STUDY OF AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS MIGRATION SOCIAL NETWORK AND THE MIGRATION BEHAVIOUR

Dr. K.S. Meenakshisundaram *Ph.D,*

Professor,
Department of Management Studies,
SCSVMV University, Kancheepuram, India

Dr. N. Panchanatham, *Ph.D,*

HOD,
Department of Business Administration,
Annamalai University, Chidambaram, India

ABSTRACT

Migration is the movement of an individual or group of people from one place to another and this is also true in the case of agricultural labourers who migrate to urban areas for better wages and to have a better standard of living. Due to this farmers are not in a position to cultivate and get maximum returns even though advanced scientific cropping technologies are now available. Hence, a research study was conducted in Kancheepuram & Wallajah blocks of Kancheepuram district in Tamilnadu to analyse the migration social network for migration of agricultural labourers with selected demographic variables and suitable suggestions to minimise Rural Urban Migration were suggested

Keywords: Rural Urban Migration, Migrants, Agricultural Labourers.

Introduction:

Man started to migrate as soon as soon as he has born in the earth in search of food and water. The decision to move is based on certain felt deprivations, stress, constraints, aspirations, motivation at the place of origin etc. Deprivations are felt collectively or by individuals when the immediate needs are not fulfilled by the existing conditions within a community (Haq, 1974). Migration is a process of socio–economic change and it is a movement of an individual form one setting to another for the purpose of economic, political and educational reasons. Increasing population, decline in land area for cultivation purpose monsoon failure, shortage of employment, increased awareness about job availabilities, aspiration, nearness to city and infrastructure facilities are the factors which influence migration (Sharma and jaswal, 2006). Human migration is physical movement from one area to another. Majority of our young people, who get educated only till primary or elementary level, are desperate to change their destiny just by changing their geography (Anil Jaggi, 2003). The common response of farmers to their occupational problem is to migrate to urban areas and involve in nonfarm occupations which provides higher earnings (Anamica, 2010). But the very fact remains that the entire World population have to depend only on the rural population who only feeds all. Migration of labourers from agriculture to non-agricultural occupations lead to over exploitation by the employers and they are less paid in unfavourable working conditions The agent who takes them for work in cities pay less to them and mostly they go for construction and road laying industry which is booming.

Review of Literature:

Anamica (2010) stated While observing the decision making pattern, it was found out that nearly half of the respondents (54.44%) were found to take independent decisions. The remaining 30.00 per cent reported to have consulted with their family followed by 5.00 per cent of respondents who consulted with friends and neighbours in the decision to migrate. Only 3.00 per cent of the respondent's family members are engaged in some job occupation in the migrant's destination. The left 97.00 per cent look after the family chores or involve them in some occupation in the home place. Majority have migrated through the network of relations (37.78%) followed by neighbours (33.33%), friends (16.67%) and agencies (12.22%). Three-fourth of the respondents (73.00%) stay in their work place i.e. in the migration destination and the remaining 27.00 per cent of the respondents are commuters who stay in their home place. One-fourth (25.00%) of the respondents visit their home daily and the remaining 75.00 per cent visit at intervals of weeks or months or a year and more.

Methodology:

Kancheepuram taluk of Kancheepuram district was selected for the study since Kancheepuram taluk has more number of villages more Agricultural Labourers. In Kancheepuram taluk, both Kancheepuram & Walajabad blocks were selected for the study. The details of agricultural workers are given in Table 1.

