

Negotiated Identities: Male Migration and Left Behind Wives in India

Abstract:

This paper examines the impact of husband's migration on lives of women left behind. Using data from India Human Development Survey 2005, this paper examines the impact on two dimensions of women's lives: (a) Women's autonomy and control over their lives; (b) Women's labor force participation. Results suggest that household structure forms the key mediating factor through which husband's absence affects women. Women not residing in extended families are faced with both higher levels of responsibilities as well as greater autonomy, while women who live in extended households do not experience these demands or benefits.

Introduction:

In recent years demographic research on voluntary and involuntary migration has begun to recognize that migration is both a gendered and gendering process and research on women migrants has increasingly begun to attract attention (Bilsborrow 1992). However, little attention is directed to women who are not migrants themselves but are deeply affected by the migration process, i.e. women whose husbands have migrated in search of work leaving them behind. The impact of this type of migration on women's lives has attracted surprisingly little attention (Hugo 2000), a gap this paper seeks to fill.

Unlike other demographic phenomena such as birth and death, migration is a process rather than an event. Diversity seems to be the norm when it comes to characterizing migration with respect to reasons for departure, length of migration, frequency of return to place of origin and ties to home communities (Goldscheider 1987; Lucas 1997; Massey et al. 1990). However, males in developing countries leaving their place of origin in search of work form a sufficiently large group that this phenomenon has attracted attention in many studies of urbanization. Although some of these labor migrants are accompanied by their wives, many choose to leave their families behind for short or long periods of time. A variety of factors are implicated in this process. In some instances state policies such as the apartheid resulted in the influx of male mine workers who were prohibited from bringing their families with them, in others immigration policies in host countries make it virtually impossible to jump the immigration hurdle for families to migrate together. Sometimes urban housing shortages or the need for farm labor separates the families. While sole female migration is increasing for specific occupations such as nurses or domestic workers, in many parts of the world, labor migration is largely composed of males who leave their wives behind to pick up the pieces of family life.

Gender and Migration:

A review of the available literature on the impact of male migration on families documents two types of effects. The first focuses on direct impact of husband's absence on women's autonomy and looks for possible effects on women since husband's absences forces or frees them to take on roles that they would not normally undertake (Hugo 2000). A study of 44 migrant Mexican men and women in San Francisco Bay

Area (Hondagneu-Sotelo 1992) suggests that migration of men typically entails expansion of responsibilities and acquisition of skills in tasks not traditionally undertaken by women- for instance, to cope with the low level of remittances women often take up employment in the informal sector and learn to administer household budgets. Thus, men's absences from homes provide conditions for fostering women's autonomy, self esteem and role expansion. Separation from wives on the part of men necessitates undertaking domestic tasks that they would not have otherwise done. However, the dismantling in gender-segregated roles is only partial since frequently families return to a patriarchal division of labor once they reunite. Another study of male migration from rural to urban areas for skilled manual and white collar employment in the coastal state of Goa, India suggests that in the absence of husbands women are de facto household heads and execute various responsibilities as hiring and supervision of agricultural labor (Mascarenhas-Keyes 1990).

The other line of research emphasizes financial hardships and increased responsibilities for women. Further, the assumption of responsibilities outside the home may in some instances actually enhance the work burden of women. For instance, in rice producing villages of eastern UP, if remittances are not large enough, women's work load is likely to increase as they have to compensate for the absence of their husband's farm labor (Paris et al. 2005). Other studies also note that frequently remittances from the migrant are not enough and women who get "left behind" in the native villages have to assume the role of sole breadwinner in addition to added familial and domestic responsibilities (Jetley 1987). Domestic responsibilities may be shared by the older daughter who acts as a "littler surrogate mother" to her brothers and sisters.

While these arguments appear logical, reality is often far more complex. As Gupta and Ferguson note in a slightly different context, “Representations of space in the social sciences are remarkably dependent on images of break, rupture, and disjunction.” (Gupta and Ferguson 1992). However, this rupture may be less severe than one imagines. We have already noted earlier that migration is a messy process; migrant husbands often leave behind a very large presence, reinforced by periodic visits to their homes. More importantly, the vision of a static rural community may also be unrealistic. Communities and households may well reconfigure themselves to respond to male migration to preserve gender patterns. An interesting study of male migrants to the Gulf countries from Cairo (Hoodfar 1996) finds that male migration has tended to strengthen rather than weaken the traditional gender ideologies whereby women are seen as being dependent on their men folk and many households have reorganized themselves so that brothers or other male relatives moved in to take care of the women left behind. Studies in India have also found that migrants often delayed their migration until some male relatives were available to care for the families being left behind (de Haan 2006). Thus, how households and communities respond to migration is likely to be the key to shaping the impact of male migration on women’s autonomy and empowerment which forms the focus of the present paper.

