad during the last 12 months period?

Yes-1 (If Yes, go to Q.55) No-2 (If No, go to Q.58)

55. If Yes, total amount of money received last year Rs.

56. If any goods/gifts received, specify by mark

1	Clothes	4	MP3/VCD/DVD
2	Gold ornaments	5	Others (Specify)
3	Small electrical equipments		
Total value Rs.			

57. In what ways did you use the money? (Tick the appropriate)

1	For day-to-day household expenses	6	To build/purchase new house/renovation of old house
2	Education of children	7	To embark new business/enlarging the existing one
3	To repay debts	8	To Maintain agricultural land
4	To purchase land	9	Deposited in bank
5	Dowry payment of relatives	10	Others (Specify)

Interviewer to Note – Only amounts which are not included in Q. 55, 56 should be included in the Q. No 58 and 59

58. Did anyone in your family residing abroad bring money to build house/to purchase land during last 12 months? (Code: Yes-1, No-2)
If Yes, how much? Rs.

59. Did anyone in your family bring money during the last 12 months for any purpose, which is not included above?

Item	Amount in Rs.
To buy a Car / Scooter / Taxi etc	
To invest in share / Bonds / mutual funds etc	
To start a small enterprise	
Dowry	
Education	
Medical Expenses	
Repayments of Debts	
Others (Specify)	

60. What is your religion?

(Hindu-1, Christian-2, Muslim-3, Sikhs-4, Others-5)

61.1 If Hindu, which caste do you belong to?

(Nair-1, Ezhava-2, Brahmins-3, Nadar-4, Viswakarma/Barber/Washerman-5, Scheduled Caste-6, Scheduled Tribe-7, Others -8)

61.2 If Christian, which denomination do you belong to?

(Syrian Malabar Catholic-1, Malankara Syrian Catholic-2, Latin Catholic-3, Jacobite Syrian-4, Orthodox Syrian-5, Marthoma Syrian-6, C.S.I.-7, SC-8, Others-9)

61.3 If Muslim, which sect do you belong to?

(Shiya Muslim-1, Sunni Muslim-2)

Block – 8 : Summary information of Return Emigrants (REM) as per Resurvey 2009					
Q.90 Return migrants from outside India					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Sl No. from Block 3 or Block 4					
Name					

Block – 9 : Summary information of Emigrants (EMI) as per Resurvey 2009					
Q.91 Emigrants living outside India					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Sl No. from Block 3 or Block 4					
Name					

Block – 10: Remarks of the Investigator
Date:
Signature:

PUBLICATIONS

For information on all publications, please visit the CDS Website: www.cds.edu. The Working Paper Series was initiated in 1971. Working Papers from 279 can be downloaded from the site.

The Working Papers published after April 2007 are listed below:

- W.P. 431 GARGI SANATI**, *Integration of India's Financial Markets on the Domestic and International Fronts: An Empirical Analysis of the Post-Liberalisation Period*, June 2010.
- W.P. 430 SUNIL MANI**, *Has China and India Become more Innovative Since the onset of Reforms in the Two Countries?* May 2010.
- W.P. 429 T. R. DILIP**, *School Educational Attainment in Kerala: Trends And Differentials*. April 2010.
- W.P. 428 SUNIL MANI**, *The Flight from Defence to Civilian Space: Evolution of the Sectoral System of Innovation of India's Aerospace Industry*. April 2010.
- W.P. 427 J. DEVIKA, V. J. VARGHESE**, *To Survive or to Flourish? Minority Rights and Syrian Christian Community Assertions in 20th Century Travancore/Kerala*. April 2010.
- W.P. 426 ANUP KUMAR BHANDARI**, *Global Crisis, Environmental Volatility and Expansion of the Indian Leather Industry*. March 2010.
- W.P. 425 P L. BEENA, HRUSHIKESH MALLICK**, *Exchange Rate and Export Behaviour of Indian Textiles & Clothing Sector: An Enquiry for Major Destination Countries*. March 2010.
- W.P. 424 K. C. ZACHARIAH, S. IRUDAYA RAJAN**, *Migration Monitoring Study, 2008 Emigration and Remittances in the Context of Surge in Oil Prices*. March 2010.
- W.P. 423 VIJAYAMOHANAN PILLAI N**, *Loss of Load Probability of a Power System: Kerala*. February 2010.

- W.P. 422 JAYASEKHAR S, C. NALIN KUMAR**, *Compliance, Competitiveness and Market Access: A Study on Indian Seafood Industry*. February 2010.
- W.P. 421 S.IRUDAYA RAJAN, V.J. VARGHESE, M.S. JAYAKUMAR** *Overseas Recruitment in India: Structures, Practices and Remedies*. December 2009.
- W.P. 420 V.J. VARGHESE**, *Land, Labour and Migrations: Understanding Kerala's Economic Modernity*, December 2009.
- W.P. 419 R.MOHAN, D. SHYJAN** *Tax Devolution and Grant Distribution to States in India Analysis and Roadmap for Alternatives*, December 2009.
- W.P. 418 WILLIAM JOE & U. S. MISHRA** *Household Out-of-Pocket Healthcare Expenditure in India Levels, Patterns and Policy Concerns*, October 2009.
- W.P. 417 NEETHI P** *Globalisation Lived Locally: New Forms of Control, Conflict and Response Among Labour in Kerala, Examined Through a Labour Geography Lens*. October 2009.
- W.P. 416 SUNIL MANI** *High skilled migration from India, An analysis of its economic implications*, September 2009.
- W.P. 415 SUNIL MANI** *Has India Become more Innovative Since 1991? Analysis of the Evidence and Some Disquieting Features*, September 2009.
- W.P. 414 WILLIAM JOE, PRIYAJIT SAMAIYAR, U. S. MISHRA** *Migration and Urban Poverty in India Some Preliminary Observations*, September 2009.
- W.P. 413 K. N. NAIR, T.P. SREEDHARAN, M. ANOOPKUMAR**, *A Study of National Rural Employment Guarantee Programme in Three Grama Panchayats of Kasaragod District*, August 2009
- W.P. 412 B.S. SURAN, D. NARAYANA**, *The Deluge of Debt: Understanding the Financial Needs of Poor Households*. July 2009
- W.P. 411 K. NAVANEETHAM, M. KABIR, C.S. KRISHNAKUMAR** *Morbidity Patterns in Kerala: Levels and Determinants*. April 2009.

