

EFFECT OF MIGRATION ON LIVELIHOOD AND OTHER SOCIO-ECONOMIC TRAITS

O. P. Parganiha¹, M. L. Sharma², H. K. Awasthi³ and R. K. Tiwari⁴

ABSTRACT

Migration has been an important aspect of the demographic landscape in Chhattisgarh. To know the effect of rural migration, data were taken from eight selected villages of Chhattisgarh during the year 2001-2002. A total of 80 migrant farmers were selected randomly and personally interviewed with the help of the structured interview schedule. Data were analyzed with the help of suitable statistical analysis. Migrants spend their major part of income on domestic items comparing to non-migrants. The decision making pattern of migrants on various phases of migration was found that mainly decision was taken by head of the family. Majority of migrants reported that their saving status, expenditure of family and economic condition, nutritional status was increased after migration.

Key words: Migration; Demographic landscape; Migrants.

INTRODUCTION

Migration is a part of active livelihood strategies, but is also determined by social context, social norms and structures, household composition, gender ideologies, social contacts and profit-making opportunities. Migration tends to be less disruptive of social structures than often assumed. Migrants are agents of change - economically and technologically. Social and political migration may reinforce 'traditional' structure, ideologies and support networks, but migrants also create new identities. The determinants of migration, which influence the decision to migrate, are complex and varied in their nature. Since, migration is a selective process affecting individuals and which contains socio-cultural, economic, political, educational, ethnic, religious and demographic characteristics, the relative influence of these economic and non-economic factors may vary not only between nations and regions but also within defined geographic area and population. Lewis (1954) believes that rural migration leads to agricultural mechanization and hence increases productivity. Adegbola (1977), Agboola (1977) and Mordi (1983) have made similar claims of benefits of rural migration in terms of financial remittance made by migrants to their rural source origin. On the other hand, there are also some clear indications of adverse consequences of agricultural labourer migration. The objectives of study are as follows:

1. To know the effect of migration on livelihood of the migrant farmers.
2. To ascertain the involvement of selected migrant farmers in decision- making pattern during various phases of migration.
3. To find out the factors responsible for migration of migrant farmers.

METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in one purposively selected Raipur district of Chhattisgarh because maximum number of migrants was found in this district of Chhattisgarh plain during last five years. Two blocks from the district was purposively selected on the basis of maximum number of migrants. From each selected village, a representative sample of 10 migrants (Total 10 X 8 = 80) and 5 non- migrants (Total 5x8 =40) were selected for both the group. In this way, total 120 respondents were identified. This selection was done by simple random sampling method for the purpose of the study. To obtain the effect of migration on socio-economic aspect, it was categorized in low medium and high of such aspects like saving status, economic condition, expenditure on family, and nutritional status, etc. To find out participation of male and female members of the family in decision making on different on-farm and off-farm aspects, a decision making index was worked out and the answer was scored for each aspect according to the involvement of family members. To determine the effect of migration on various socio- economic status of the migrants, the responses of the migrants were recorded on a three point scale i.e. increase, constant and decrease. The scores given to these categories were 3, 2 and 1, respectively. A device was developed to assess the effect of migration on each socio-economic aspect as follows.

$$EM = \frac{O}{S} \times 100$$

Where,
 EM = Effect of migration
 O = Total score obtained by migrants
 S = Total obtainable score

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Effect of migration on livelihood:

a) *Average annual expenditure on domestic items:* Average annual expenditure on domestic consumption is given in Table 1. Data indicate that the migrants invested 80.43 per cent money on consumption of food materials, out of the total expenditure on domestic consumption in which they had expended 50.34 per cent income only on rice consumption followed by 15.23 per cent on vegetables. On other hand, non-migrants invested 72.30 per cent money on consumption of food material out of total domestic consumption in which they had expended 35.35 per cent of income on rice consumption followed by 13.57 per cent on vegetable consumption, whereas, the expenditure of physical facilities was 3.09 and 5.82 per cent by the migrants and non-migrants, respectively.