Migration in Indian Society:

Migration in India is a highly localized phenomenon. A report by the National Sample Survey Organisation provides an interesting description of migration in India. Almost 99% of the migration takes place within India, although given the overall population size, India also contributes substantially to international migration. While 27

percent of Indian population is identified as “migrant”, i.e. consisting of individuals who no longer live in the town/village where they were born, an overwhelming majority – 77% -- are women who migrated in the context of an arranged marriage. Over 40% of the female population in rural as well as urban areas consists of migrants. However, male migration is not insubstantial. Nearly 7% of the rural population and 27% of the urban male population consists of migrants. Of this, 30% of the rural male migrants and 53% of the urban male migrants migrated for employment related reasons, an increasing number also travel to urban areas to study.ⁱ Most of this migration is relative short distance. Among rural male migrants, 57% come from same district and 82% from same state. Among urban male migrants, 34% from same district and 74% from same state (National Sample Survey Organisation 2001).

However, it appears that short distance migrants often take their families with them. In contrast, individuals migrating to another state or abroad may well be more likely to leave their families behind. The India Human Development Survey described below documents that among ever married women aged 15-49, about 4.5% of the rural women and about 1.5% of the urban women had husbands who lived elsewhere. Among migrant husbands, 26% are in the same state, 62% in a different state and 12% live in a different country. However, this phenomenon is highly geographically clustered. In the mountainous state of Uttarkhand, nearly 9% of the ever married women have husbands living elsewhere, as do 8% of the rural women in central plains of Uttar Pradesh and 11% in Bihar. In contrast, in the more prosperous southern states of Karnataka and Tamil Nadu, few women reside away from their husbands.

Socioeconomic characteristics of the families with male migrants as well as geographic distribution are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

[Tables 1 and 2 about here]

A few characteristics of women with migrant husbands compared to their sisters who have co-resident husbands or those who are currently not in a union are noteworthy. Younger wives are more likely to be living away from their husbands than older wives. Presumably, older wives have over time figured out a living situation in which they are reunited with their husbands. Education does not seem to play a role in women's living away from their husbands and caste/ethnicity/religion plays only a minor role with non Hindu women far more likely to have migrant husbands. Since there appears to be a preference for Muslim employees among the Middle East recruiters that may partially explain this phenomenon. Families whose primary source of income is salaried or professional work seem to be more likely to have migrant males, as do families subsisting on retirement income or remittances. Lack of formal sector employment in rural areas may drive informal sector workers to leave their families behind as they migrate to urban areas in search of work. Interestingly, women with migrant husbands live in slightly better off households than women who live with their husbands. It is difficult to identify the direction of this relationship. It has been noted that privileged individuals are more likely to migrate than their poorer brothers (Massey et al. 1998) but at the same time, having a migrant family member increases income from remittances, increasing over all standard of living.

Interestingly, we expect migrant households to be smaller than other households since one of its members is no longer present. However, our data indicate that in India

household size does not seem to differ by husband's presence in the household, even number of adults across migrant and non migrant households differ by less than 0.5. It seems clear that other family members, particularly older female (and male) relatives seem to fill in the gap. This suggests that many women live with other family members in absence of their husbands; in contrast widows and divorced/separated women live in smaller households with fewer adults.

Male Migration and Women's Lives in India:

It would be reasonable to expect that absence of husbands has a deep impact on the way women's lives are shaped. In an Indian context, two areas seem to be particularly affected:

- (1) A variety of studies of women's empowerment in India have noted limited autonomy and decision making ability on the part of women (Bloom, Wypij and das Gupta 2001; Desai 1994; Jejeebhoy and Sathar 2001; Mason and Smith 2000). We expect that in husband's absence women may have a greater role in family decision making and may be able to put aside norms of female seclusion since husband's absence would increase the need for their participation and leadership in day to day affairs of the family. Moreover, migration may introduce new ideas and attitudes in men which may ultimately change gender roles in the family.
- (2) While male migration may be associated with higher likelihood of remittances, women may need to fill in for absent husbands in many ways including care of animals, and work on family farm or in family business (Paris, T., et al 2005;

Jetley 1987). Moreover, in some instances sporadic nature of remittance may also force women to generate cash income through wage work (Gulati 1993).

A fascinating set of interviews with women in Kerala provide insights into the processes shaping women's lives in the context of male migration (Gulati 1993) and documents both constraints and opportunities provided by male migration. Hameeda, one of Gulati's informants reports (p.31)

“When Jamal [husband] is visiting home, he takes me out to movies. He never insists that I should cover my head. My mother is very orthodox and would never have permitted me such liberty. Actually, now several women in our neighbourhood have stopped covering their heads and go to the movies in short-sleeved blouses. You need someone to take the initiative and introduce these small changes.”