Table 1: Distribution of Respondents from the Selected Villages

Name of the Block	Name of the Selected Village	Number of Agricultural Labourers as per Census 2001.	Migrants Selected
Kancheepuram Block	Vippedu	85	25
	Valluvapakkam	125	25
	Kalakattur	309	50
	Total	**519**	**100**
Walajabad Block	Vaiyavur	619	80
	Paranthur	318	50
	Thenneri	371	40
	Total	**1308**	**170**
	Grand Total	**1827**	**270**

Migration Behaviour:

Migration is movement of a person from one place to another in search of employment in order to earn. The Migration Behaviour of migrants in this research study has been studied in respect of various dimensions of migration for a migrant agricultural labour as detailed below:

1) Nature of Migration - This refers whether the migration is commuting / temporary or permanent in nature
2) Type of Migration - Whether the migration is of Forced Type/ Skilled/Return/Seasonal.
3) Migration Social Network - Whether Migration is through Relations / Friends/Neighbours/Agencies/Mass Media/All the above
4) Migration Decision Making -Whether Consultation   for migration were made with Elders/Spouse/Friends/ Neighbours/Agencies/Own.
5) Distance of Work Place - The actual distance of migrants for their work whether less than 25 kilometres/25-50 kilometres/50-100 kilometres/   more than 100 kilometres.
6) Stays Place - In this the staying place of migrant agricultural labour was examined whether he stays in the village itself or in the work place.
7) Visit to Home -This was studied to understand how often the migrant agricultural labour was able to visit his/ her home whether it is Daily/weekly once/Monthly once/Once in three months/Once in six months/Yearly once/More than a year.
8) Willingness to Re migrate; Yes/No
9) Period for Remigration; Within 1 year/   within 2 years/2-3 years/Within 5 years./within 5-10 years />10 years

The total scores of all the above items are the Migration Behaviour score of a migrant agricultural labourer.

Results and Discussion:

Selected demographic variables of migrants like Age, Gender, Educational Qualification, Occupation, Family Type, Residence Type Farming Experience and Annual Income were analyzed with Migration Behaviour components like Nature of Migration, Type of Migration, Migration Social Network, Migration Decision Making, Distance of Work Place, Stay Place, Visit to Home in order to understand in detail about the migration behaviour of agricultural labourers. The results are discussed with respect to migration social network and Migration Behaviour of 270 respondents is given below:

Migration Social Network:

Migration Social networks refer to the nature of outside contacts of the migrants with relations, friends, neighbours, agencies, mass media sources. An analysis was made with selected demographic variables and the Migration Social Network of the migrants and the details are presented below for each variable.

Analysis of Age Groups with Migration Social Network:

An analysis was made with Age and Social Network and the results are presented in Table.2.

Table 2: Distribution on the Basis of Age groups and Migration Social Network

(n=270)

Sl. No	Age Group (Years)	Social network						Total
		Relations	Friends	Neighbours	Agencies	Mass media	All the above	
1	20-30	36(41.4)	23(29.5)	19(45.2)	14(58.3)	26(96.3)	7(58.3)	125(46.3)
2	31-40	40(46.0)	40(51.3)	18(42.9)	10(41.7)	0(0)	0(0)	108(40.0)
3	41-50	8(9.2)	14(17.9)	5(11.9)	0(0)	0(0)	5(41.7)	32(11.9)
4	51-60	3(3.4)	1(1.3)	0(0)	0(0)	1(3.7)	0(0)	5(1.9)
	Total	87(100.0)	78(100.0)	42(100.0)	24(100.0)	27(100.0)	12(100.0)	270(100.0)

Source: Primary Data. Percentage shown in brackets It could be concluded from the 2 that, majority of migrants were in the age group of 20-30 years were found to have utilised Mass Media (96.3 Percentage) followed by agencies (58.3 Percentage) and all the sources (58.3 Percentage) for migration to urban areas. The age group of 31-40 years have utilised friends for their migration.