Table 1. Distribution of respondents according to average annual expenditure on domestic items

Particulars	Migrants (n=80)		Non-migrants (n=40)		'z' value
	Rs/Year	%	Rs/Year	%	
Food					
Rice	8237.73	50.34	8982.00	35.36	0.538
Wheat	33.37	00.20	487.50	01.91	6.453**
Pulse	792.07	04.84	1554.50	06.12	2.731*
Vegetables	2492.87	15.23	3448.50	13.57	1.832
Fruits	8.34	00.05	380.00	01.50	7.215**
Milk products	69.75	00.42	1136.00	04.47	6.514**
Egg/Meat	258.57	01.58	497.00	01.95	2.951*
Spices	423.50	02.58	594.00	02.34	0.010
Oil	855.75	05.22	1288.25	05.07	1.584
Total	13171.95	80.43	18367.75	72.30	2.954*
Physical facilities	505.87	03.9	1480.00	05.82	9.231**
Miscellaneous	2684.75	16.40	5556.00	21.87	4.529**
Total	16362.57	100.00	25403.75	100.00	3.493*

* Significant at 5 % level of significance

**Significant at 1 % level of significance

To determine the significance of difference between both the group, "z" test was applied and found that the expenditure on food materials, physical facility and miscellaneous shows a significant difference between migrants and non-migrants.

b) *Effect of migration on various socio-economic aspects of the migrants:* The data in Table 1b show the impact of migration on various socio-economic aspects of the migrants. Majority of the migrants (58.75%) said that their saving status was increased during migration followed by economic condition (37.50%) and nutrition status (37.50%). Majority of the migrants (93.75%) said that there was negative impact on participation in village festivals (83%). Similar result was found by Premi (1981), Chanda (1991) and Bhattacharya (2000).

The data compiled in table 2 show that the migration had major impact on saving status with I Rank, expenditure on family was reported second major impact of migration with II rank and impact on economic condition and nutrition status was found as with III rank.

2. *Involvement of migrant family members in decision making pattern:* With regards to decision making the involvement of

family members about different on-farm and off-farm activities in various phases of migration is shown in table 2. It reveals that head of the family took most of the decisions. Head along with wife was found as important decision makers in the family.

It was found that majority of the migrants (80%) had taken their own decision about selection of place for migration before migration followed by 77.50 per cent about migration. It was also found that 63.75 per cent head of family along with wife were taking decision for purchasing of daily needs during migration. Also 71.25 per cent migrants were taking their own decision about education of children after migration.

Table 1b. Effect of migration on various socio-economic aspects of the respondents.

Particulars	Increase		Constant		Decrease		Rank
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	
Economic condition	30	37.50	50	62.50	00	00.00	III
Nutritional status	30	37.50	50	62.50	00	00.00	III
Child education	09	11.25	39	48.75	32	40.00	VI
Saving status	49	58.75	29	37.25	02	02.50	I
Expenditure on family	37	46.25	41	51.25	02	02.50	II
Investment on agriculture	19	23.75	58	71.50	03	03.75	IV
Participation in social function	00	00.00	05	06.25	75	93.75	VIII
Participation in village festivals	00	00.00	04	05.00	66	83.00	IX
Social contact	00	00.00	10	12.50	70	87.50	VII
Social status	07	08.75	64	80.00	09	11.25	V

3. *Factors of migration:* Factors, which were responsible for the migration of respondents, are given in Table 3. The factors were categorized as complete, medium and partial, which were based on multiple responses.

The study revealed that majority of migrants (97.5%) said that lack of employment was completely responsible for their migration followed by small holding (90%), lack of irrigation (72.50%) and low wage rate (61.25%) in their natives.

It also revealed that mechanization of village level works (71.25%) and lack of money for social functions (38.75%) were noted as partial factors for their migration. It also shows that the lack of employment was major factor (I rank). Small land holding was reported as second major factor (II rank) and lack of irrigation was found as III ranked factor for migration of respondents.

4. *Overall involvement in decision-making pattern:* The involvement of family members in overall decision-making pattern is shown in the table 4. It reveals that majority (48.75%) migrants reported medium level of involvement of family members in decision-making pattern. It was reported by 22.50 per cent respondents with their family members had low level of involvement in decision-making pattern.

Table 4. Distribution of the migrants according to their overall involvement in decision making process.