- W.P. 410 ARINDAM BANERJEE**, *Peasant Classes, Farm Incomes and Rural Indebtedness: An Analysis of Household Production Data from two States.* March 2009.
- W.P. 409 SUNIL MANI**, *The Growth of Knowledge-intensive Entrepreneurship in India, 1991-2007 Analysis of its Evidence and the Facilitating Factors.* February, 2009
- W.P. 408 M. S. HARILAL**, *Home to Market: Responses, Resurgence and Transformation of Ayurveda from 1830s to 1920.* November 2008
- W.P. 407 HRUSHIKESH MALLICK**, *Do Remittances Impact the Economy ? Some Empirical Evidences from a Developing Economy.* October 2008.
- W.P. 406 K.C.ZACHARIAH, S.IRUDAYA RAJAN**, *Costs of Basic Services in Kerala, 2007, Education, Health, Childbirth and Finance (Loans)* September 2008.
- W.P. 405 SUNIL MANI** *Financing of industrial innovations in India How effective are tax incentives for R&D?* August 2008.
- W.P. 404 VINOJ ABRAHAM** *Employment Growth in Rural India: Distress Driven?* August 2008.
- W.P. 403 HRUSHIKESH MALLICK**, *Government Spending, Trade Openness and Economic Growth in India: A Time Series Analysis.* July 2008.
- W.P. 402 K. PUSHANGADAN, G. MURUGAN**, *Dynamics of Rural Water Supply in Coastal Kerala: A Sustainable Development View,* June 2008
- W.P. 401 K. K. SUBRAHMANIAN, SYAMPRASAD**, *Rising Inequality With High Growth Isn't this Trend Worrisome? Analysis of Kerala Experience,* June 2008
- W.P. 400 T.R. DILIP**, *Role of Private Hospitals in Kerala: An Exploration,* June 2008
- W.P. 399 V. DHANYA**, *Liberalisation of Tropical Commodity Market and Adding-up Problem: A Bound Test Approach,* March 2008

- W.P. 398 P. MOHANAN PILLAI, N. SHANTA, *ICT and Employment Promotion Among Poor Women: How can we Make it Happen? Some Reflections on Kerala's Experience.*** February 2008.
- W.P. 397 K.N.NAIR, VINEETHA MENON, *Distress Debt and Suicides among Agrarian Households: Findings from three Village Studies in Kerala.*** December 2007
- W.P. 396 K.N.NAIR, C.P. VINOD, VINEETHA MENON, *Agrarian Distress and Livelihood Strategies: A Study in Pulpalli Panchayat, Wayanad District, Kerala*** December 2007
- W.P. 395 K.C. ZACHARIAH, S.IRUDAYA RAJAN, *Migration, Remittances And Employment Short-term Trends and Long-term Implications.*** December 2007
- W.P. 394 K.N.NAIR, ANTONYTO PAUL, VINEETHA MENON, *Livelihood Risks and Coping strategies: A Case Study in the Agrarian Village of Cherumad, Kerala.*** November 2007
- W.P. 393 S. IRUDAYA RAJAN, U.S.MISHRA, *Managing Migration in the Philippines: Lessons for India.*** November 2007.
- W.P. 392 K.N. NAIR, R. RAMAKUMAR *Agrarian Distress and Rural Livelihoods, a Study in Upputhara Panchayat Idukki District, Kerala.*** November 2007.
- W.P. 391 PULAPRE BALAKRISHNAN, *Visible hand: Public policy and economic growth in the Nehru era.*** November 2007.
- W.P. 390 SUNIL MANI, *The Growth Performance of India's Telecommunications Services Industry, 1991-2006 Can it Lead to the Emergence of a Domestic Manufacturing Hub?*** September 2007.
- W.P. 389 K. J. JOSEPH, VINOJ ABRAHAM, *Information Technology and Productivity: Evidence from India's Manufacturing Sector.*** September 2007.
- W.P. 388 HRUSHIKESH MALLICK, *Does Energy Consumption Fuel Economic Growth In India?*** September 2007.

- W.P. 387 D. SHYJAN**, *Public Investment and Agricultural Productivity: A State-wise Analysis of Foodgrains in India*. July 2007.
- W.P. 386 J. DEVIKA**, *'A People United in Development': Developmentalism in Modern Malayalee Identity*. June 2007.
- W.P. 385 M. PARAMESWARAN**, *International Trade, R&D Spillovers and Productivity: Evidence from Indian Manufacturing Industry*. June 2007.
- W.P. 384 K. C. ZACHARIAH, S. IRUDAYA RAJAN** *Economic and Social Dynamics of Migration in Kerala, 1999-2004 Analysis of Panel Data*. May 2007.
- W.P. 383 SAIKAT SINHA ROY** *Demand and Supply Factors in the Determination of India's Disaggregated Manufactured Exports : A Simultaneous Error-Correction Approach*. May 2007.

This work is licensed under a
Creative Commons
Attribution – NonCommercial - NoDerivs 3.0 Licence.

To view a copy of the licence please see:
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>