Analysis of Gender with Migration Social Network Cross tabulation:

An analysis was made with Gender and Migration Social Network and the results are presented in Table.3

Table 3: Distribution on The Basis of Gender and Migration Social Network (n=270)

Sl. No	Gender	Social Network						Total
		Relations	Friends	Neighbours	Agencies	Mass media	All the above	
1	Male	52(59.8)	50(64.1)	27(64.3)	10(41.7)	17(63.0)	5(41.7)	161(59.6)
2	Female	35(40.2)	28(35.9)	15(35.7)	14(58.3)	10(37.0)	7(58.3)	109(40.4)
	Total	87(100.0)	78(100.0)	42(100.0)	24(100.0)	27(100.0)	12(100.0)	270(100.0)

Source: Primary Data. Percentage shown in brackets

It can be seen from the Table 3 that male respondents have utilised their neighbours (64.3 Percentage) for their social network and females were found to have utilised Agencies (58.3 Percentage) and all the sources (58.3 Percentage) for social network for migration.

Analysis of Educational qualification with Social Network:

An analysis was made with Education qualification and Social Network and the results are presented in Table.4.

Table 4: Distribution on The Basis of Education qualification and Migration Social Network (n=270)

Sl. No.	Education Qualification	Social Network						Total
		Relations	Friends	Neigh-bours	Agencies	Mass media	All the above	
1	Up to 5th Std.	20(23.0)	22(28.2)	8(19.0)	4(16.7)	3(11.1)	4(33.3)	61(22.6)
2	Up to 7th Std.	2(2.3)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4(14.8)	0(0.0)	6(2.2)
3	Up to 8th Std.	13(14.9)	17(21.8)	5(11.09)	1(4.2)	8(29.6)	0(0.0)	44(16.3)
4	Up to 9th Std.	8(9.2)	13(16.7)	4(9.5)	8(33.3)	0(0.0)	3(25.0)	36(13.3)
5	Up to S.S.L.C.	23(26.4)	11(14.1)	11(26.2)	7(29.2)	9(33.3)	4(33.3)	65(24.1)
6	Up to H.S.C.	6(6.9)	9(11.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	3(11.1)	0(0.0)	18(6.7)
7	Up to Diploma	2(2.3)	0(0.0)	2(4.8)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4(1.5)
8	No Education	13(14.9)	6(7.7)	12(28.6)	4(16.7)	0(0.0)	1(8.3)	36(13.3)
	Total	87(100.0)	78(100.0)	42(100.0)	24(100.0)	27(100.0)	12(100.0)	270(100.0)

Source: Primary Data. Percentage shown in brackets

It may be seen from the Table 4 that, majority of migrants who have been educated up to 5th Standard and studied up to S.S.L.C. have utilised all the sources for their migration to urban areas by 33.3 Percentage each. Migrants educated up to 8th standard and studied up to H.S.C. have utilized their friends for their migration by 21.8 Percentage and 11.5 Percentage respectively. It could be seen that majority of 9th standard educated migrants 33.3 Percentage have utilized Agencies for migration and Diploma level or no education category labourers have found to have utilised neighbours for their migration by 4.8 Percentage and 28.6 Percentage respectively. Majority of 14.8 Percentage respondents studied up to 7th standard were found to utilize mass media sources for their migration

Analysis of Occupation with Migration Social Network:

An analysis was made with Occupation and Social Network and the results are presented in Table.5

Table 5: Distribution on The Basis of Occupation and Migration Social Network (n=270)

Sl. No.	Occupation	Social Network						Total
		Relations	Friends	Neigh-bours	Agencies	Mass media	All the above	
1	Salaried	73(83.9)	59(75.6)	37(88.1)	15(62.5)	23(85.2)	8(66.7)	215(79.6)
2	Wage Earner	1(1.1)	1(1.3)	1(2.4)	0(0.0)	4(14.8)	0(0.0)	7(2.6)
3	Both Salary and Wage Earner	13(14.9)	18(23.1)	4(9.5)	9(37.5)	0(0.0)	4(33.3)	48(17.8)
	Total	87(100.0)	78(100.0)	42(100.0)	24(100.0)	27(100.0)	12(100.0)	270(100.0)

Source: Primary Data. Percentage shown in brackets

It may be seen from the Table 5 that, Mass Media source acted as most used network source for the salaried occupied class and for the Wage Earner categories by 85.2Percentage and 14.8Percentage respectively. Agencies acted as the source for both the Salary and Wage Earner category by 37.5 Percentage.

