

## A comparative study of QOL and personality factor between migrant and non migrant

Dr. Ramendra Kumar Singh\*

### Abstract

**Background:** Quality of life is tied to perception of meaning or feeling of well-being by the individual. It shows the extent to which people happiness requirements are met i.e. those requirements which are a necessary (although not sufficient) condition of anyone's happiness—those without which any member of the human race can be happy. **Aim:** Present study was intended to assess quality of life and personality factor of migrant individual. **Method:** A cross sectional study was undertaken. A total 400 employee(200 were migrant and rest 200 were non migrant) were taken as sample for the present study. Sample was selected on the basis of purposive or judgemental sampling method. **Result:** Migrant and non- migrant were significantly differed in respect to quality of life and personality traits. Non migrant had better psychological, social and physical quality of life than migrant. Migrant were more neurotic, extroverted and openness than non-migrant. **Conclusion:** Non migrant group had better quality of life than people who were migrants from native place due to any reason.

**Key words:** Migrant, Personality, Quality of life

\* Paper presented in 100<sup>th</sup> Indian Science congress held at Kolkata University, Kolkata from 3-7 jan 2013.

**Background:** Quality of life is tied to perception of meaning or feeling of well-being by the individual. It shows the extent to which people happiness requirements are met i.e. those requirements which are a necessary (although not sufficient) condition of anyone's happiness—those without which any member of the human race can be happy(Mc Call,1975).Quality of life is conceptualized in the three terms: Being, Belongingness and Becoming. Quality of life is the product of interplay among social, health, economic and environmental conditions which affect human and social development. **Human migration** (derived from Latin: *migratio*) is physical movement by human from one area to another, sometimes over long distances or in large groups. Historically this movement was nomadic often causing significant conflict with the indigenous population and their displacement and cultural assimilation. Only a few nomadic people have retained this form of lifestyle in modern times. Migration has continued under the form of both voluntary migration within one's region, country, or beyond and involuntary migration. Our world is very unequal. For many people around the world moving away from their home town or village can be the best — sometimes the only — option open to improve their life chances. Migration can be hugely effective in improving the income, education and participation of individuals and families, and enhancing their children's future prospects. Migration is a central demographic process in directing population dynamics and creating social differences between geographical areas. Recent studies have suggested that personality differences may be relevant in understanding residential mobility. Silventoinen et al. (2008) found that Finnish twins with high extraversion and high neuroticism were more likely to migrate to their neighboring country Sweden than those with low extraversion and neuroticism. In another study of Finns, **Jokela, et al (2008)** found that high sociability increased internal rural-to-urban migration and predicted longer distances covered by migrant individuals. Furthermore, high emotionality tended to increase migration propensity and predicted shorter migration distances, while high activity increased general migration propensity. Cross-sectional

---

\* Lecturer Cum Counselor, DISHA Centre, Beur Jail, Patna (Bihar)

studies in other countries also suggest associations between personality and residential mobility.

**Materials and Methods:**

**Study Design & venue of the study:**

It is a cross sectional comparative study, which was conducted at different rural as well as urban area of Bhojpur (Bihar) and Ranchi(Jharkhand) district region.

**Sample:**

A total 400 employee(200 were migrant and rest 200 were non migrant) were taken as sample for the present study. Two hundred migrant employee were constituted the experimental group and rest two hundred non migrant employee constitute the control group for the study. Sample was selected on the basis of purposive or judgemental sampling method. Following inclusion and exclusion criteria were taken under consideration during sample selection.

**Inclusion criteria for Migrant group/ Experimental group**

- ✓ Individual having history of migration from rural area of Bihar, Jharkhand to Delhi and other area of India.
- ✓ Duration of stay or migration in migrant place is longer than 2 yrs.
- ✓ Individual working in company or private sector
- ✓ Age range between 25-45 yrs
- ✓ Individual of either sex
- ✓ Individual educated upto 12<sup>th</sup> class
- ✓ Individual must be married

**Exclusion criteria for Migrant group/ Experimental group**

- ✓ Individual who were not cooperative for the study
- ✓ Individual having family history of any significant illness.

**Inclusion criteria for Non-Migrant group/ Control group**

- ✓ Individual having no history of migration from rural area of Bihar, Jharkhand to Delhi and other area of India.
- ✓ Duration of stay or migration in migrant place is longer than 2 yrs.
- ✓ Individual working in company or private sector
- ✓ Age range between 25-45 yrs
- ✓ Individual of either sex
- ✓ Individual educated upto 12<sup>th</sup> class
- ✓ Individual must be married

**Exclusion criteria for Non Migrant group/ Control group**

- ✓ Individual who were not cooperative for the study
- ✓ Individual having family history of any significant illness

**Hypotheses:**

Following hypotheses were formulated for the present study:

- **Ha1.** There will be significant difference among migrant and on-migrant in respect to quality of life.
- **Ho<sub>2</sub>.** There will be no significant difference among migrant and non-migrant in regards to personality factors.

**Tools:**

The Following tools were used for the study:

- **Socio demographic and personal data sheet**
- **WHO Quality of Life-BREF (WHOQOL-BREF)(2004)**
- **5-Factor Model of Personality**

**Procedure for data collection**

First of all, the subjects of the experimental and control group were contacted. Then, prior permission was sought to undertake the study in their respective homes. They were made acquainted with the aims and objective of the study. All the selected questionnaire were administered on the all the subjects of both group in sessions and during assessment convenience of sample was taken under consideration.

**Statistical Analysis**

Statistical package for social science for win version 13.0 was used. Data of the present study is described using, mean, SD for continuous variable and number and percentage for category variable. Group comparison for was done by t-test for continuous variables and X<sup>2</sup> test for category variable.