In contrast, Rehana reports (p. 38):

“My position is rather awkward. Of the 13 persons living in this house, I am the only outsider. Although I am married to the most important person who is everyone's hope, I have very little freedom of movement, speech or action. I cannot go out of the house without the permission of my mother-in-law....In my position, I simply cannot afford to displease anyone.”

Similarly, Gulati's respondents also note a diversity of economic outcomes. Sultana reports (p. 55):

“My husband’s migration has descended on me as a curse ... After Shams stopped sending me money, I registered with the government employment exchange for a job.”

In contrast, Kumari documents an incredible growth in self confidence and control over finances (p. 107).

“In the beginning after Mani departed for Abu Dhabi, I had all kinds of doubts about my ability to cope with things in his absence. My problems started with writing letters ... I had to ask someone to write it for me. I was not certain also how I would be able to manage finances Keeping money in the bank, I found, was a help. You keep it there safely until you really need it.”

These interviews – and others -- document both rigid constraints on women and spaces in which they manage to find their voice. They also raise an interesting question. Why do some women find freedom and responsibility in their husband’s absence and others do not?

We suggest that living arrangements form the sieve through which migration experience is filtered. Some women establish or maintain their own households and gain increased autonomy as well as responsibility. Others live with extended family and are subject to strict supervision and regulation and must cope without help from their husbands mediating between them and the extended households.

While extended family living remains prevalent in India and in our survey over 90% women started out their married life by residing with husband’s parents, over time families frequently divide, particularly as children are born and parents pass away. In

India Human Development Survey, nearly half the households are nuclear, the rest are extended. However, it is considered unusual for women to live alone and husband's migration may be feasible only if young women are able to live with other family members (de Haan 2006). Moreover, it would not be acceptable for a young woman to live alone with older male relatives of her husband; chaperonage of a female relative would be required. Thus, we argue that gender impact of male migration on women is moderated via household structure with greater freedom in households where no older woman is present.

Research Questions and Data:

This paper asks the following questions:

- (1) Is husband's migration empowering for women who are left behind in terms of increasing their autonomy and decision making power?
- (2) Is husband's migration associated with higher work demands on women?
- (3) Is this effect conditional on living arrangements of the women left behind?

In addressing these questions we compare three groups of women, women living with their husbands, women whose husbands live elsewhere, women who do not have a husband, i.e., widows, separated and divorced women.

Most of the literature in this area, including the literature cited above, is based on qualitative research. While these studies help in developing a sophisticated theoretical framework, testing this framework is very difficult. For example, the study of Egyptian urban households cited above (Hoodfar 1996) argues, "Studies of the impact of male migration on the position of women must take into consideration other important

variables such as age, social class, education, rural versus urban context, and the duration of migration.” (ibid: p. 72). However, by their very nature, qualitative studies focus on small homogeneous sample and find it difficult to address these differences. On the other hand, quantitative studies based on sample surveys need a fairly large sample to find sufficient cases of non-traditional households, such as households with migrant husbands. We are fortunate to have access to India Human Development Survey, 2005. This survey of 41,550 households was conducted in both urban and rural areas and covered all states and union territories of India with the exception of small populations living in the islands of Andaman Nicobar and Lakshadweep. Fieldwork was conducted between December 2004 and November 2005 and included interviews of a key informant – typically a male household head – about the economic conditions of the household and interview with one ever married woman aged 15-49 about a variety of factors including gender relations within the household. This provides us with a large enough sample of ever married women age 15 to 49 women (total of 33,480 women) – including 991 women with absent husbands – to study the impact of migration on women’s lives. Moreover we are also able to compare these women with women who live with their husbands as well as women who don’t have a husband due to death or divorce.

While use of survey data offers many benefits, its structured nature limits the kind of questions that can be addressed. Consequently, empowerment in this paper has a very specific meaning. It draws from a focus on subjective sense of self efficacy and entitlement (Kabeer 1999) and focuses on women’s role in household decision making

and their ability to move freely outside their home. We focus on the following markers of empowerment:

- *Women's role in decision making:* The survey asked women respondents who made decisions in their family regarding day to day cooking, purchasing large consumer items, how many children to have, children's marriage, and taking children to a clinic in case of illness. When respondent identified multiple decision makers, she was asked who the primary decision maker is. In this paper we focus on a decision making index that counts the number of items on which respondents are primary or sole decision makers.ⁱⁱ This index ranges from 0 to 5.
- *Women's mobility and freedom of movement:* It has been noted by a variety of scholars of South Asia that women's physical mobility is severely restricted in most parts. Norms of female seclusion expressed in ghunghat or purdah play a role but even for women who do not practice purdah, there is an expectation that they will seek permission from their husband or older family members to go to a shop or visit friends. IHDS asked women whether they needed permission to go to a grocery store, health clinic and to visit friends/neighbors. The number of places where they can move freely without needing permission is added up to construct a mobility index.ⁱⁱⁱ This index ranges from 0 to 3.^{iv}