Analysis of Family Type with Migration Social Network:

An analysis was made with Family Type and Migration Social Network and the results are presented in Table.6.

Table 6: Distribution on The Basis of Family Type and Migration Social Network (n=270)

Sl. No.	Family Type	Social network						Total
		Relations	Friends	Neigh-bours	Agencies	Mass media	All the above	
1	Joint	32(36.8)	38(48.7)	9(21.4)	6(25.0)	4(14.8)	7(58.3)	96(35.6)
2	Nuclear	55(63.2)	40(51.3)	33(78.6)	18(75.0)	23(85.2)	5(41.7)	174(64.4)
	Total	87(100.0)	78(100.0)	42(100.0)	24(100.0)	27(100.0)	12(100.0)	270(100.0)

Source: Primary Data. Percentage shown in brackets

From the Table 6 above it may be seen that Joint Family Type of respondents had social network from all sources (58.3Percentage) and the Nuclear Type were found to have network with Mass Media (85.2Percentage).

Analysis of Residence Type with Migration Social Network:

An analysis was made with Residence Type and Migration Social Network and the results are presented in Table.7

Table 7: Distribution on The Basis of Residence type and Migration Social Network (n=270)

Sl. No	Residence Type	Social network						Total
		Relations	Friends	Neighbours	Agencies	Mass media	All the above	
1	Own	15(17.2)	37(47.4)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	14(51.9)	3(25.0)	69(25.6)
2	Rented	72(82.8)	41(52.6)	42(100.0)	24(100.0)	13(48.1)	9(75.0)	201(74.4)
	Total	87(100.0)	78(100.0)	42(100.0)	24(100.0)	27(100.0)	12(100.0)	270(100.0)

Source: Primary Data. Percentage shown in brackets

Mass Media source acted as a network source for the Own house residence category by 51.9Percentage.Neighbours and Agencies were found to be the sources of network for the Rented House category by 100 Percentage each.

Analysis of Farming Experience with Migration Social Network:

An analysis was made with Farming Experience and Migration Social Network and the results are presented in Table.8.

Table8: Distribution on The Basis of Farming experience and Migration Social Network (n=270)

Sl. No	Farming Experience	Social network						Total
		Relations	Friends	Neighbours	Agencies	Mass media	All the above	
1	Less than 5 years	34(39.1)	20(25.6)	17(40.5)	10(41.7)	10(37.0)	7(58.3)	98(36.3)
2	5-10 years	26(29.9)	21(26.9)	11(26.2)	5(20.8)	12(44.4)	1(8.3)	76(28.1)
3	11-15years	17(19.5)	15(19.2)	6(14.3)	1(4.2)	1(3.7)	0(0.0)	40(14.8)
4	16-20 years	4(4.6)	11(14.1)	8(19.0)	0(0.0)	4(14.8)	0(0.0)	27(10.0)
5	21-25years	5(5.7)	4(5.1)	0(0.0)	8(33.3)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	17(6.3)
6	26-30yeas	1(1.1)	3(3.8)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4(33.3)	8(3.0)
7	31-35 years	0(0.0)	4(5.1)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4(1.5)
	Total	87(100.0)	78(100.0)	42(100.0)	24(100.0)	27(100.0)	12(100.0)	270(100.0)

Source: Primary Data Percentage shown in brackets

From the Table 8 it may be seen that, the respondents with less than five years have used sources viz. Relations (39.1 Percentage), neighbours (40.5 Percentage), Agencies (41.7 Percentage) and all the alone sources (58.3 Percentage). Respondents with 5-10 years have found to utilize Friends (26.9Percentage) and Mass Media Sources (44.4Percentage).