**Result:**

The present study was intended to compare the quality of life and other psycho social domains of migrant and non-migrant. For present study total 400 subjects were selected among which 200 were migrant and another 200 were non migrant. Sample was selected through purposive sampling from Bhojpur and Ranchi district region. Result was presented in the following sections.

**Comparison of socio -demographic characteristics:**

Both groups were comparable on all the selected socio demographic variables i.e. age, sex, marital status, duration of marriage, nature of migration and education level. There was no significant difference found between both groups on all the domains except history of migration.

**Comparison of quality of life between Migrant and Non –migrant**

Table-1 shows that both groups differed significantly on total score of quality of life scale(t=55.31 ,P<.01) as well as three domains of the scale likewise Physical domain(t= 12.9,P<.01),Psychological domain(t= 18.5,P<.01) and social domain(t= 20.5,P<.01).Result shows that Non migrant group had better quality of life than people who were migrant from native place due to any reason.

**Table-1 Comparison of quality of life between Migrant and Non –migrant**

Vriables	Migrant group	Non-migrant group group	t	p
WHOQOL BREF-1	3.30±.83	3.26±.69	.57	NS
WHOQOL BREF-2	3.00±.91	3.43±.89	.61	NS
Physical domain	21.13±4.43	25±.76	12.9	.00
Psychological domain	16.45±3.34	22±.56	18.5	.01
Social domain	9.89±3.89	18±.90	20.5	.01
Environmental domain	22.45±.78	24.67±.89	1.2	NS
Total QOL	71±12.76	123.89±4.56	55.31	.01

**Comparison of Personality factor between Migrant and Non –migrant**

Table-2 showed the comparison between migrant and non-migrant on different personality traits .It was obvious from obtained result that both groups differed significantly on three sub scale of scale that is neuroticism(t= 10.01,p>.01) , extroversion(t=2.76,p>.01)and openness(t= 2.78,p>.01) all other domains both groups comparable i.e. conscientiousness, and agreeableness.

**Table-2 Comparison of Personality factors between Migrant and Non –migrant**

Sub scale	Migrant Group	Non migrant group	t	p
Neuroticism	58.76±4.56	48.67±3.34	10.01	S
Extraversion	43.54±2.34	41.34±2.56	2.76	S
Openness	39.89±8.45	36.78±4.56	2.78	S
Agreeableness	37.45±6.34	35.56±6.45	.92	NS
Conscientiousness	35.56±4.34	34.56±6.34	1.13	NS

**Discussion:**

The present study was carried out on total 400 individuals among which 200 were migrant from native place and another 200 were non migrant to see the differences in some psycho social qualities i.e. quality of life and personality traits between migrant and non-migrants. Sample was selected from different region of Bhojpur and Ranchi districts. Previous study done in this respect were limited due to small sample and concentrated on only one or two psycho social aspects, but present study was carried out on large sample and measures a huge psycho social aspects aspect. All the tools which were used in this study were very much reliable and validated for Indian scenario. Migrant and non- migrant were significantly differed in respect to quality of life. Non migrant had better psychological, social and physical quality of life than migrant. They are much more satisfied with their life in respect to migrant. Other studies done in this respect also supported the present finding (Massey, 1999; Smock, 1994; and Rankin,1985). They found that the process of migration, however, is a transitional phenomenon that has profound effects on the lives of migrant's life. It causes anonymity, which creates social vacuum and sense of dejection among individuals. Continued feeling of dejection may motivate people to fall in the trap of anti-social activities like crime and drug abuse. Migration affects the women more. Nicholson,1997 said that migrant had poor quality of life because families as units of social and emotional support ideally protect their members from experiencing dramatic psychological distress brought about by stressful life events. Finding shows that migrant were more neurotic, extroverted and openness than non-migrant. They are more assertive, excitement seeker, more active and idea. They have more anxiety, tension, worried in comparison to non-migrant. Migration is a central demographic process in directing population dynamics and creating social differences between geographical areas. Recent studies have suggested that personality differences may be relevant in understanding residential mobility. Silvetoinenet et al,2008 found that persons who have high extraversion and neuroticism score were more likely to migrate. Jokela et al,2008 found that high sociability increased internal rural to urban migration. Cross sectional studies in other countries like Camperio et al, 2007 also suggest association between personality and residential mobility.

**Conclusion:**

Both groups differed significantly on total score of quality of life scale as well as three domains of the scale likewise Physical domain, Psychological domain and social domain. Result shows that Non migrant group had better quality of life than people who were migrants from native place due to any reason.

**References:**

1. **Jokela, M., Elovainio, M., Kivimäki, M., &Keltikangas-Järvinen, L.** (2008).Temperament and migration patterns in Finland. *Psychological Science*, 19,831–837.
2. **Massey, D. S.** (1999). "Why Does Immigration Occur? A Theoretical Synthesis" Pp. 34-52 in *The Handbook of International Migration*. Hirschman, C., P. Kasinitz and J. DeWind, Eds. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
3. **Nicholson L.** (1997). "The Myth of Traditional Family" Pp. 27-42 in *Feminism and Families*. Nelson H.L. Ed. New York: Routledge.
4. **Rankin MA**(1985). *Migration: Mechanisms and Adaptive Significance*.Contributions in Marine Science 27 (suppl.). Austin: Marine Science Institute, University of Texas.
5. **Silventoinen, K., Hammar, N., Hedlund, E., Koskenvuo, M., Ronnema, T., &Kaprio, J.**(2008). Selective international migration by social position, health behaviour and personality. *European Journal of Public Health*, 18, 150–154.
6. **Smock P. J.**(1994).Gender and the short-run economic consequences of marital disruption, *Social forces*, Vol.73, No. 1. pp243-262.