In addition to a focus on gender roles, we also argued that male migration changes the labor balance in the household. In some cases women may need to fill the gap left by their husbands in terms of taking care of farms or business, in others the remittance income may allow her to withdraw from the labor force or allow for the possibility of

hiring labor in the farm or business. In order to examine these effects we focus on two types of labor force activities:

- *Women's participation in labor force* measured by whether they worked on the family farm or in family business, looked after animals, or participated in any kind of wage work (0 = no labor force participation, 1=work for wages, on farm/business, care for animals)
- *Women's participation in wage labor* measured by whether she worked for pay in agricultural or non agricultural work (0=no, 1=casual wage work or regular salaried work)

The two gender roles variables are indices which are analyzed using an ordinal logit regression while the labor force variables are analyzed using a logit model. In each model in addition to the migration and marital status, we also control for state of residence, urban residence, age of the woman, number of children, caste/religion, log of per capita household consumption expenditure (a marker of permanent income), woman's education and household's primary source of income. Descriptive statistics are presented in Appendix Table 1. The primary independent variables of interest are: (1) Marital status divided into three categories: co-resident husband, migrant husband, and not being currently in a union which includes divorced, widowed, separated women as well as a handful for whom we could not figure out the location of the husband. (2) Living in an extended family where an older woman is present.

Results:

Results from the ordinal logits and logit regressions for the four dependent variables of interest are presented in Appendix Table 2. Given the difficulties in interpreting results from non-linear models, we present these results by calculating the difference in outcome variables for different categories of independent variables of interests where all control variables are held at their mean value. These calculations are based on the full models from Appendix II.

[Table 3 about here]

Table 3 containing predicted average scores on decision making and mobility index as well as probabilities of employment tells an interesting and consistent story. Women with migrant husbands are more likely to participate in household decisions, are better able to venture outside the home without seeking permission and more likely to participate in the labor force than their sisters whose husbands have not migrated. However, this effect is considerably lower than that for women who have no husbands. For example, average predicted score on decision making index (which ranges from 0-5 decisions on which the respondent is the primary decision maker) is 1.33 for women with co-resident husbands, it is 1.93 for women with migrant husbands and it is 3.42 for women who are widowed or separated. Note that these effects are net of other socio-economic factors such as presence of older women in the household, place of residence, household consumption expenditure, household's primary occupation and woman's education. Similarly, women with migrant husbands are more likely to participate in the labor force than those with co-resident husbands but divorced/widowed women are the most likely to work.

This suggests that while husband's absence changes women's lives in many different ways, a migrant husband is still very much present in the way women's lives are shaped and makes their experiences different from those of their widowed and divorced sisters. How is this influence exercised? Our review of the literature above suggests that household composition is an important intervening factor. When men migrate, instead of living alone or only with their children, women may be left in the care of other relatives. Frequently migration may only be possible if other household members are available to co-reside with women. When this co-residence occurs with older family members they may not have to deal with the difficult yet empowering experience of coping on their own, with little enhancement in autonomy even in husband's absence.

[Table 4 about here]

In order to examine this, we add an interaction term to our regression models between presence of an older woman in the household and marital status. The interaction between presence of an older woman and having a migrant husband is statistically significant at 0.05 level for three variables, decision making, mobility, and participation in the labor force. It is significant at 0.1 level for wage work. Predicted probabilities from this model are presented in Table 4. The results show an interesting difference between women in extended families and those in household where no older woman is present. Results show that much of the positive effect of husband's migration on wives is limited to those who live in nuclear families and not those in extended families. For example, on decision making scale, the average predicted score in nuclear households is 1.46 for women with co-resident husbands, 2.77 for those with

migrant husbands and 4.07 for widows. However in extended households, these scores are 1.08, 1.10 and 1.98 respectively.

This table highlights several issues facing Indian women. First, when women live in an extended family, whether the husband is present or not, they are embraced within a family circle and bound by the same rules and regulations as their peers whose husbands reside within the household. Second, widows and divorced women have different and unique experiences. Whether they live in an extended household or not, they are more likely to control their own lives and carry greater labor market responsibilities.

[Table 5 about here]

Table 5 presents descriptive statistics that shed some light on the nature of household composition. Each entry in the table represents the proportion of households in that cell which are extended –as defined by the presence of an older woman in the household. It indicates that among the women with co resident husband, about 34% live in households with an older woman, but this proportion rises to 56% among women with migrant husbands. Younger women are far more likely to live in extended families in husband's absence than older women as are rural women. But perhaps one of the most striking observations is that it is privileged women who are most likely to live with other relatives. For example, in results not reported here, residence in extended family for wives of migrants is significantly more likely for literate women as opposed to their illiterate sisters. Similarly, upper caste Hindu women are far less likely to live alone in absence of their husbands than the lower caste *dalit* women. Interestingly, women's

extended family living was not associated with the destination of husbands; wives of international migrants were as likely to live in extended families as wives of domestic migrants.