Analysis of Annual Income with Migration Social Network:

An analysis was made with Annual Income and Migration Social Network and the results are presented in Table.9

Table 9: Distribution on The Basis of Annual income and Migration Social Network (n=270)

Sl. No.	Annual Income (in Rs.)	Social Network						Total
		Relations	Friends	Neigh-bours	Agencies	Mass media	All the above	
1	Up to 10,000	3(3.4)	4(5.1)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	7(2.6)
2	10,001 to 20,000	30(34.5)	19(24.4)	12(28.6)	6(25.0)	3(11.1)	3(25.0)	73(27.0)
3	20,001 to 30,000	21(24.1)	18(23.1)	14(33.3)	5(20.8)	15(55.6)	3(25.0)	76(28.1)
4	30,001 to 40,000	9(10.3)	16(20.5)	4(9.5)	4(16.7)	4(14.8)	6(50.0)	43(15.9)
5	40,001 to 50,000	17(19.5)	11(14.1)	8(19.0)	9(37.5)	4(14.8)	0(0.0)	49(18.1)
6	50,001 to 60,000	6(6.9)	3(3.8)	2(4.8)	0(0.0)	1(3.7)	0(0.0)	12(4.4)
7	60,001 to 70,000	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(2.4)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(0.4)
8	Above 70,000	1(1.1)	7(9.0)	1(2.4)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	9(3.3)
	Total	87(100)	78(100)	42(100)	24(100)	27(100)	12(100)	270(100)

Source: Primary Data. Percentage shown in brackets

From the Table 9 it may be observed that, Relations, Friends were found to be sources for Rs.10, 001 to Rs.20, 000 categories by 34.5 Percentage and by 24.4 Percentage respectively. Neighbours and Mass Media sources were found to be the network sources for the income group of Rs.20,001 to Rs.30,000 by 33.3 Percentage and by 55.6 Percentage respectively. Agencies were found to be sources for Rs.40, 001 to Rs.50, 000 of respondents by 37.5 Percentage. For the income group of Rs.30, 001 to Rs.40, 000, all the sources (50.0 Percentage) were formed to be the network sources for migration.

Conclusion:

Based on the study the following suggestions are made to reduce migration of agricultural labourers.

1. Village development plans should be drawn for agricultural labourers in each village by the Government Departments to keep the agricultural labourers engaged in villages .The agricultural labourers who had good educational background can be motivated and trained to start agro industries with financial support from Nationalised Banks.

2. Contingent plans for each agricultural labourers have to be planned to keep them engaged in NREGA programmes and also in other village development programmes in case of natural disasters.

3. Preference may be given to the agricultural labourers in lean period when no agricultural activity is carried out for all developmental activities.

4. Agricultural labourers who are with multi skills can be engaged locally by giving special preferences according to their knowledge and experience in their known area.

5. Agricultural labourers can be also provided with milk animals and other animals   which will fetch income locally to make them to remain in their villages.

6. Agricultural labourers and his family members can be provided with free medical treatment. The medical establishments can do this as a measure of social responsibility and it is a chance to serve to the poor who are toiling in hot sun and heavy rains to feed the Nation.

References:

[1] Anamica, M. 2010. "Migration Behaviour of Dry Land Farmers-An Expost Facto Study" (UNPUBLISHED M.Sc. (Ag) Thesis – Department of Agricultural Extension & Rural Sociology, TNAU, Coimbatore).

[2] Anil Jaggi. 2003 "Information and Communication Technology and Poverty Reduction in Rural India, 27th -28th November, Bangkok, Thailand.

[3] Haq, A., 1974. Theoretical consideration for studying socio – psychological factors in migration. The Pakistan Rev., XIII: 353–60.

[4] Sharma and Jaswal. 2006. Migration and Magnitude of Psychological Distress, Journal of Social Science, 12(3):225-229.

******