Involvement	Frequency	Percentage
Low	18	22.50
Medium	39	48.75
High	23	26.75

Table 2. Distribution of the migrants according to their participation in decision making process during various phases of migration

Particulars	Migrants (n=80)					
	Self		Both*		Whole family	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
A. Before migration						
1. About migration	62	77.50	14	17.50	04	05.00
2. Selection of place for migration	64	80.00	12	15.00	04	05.00
3. Duration for migration	37	46.25	38	47.50	05	06.25
4. Numbers of family member involved in migration	53	66.25	21	26.25	06	07.50
B. During migration						
1. Job preference	44	50.00	31	38.75	05	06.25
2. About wage rate	60	75.00	18	22.50	02	02.50
3. Place of staying	26	32.50	43	53.75	11	13.75
4. Education of children	31	38.75	38	47.50	11	13.75
5. Participation in social work	20	25.00	41	51.25	09	11.25
6. Selling/purchasing of land	47	58.75	20	25.00	13	16.25
7. Acquisition and repayment of loan	45	56.25	24	30.00	11	13.75
8. Purchasing of daily needs	18	22.50	51	63.75	11	13.75
C. After migration						
1. Sowing of crops	43	53.25	23	28.75	18	22.50
2. Purchasing of seeds	47	58.75	20	25.00	13	16.25
3. Purchasing of fertilizers	48	60.00	15	18.75	17	21.25
4. Selling of agriculture produces	33	41.25	33	41.25	14	17.50
5. About animal husbandry	24	30.00	29	36.25	27	33.75
6. Education of children	57	71.25	14	17.50	09	11.25
7. Participation in social work	48	60.00	21	26.25	11	13.75
8. Selling/purchasing of land	46	57.50	20	25.00	14	17.50
9. Acquisition and repayment of loan	39	61.25	21	26.50	10	12.25
10. Purchasing of daily needs	32	40.00	37	46.50	11	13.75

* Self & wife

Table 3. Distribution of respondents according to factors responsible for migration.

Particulars	Migrants family (n=80)								Rank
	Complete		Medium		Partial		Nil		
F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
Big size of family	34	42.50	04	05.00	07	08.75	35	43.75	VIII
Small land holding	72	90.00	08	10.00	00	00.00	00	00.00	II
Lack of employment	78	97.50	00	00.00	00	00.00	02	02.50	I
Natural calamities	30	37.50	20	25.00	18	22.50	08	10.00	VI
Lack of resources	11	13.75	61	76.25	08	10.00	00	00.00	V
Lack of irrigation	58	72.50	21	26.25	01	01.25	00	00.00	III
Social conflict	00	00.00	00	00.00	00	00.00	80	100	XII
To repay the loan	05	06.25	02	02.50	06	07.50	67	83.75	XI
Lack of money for Social functions	01	01.25	43	43.75	31	38.75	05	06.25	VII
Low wage rate	49	61.25	28	35.00	03	03.75	00	00.00	IV
For marriage	00	00.00	00	00.00	01	01.25	79	98.75	XI
Mechanization of village level works	00	00.00	04	05.00	57	71.25	19	23.75	IX
For good social atmosphere	00	00.00	00	00.00	01	01.25	79	98.75	XI

CONCLUSION

From the above consideration it may be concluded that rural migration does not seem to offer a reliable strategy for rural development. Alternative approaches aimed at rural population resources in the rural area for its development may perhaps be preferable. The decision making pattern of the migrants in various phases, migration was found that mainly decision was taken by head of the family followed by the head along with wife. As far as overall involvement in decision making process of the migrant was concerned, it was found as medium. Majority of the migrants reported that the effect of migration on various socio-economic aspects was mainly on their saving status, expenditure on family, economic condition and nutritional status.

REFERENCES

1. Adegbola, O. (1977). Migration and capital formation in rural western Nigeria, in O. Adejuygbe and F. Heleiner (eds.) Environment and spatial factors in rural development in Nigeria. Proceedings of the 20th N.G.A. Conference, Ile-Ife, Nigeria. pp.178.
2. Agboola, S. A. (1977). Migration process in the eastern cocoa belt of south western Nigeria, Eds. O. Adejuygbe and F. Heleiner op.cit., pp. 84.
3. Bhattacharya, P.C. (2000). An analysis of rural migration in India. *J. Int. Dev.* 12(5): 655-667
4. Chanda, R. (1991). Migration of rural resource management and development in Samfya. Zambia general statements, significant variables and dimension of variation. *Zeritschrift fur wirtschanfis geographie.* 35(3-4)pp 192-199
5. Mordi, A. A. (1983). The contribution of rural urban migration to rural development, paper Presented at the 26th annual conference of the Nigerian Geographical association, Illorin
6. Premi, M. K. (1981). Role of migration in the urbanization process in third world countries: A case study of India. *Social action* 31(3) pp291-310.