To summarize our findings, our results suggest that husband's migration has a substantial impact on women's lives if they do not live in an extended household. When living independently, women are far more likely to make independent decisions regarding day to day living as well as longer term decisions for children's well being and have greater physical mobility and independence than women living with their husbands. These women also face greater labor demands and are more likely to participate in the labor force. However, many women are likely to be incorporated into extended households when their husbands migrate and they do not experience these challenges as well as liberation from rigid gender rules. Moreover, it is women from higher social classes who are more likely to be incorporated into extended households when their husbands migrate.

Discussion:

Social science models are consistently being challenged by exceptional circumstances and are being modified in response. Research on separate finances for men and women in sub Saharan Africa led to criticism of neo-classical household economic models and their assumption that interests of different individuals in the household can be pooled within a single utility function (Folbre 1994). This resulted in reformulations focusing on intra household distribution considerations (Thomas 1994). Similarly, focus on female headed households in the United States and Latin America (Buvinic, Lycette and McGreevey 1983) led to a need to move beyond research on male

breadwinners and to explicitly pay attention to the nature of women's work (Beneria and Sen 1982) as well as a redefinition of the concept of "household headship" in census and other data collection efforts (Presser 1998). Results presented in this paper also have considerable implications for research on the nature of gender and patriarchy in developing countries.

Our results suggest that any empowering effect associated with husband's absence is limited to women who do not live in families with older women – our proxy for an extended household in which the respondent is a junior member. Although considerable attention is devoted to the role of differences in power between men and women, with some notable exceptions (Adams and Castle 1994; Sen, Rastogi and Vanneman 2006) few studies have paid any attention to the role of age and generation in disempowering young women. Our results suggest that extended families create a climate within which young women's choices are limited. Consequently, whether the husband is living with the woman or living in another state, women do not gain more freedom and autonomy as long as they are living in an extended family.

While not directly geared towards studying the role of social class in shaping gender inequality, these results also suggest that it is the higher social classes are more reluctant to allow women the freedom of living alone than lower social classes. Upper caste women and literate women are less likely to live alone in their husbands' absence than lower caste and illiterate women. These findings echo the observations in urban Egypt (Hoodfar 1996). This suggests that situations where the grip of patriarchy might be relaxed are resisted with greater fervor by upper social classes than those located lower in the class hierarchy.

Finally, our results also point to the unique status of widowed and divorced women. These women seem to stand out even when they are part of an extended family. Unlike married women, widows and divorcees seem to be expected to work to support themselves (and their children) even when they live in an extended family. They are also far more likely to have the freedom to make decisions that concern them or their children. While on surface this may appear to mark greater opportunities for empowerment, when taken in conjunction with the vulnerabilities of Indian widows noted by other studies (Chen 2000), these highlight the ambiguous position of widows and divorcees in Indian families.

References

Adams, A. and S. Castle. 1994. "Gender Relations and Household Dynamics." in *Population Policies Reconsidered: Health, Empowerment, and Rights.*, edited by G. Sen, A. Germain, and L. Chen. Boston, Mass: Harvard School of Public Health.

Beneria, L. and G. Sen. 1982. "Class and Gender Inequalities and Women's Role in Economic Development: Theoretical and Practical Implications." *Feminist Studies* 8(1):157-176.

Bilsborrow, R.E. 1992. "Preliminary Report of the United Nations Expert Group Meeting on the Feminization of Internal Migration." *International Migration Review* 26(1):138-161.

Bloom, S.S., D. Wypij, and M. Das Gupta. 2001. "Dimensions of Women's Autonomy and the Influence on Maternal Health Care Utilization in a North Indian City." *Demography* 38(1):67-78.

Buvinic, M., M.A. Lycette, and W.P. McGreevey. 1983. "Women and Poverty in the Third World." Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Chen, M.A. 2000. *Perpetual Mourning: Widowhood in Rural India*. New York: Oxford University Press.

de Haan, A. 2006. "Migration, Gender, Poverty: Family as the Missing Link." in *Poverty, Gender and Migration*, edited by S. Arya and A. Roy. New Delhi: Sage.

Desai, S. 1994. *Gender Inequalities and Demographic Behavior in India*. New York: The Population Council.

Folbre, N. 1994. *Who Pays of the Kids? Gender and the Structure of Constraint*. New York: Routledge.

Goldscheider, C. 1987. "Migration and Social Structure: Analytic Issues and Comparative Perspectives in Developing Nations." *Sociological Forum* 2(4):674-696.

Gulati, L. 1993. *In the Absence of their Men: The Impact of Male Migration on Women*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Gupta, A. and J. Ferguson. 1992. "Beyond "Culture": Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference." *Cultural Anthropology* 7(1):6-23.

Hoodfar, H. 1996. "Egyptian Male Migration and Urban Families Left Behind: "Feminization of Egyptian Family" or a Reaffirmation of Traditional Gender Roles?" Pp. 51-79 in *Development, Change, and Gender in Cairo: A View from the Household*, edited by D. Singerman and H. Hoodfar. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Hugo, G. 2000. "Migration and Women's Empowerment." Pp. 287-317 in *Women's Empowerment and Demographic Processes: Moving Beyond Cairo*, edited by H. Presser and G. Sen. New York: Oxford University Press.

Jejeebhoy, J.S. and A.Z. Sathar. 2001. "Women's Autonomy in India and Pakistan: The Influence of Religion and Region." *Population and development review* 27(4):687.

Jetley, S. 1987. "Impact of Male Migration on Rural Females." *Economic and Political Weekly* 22(44):WS47-WS53.

Kabeer, N. 1999. "The Conditions and Consequences of Choice: Reflections on Measurement of Women's Empowerment." in *UNRISD Discussion Paper No. 108*. Geneva, Switzerland: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.

Lucas, R.E.B. 1997. "Internal Migration in Developing Countries." Pp. 721-798 in *Handbook of Population and Family Economics*, edited by M.R. Rosenzweig and O. Stark. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Mascarenhas-Keyes, S. 1990. "Migration, 'Progressive Motherhood' and Female Autonomy: Catholic Women in Goa." in *Structures and Strategies: Women, Work and Family*, edited by L. Dube and R. Palriwala. New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Mason, K.O. and H.L. Smith. 2000. "Husbands' versus Wives' Fertility Goals and Use of Contraception: The Influence of Gender Context in Five Asian Countries." *Demography* 37:299-311.

Massey, D., R. Alarcon, J. Durand, and H. Gonzalez. 1990. *Return to Aztlan: The Social Process of International Migration from Western Mexico*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Massey, D., J. Arango, G. Hugo, A. Kouaouci, A. Pellegrino, and J.E. Taylor. 1998. *Worlds in Motion: International Migration at the End of the Millennium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

National Sample Survey Organisation. 2001. "Migration in India, 1999-2000." New Delhi, India: Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India.

Paris, T., A. Singh, J. Luis, and M. Hossain. 2005. "Labour Outmigration, Livelihood of Rice Farming Households and Women Left Behind: A Case Study in Eastern Uttar Pradesh." *Economic and Political Weekly* 40(25):2522-2529.

Presser, H. 1998. "Decapitating the U.S. Census Bureau's 'Head of Household': Feminist Mobilization in the 1970s" *Feminist Economics* 4(3):145-158.

Sen, M., S. Rastogi, and R. Vanneman. 2006. "Disempowered by Whom? Gender Vs. Generation in Family Decision Making." in *Annual Meeting of Population Association of America*. Los Angeles.

Thomas, D. 1994. "Like Father, like Son; Like Mother, like Daughter: Parental Resources and Child Height." *The Journal of Human Resources* 29(4):950-988.

Notes:

ⁱ Less than 3% of the women migrants left in search of work.

ⁱⁱ When women do not have children, the final two items are not asked. Consequently when using all five items, our sample is restricted to women with children. The analysis presented in this paper contains all five items and hence, omits childless women. However, we repeated this analysis with only three items which were administered to all women and conclusions do not change substantially.

iii Residential structure in Indian villages is such that many related families live next to each other, often because an ancestral home is divided and subdivided in succeeding generations. Thus, even when women are not living with older relatives in their own home, they have older relatives living nearby from whom they may be expected to seek permission.

iv This index has a substantial number of missing cases because women often said that they never visited a shop or friends and were marked missing on this index. In a sense, not ever visiting a shop or friends is a far stronger restriction on their mobility than the one we are measuring in this index. Consequently, any results we present are underestimates of the effect of husband's impact on wives' freedom of movement.

Table 1: Distribution of Marital Status by Socio Economic Characteristics

	Coresident Husband	Migrant Husband	Widowed/ Separated
All India	91.65	3.65	4.7
Age of the Woman			
20	92.54	6.02	1.44
30	93.39	4.37	2.24
40	91.26	3.32	5.42
49	88.72	2.08	9.2
Woman's Education			
Illiterate	90.39	3.97	5.64
1-5 Grades	91.71	3.21	5.08
6-9 grades	93.2	3.51	3.29
10-some college	93.62	3	3.38
Graduate	93.8	3.41	2.79
Place of Residence			
Rural	90.85	4.5	4.65
Urban	93.7	1.48	4.82
Social Group			
Forward Castes	92.45	3.46	4.09
Other Backward Classes	91.27	3.99	4.75
Dalit	91.15	3.45	5.4
Adivasi	94.56	0.9	4.55
Muslim	90.75	4.99	4.27
Christian, Sikh, Jain	90.68	4.13	5.19
Household Occupation			
Agricultural Labor	91.62	1.91	6.47
Non Agricultural Labor	92.71	2.97	4.32
Small Farmer	90.89	4.46	4.65
Med/Large Farmer	94.5	1.99	3.51
Trade/Artisan	95.19	1.3	3.51
Salaried/Professional	90.33	6.06	3.61
Retired/other	73.46	13.1	13.44
Per Capita Household Cons. Expenditure	826.3915	892.4848	846.5511
No of Persons in HH	5.62069	5.61818	4.19938
No. of Adults in HH	2.88831	2.33679	2.04844
No. of Older Women in HH	0.3430483	0.5611082	0.3345972

Table 2: Distribution of Marital Status by State of Residence

	Coresident Husband	Migrant Husband	Widowed/ Separated
All India	92.44	2.96	4.6
Jammu & Kashmir	95.67	1.32	3.01
Himachal Pradesh	89.32	6.06	4.62
Uttarakhand	85.59	9.32	5.08
Punjab	93.48	2.05	4.46
Haryana	95.12	1.5	3.38
Delhi	95.93	0	4.07
Uttar Pradesh	88.49	7.91	3.6
Bihar	86.11	10.82	3.07
Jharkhand	94.99	1.25	3.76
Rajasthan	90.19	6.46	3.36
Chhattisgarh	95.65	0.74	3.61
Madhya Pradesh	96.29	0.41	3.3
Northeast States	95.17	0.14	4.7
Assam	95.18	0.39	4.43
West Bengal	93.42	2.23	4.35
Orissa	93.94	1.7	4.37
Gujarat	95.67	0.61	3.72
Maharashtra, Goa	93.41	1.29	5.3
Andhra Pradesh	92.99	0.74	6.28
Karnataka	91.73	1.29	6.98
Kerala	85.7	8.75	5.55
Tamil Nadu	92.29	1.41	6.3

Table 3: Predicted Average Score on Autonomy and Mobility Index and Predicted Likelihood of Being Employed from Model 1 in Appendix Table 2

	Predicted Average Score		Predicted Likelihood of	
	Autonomy	Mobility	Any Work	Wage Work
Co-Resident Husbands	1.33	0.88	0.53	0.14
Migrant Husbands	1.93	1.60	0.61	0.18
Divorced/Widowed W	3.42	2.03	0.77	0.43

* Significance level for coefficients for migrant husbands and divorced/widowed status is at least 0.05

Table 4: Predicted Average Score on Autonomy and Mobility Index and Predicted Likelihood of Being Employed from Model 2 in Appendix Table 2

	Predicted Average Score		Predicted Likelihood of	
	Autonomy	Mobility	Any Work	Wage Work
For Women in Households with no Older woman				
Co-Resident Husbands	1.46	0.91	0.56	0.15
Migrant Husbands	2.77	2.05	0.69	0.23
Divorced/Widowed Women	4.07	2.33	0.78	0.47
For Women in Extended Families with an Older Woman				
Co-Resident Husbands	1.08	0.82	0.49	0.12
Migrant Husbands	1.10	1.02	0.52	0.12
Divorced/Widowed Women	1.97	1.40	0.73	0.37

Table 5: Proportion residing with Older Women by Socio Economic Characteristics

	Coresident Husband	Migrant Husband	Widowed/ Separated	Total
All India	0.34	0.56	0.33	0.35
Age of the Woman				
20	0.69	0.94	NA	0.70
30	0.47	0.73	0.69	0.49
40	0.25	0.34	0.33	0.26
49	0.14	0.19	0.14	0.14
Woman's Education				
Illiterate	0.29	0.47	0.26	0.29
1-5 grade	0.32	0.58	0.39	0.33
6-10 grad	0.42	0.70	0.46	0.43
10-some college	0.48	0.75	0.49	0.49
College Graduate	0.46	0.64	0.58	0.47
Place of Residence				
Rural	0.37	0.58	0.33	0.38
Urban	0.28	0.42	0.34	0.29
Social Group				
Forward Caste	0.39	0.62	0.38	0.40
OBC	0.35	0.59	0.37	0.36
Dalit	0.32	0.48	0.28	0.32
Adivasi	0.32	NA	0.22	0.31
Muslim	0.29	0.53	0.35	0.30
Christian, Sikh & Jain	0.39	NA	0.35	0.40

NA -- Not available, cell size less than 50.

Appendix Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean
Distribution of Dependent Variables	
Decision Making Autonomy Index Score	
0	0.19
1	0.44
2	0.20
3	0.09
4	0.03
5	0.05
Mobility Index Score	
0	0.49
1	0.17
2	0.11
3	0.22
Proportion in any employment	0.55
Proportion in Wage Employment	0.25
Distribution of Independent Variables	
Coresides with Husband	0.92
Migrant Husband	0.04
Widowed/Divorced/Separated	0.05
Proportion living with older women	0.35
Distribution of Control Variables	
Urban Residence	0.28
Respondent's Age	32.81
No. of Children	2.60
Forward Castes	0.20
Other Backward Classes	0.36
Dalit	0.22
Adivasi	0.07
Muslim	0.12
Chirstian, Sikh, Jain	0.03
Illiterate or missing Education	0.48
1-5 grade Education	0.17
6-10 grade Education	0.26
10 grade-some college	0.05
College Graduate	0.04
Log per capita expenditure	9.03
Sample Size	33366

**Appendix Table 2: Coefficients from Ordinal Logit Models for Women's Autonomy & Mobility Scale
and from Logit models for Women's Employment**

Variable	Score on Decision Making		Score on Mobility Index		Any Work		Wage Work	
	Index		Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Urban Residence	0.0920**	0.10004**	0.108**	0.113**	-1.416***	-1.414***	-0.750***	-0.748***
Age of the Woman	0.0191***	0.0184***	0.0162***	0.0158***	0.0281***	0.0280***	0.0255***	0.0253***
No. of children	0.0454***	0.0415***	0.0225	0.0191	0.147***	0.146***	0.000302	-0.00058
OBC	-0.131***	-0.133***	-0.0497	-0.0531	0.400***	0.401***	0.385***	0.385***
Dalit	0.00345	-0.00467	-0.129**	-0.139**	0.329***	0.327***	0.706***	0.705***
Adivasi	0.018	0.007	-0.0817	-0.096	0.959***	0.958***	1.194***	1.192***
Muslim	-0.129**	-0.133**	-0.188***	-0.191***	-0.250***	-0.251***	-0.238***	-0.237***
Other Religion	-0.122	-0.132	-0.13	-0.126	0.322***	0.324***	0.143	0.144
Class 1-5 Education	0.0103	0.0188	-0.0931	-0.0922	-0.435***	-0.434***	-0.498***	-0.497***
Class 6-9 Education	0.027	0.0287	0.0322	0.0306	-0.613***	-0.613***	-0.893***	-0.894***
10-Some College	0.0813	0.0702	0.0267	0.0169	-0.593***	-0.594***	-0.237*	-0.238*
College Graduate	0.273***	0.274***	0.302***	0.297***	-0.111	-0.113	0.748***	0.748***
Non Agr. Labor HH	0.244***	0.245***	0.173**	0.169**	-0.413***	-0.414***	-0.311***	-0.313***
Small Farmer HH	-0.00561	-0.00865	0.0379	0.031	0.585***	0.584***	-1.130***	-1.132***
Med/Large Farmer	-0.125*	-0.127*	-0.0905	-0.097	0.407***	0.404***	-1.675***	-1.678***
Trade/Artisan HH	0.0636	0.0698	0.0869	0.0868	-0.733***	-0.733***	-1.377***	-1.377***
Salaried/Professional HH	-0.00959	-0.0041	0.192***	0.189**	-0.993***	-0.997***	-1.202***	-1.204***
Retired/Other HH	-0.213**	-0.254**	0.0584	0.0535	-0.962***	-0.971***	-1.528***	-1.535***
Log Per Capita Cons Exp	0.104***	0.0941***	0.107***	0.104***	-0.0939**	-0.0942**	-0.474***	-0.474***
Migrant Husband	1.021***	1.954***	1.103***	1.743***	0.299**	0.572***	0.285**	0.516***
Divorced/Widowed	3.015***	3.737***	1.756***	2.244***	1.052***	1.058***	1.534***	1.590***
Any Older Women in HH	-0.889***	-0.747***	-0.273***	-0.166***	-0.284***	-0.265***	-0.267***	-0.240***
Older Women*Migrant		-1.921***		-1.408***		-0.470**		-0.540*
Older Women*Divorced		-2.145***		-1.320***		-0.0165		-0.167
Constant	0.772***	0.690**	1.541***	1.527***	0.3108	0.314	1.856***	1.860***
Cut 2	3.066***	2.983***	2.361***	2.351***				
Cut 3	4.350***	4.286***	3.030***	3.025***				
Cut 4	5.460***	5.435***						
Cut 5	6.061***	6.066***						
Observations	30968	30968	27120	27120	33366	33366	33366	33366

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1