CHAPTER IV

MIGRATION: CAUSES, CONSEQUENCES, DECISIONS AND PERCEPTIONS

The present chapter has the objective of examining the causes, consequences, decisions and perceptions of migrants with respect to the Telugu Boyas of the district of Dharmapuri. That the analysis is entirely survey based needs no repetition, for data available on the migration of the Boyas are only from the survey conducted by the scholar at Coimbatore. However, the concern of this chapter is only a part of the data so collected from interviews with 403 of the Boya migrants. The method of analysis is factor analysis and its express purpose is the extraction of structural dimensions that could explain the causes and consequences and decisions and perceptions.

The discussion in the chapter is therefore in two parts: the first is about the Data and the Method of analysis including the justification as to why factor analysis is important. The second is on the interpretations of factor dimensional structures and the explanation of facts about the Boyas' migration to Coimbatore and their classification into seven common groups in terms of the retained dimensions.

The Data and the Method

The schedule consisted of some 100-odd variables on which measures were made. The four aspects concerned accounted for nearly two-fifths of the total variables, that is, about 40 variables. However, there were answers to questions in the schedule similar in content for all 403 respondents. For example, the basis of employment is contractual, and the basis of payment of wages is the assigned piece of work. The wages in the city of Coimbatore, in the migrants' opinion, are better - although they have to
work for a longer duration than before. All of them are members of a trade union or other association. The kind of job is similar - earthwork -for everybody. So much so, the final list of selected variables has turned out to be one of just about 30. On reconsideration, however, it was felt that some variables could be composited and so they were appropriately redrawn, resulting in the end in 19 variables. These are among other reasons for migration, members who make decisions, perceived prospects at destination, male and female wage differences as averaged out of three-year figures included as composites. In all the cases of composites, the variables have been scored using a ten-point scale and the composites are merely an aggregate of scores for individual items. The list of variables is given in table 4.1 and the variables are self explanatory.

**Table 4.1: List of Variables: Causes, Effects, Decisions and Perceptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Variable Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Period of unemployment at destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reasons for migrating to destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Member(s) accompanying migrant to destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Member(s) who made decisions to move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Type of assistance at destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Member(s) who followed migrant(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Improvement in living conditions at destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Number of visits to origin in the last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Advice to friends/relatives at origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Perceived prospects at destination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Male wage differences between origin and destination
Female wage differences between origin and destination
Perceived length of job availability in the destination
Male annual expenditures (personal)
Female annual expenditures (personal)
Decisions in the family
Decisions on finance in the family
Decisions on family matters in the family

Source: Interview Schedule

The variables may be classified into five categories and they are causal (variables 12 and 13), consequential (variables 2, 3, 7 and 8), decision-related (variables 5, 17, 18 and 19), perceptual (variables 8, 10, 11 and 14) and others (variables 1, 4, 6, 9, 10, 15 and 16). The classification is rather loose, even if it is pertinent. As is seen, some variables occur in two categories. For example, improvement in living conditions at the destination is both perceptual and consequential. Even a variable such as the members who followed migrant into the city may be treated as perceptual, because the migrants who asked them in and the followers who responded to such requests must have perceived the conditions at the destination as being conducive for prosperity.

The method of analysis is the factor algorithm, which is briefly and non-technically described here. Excellent summaries are available on the technique of factor analysis from Davis (1986), Johnston (1978), Gnanadesikan (1977), Yeates (1974) and Harman (1967). Hence, no technical summary is attempted here. Neither the formulae and derivations are given.
Factor Analysis is one of the sophisticated techniques of analysis. It is a multivariate analysis. The principal purpose of this analysis is the reduction of dimensions. It is assumed that, in any analysis involving factor algorithm, there are m dimensions (equaling the number of variables) and that these dimensions can be reduced to \( p \) underlying dimensions so that (a) interpretation becomes easy because (b) the complexity of multivariate spaces is simplified.

This analysis is also used, commonly, to infer the concept of structure within the variance-covariance matrices. To make it simple to understand, it may be stated that the variances can be separated into common and unique variances. The basic technique used in this analysis is of extraction of eigenvectors. The eigenvalues represent the proportions of the total variance accounted for by the factor dimensions.

Standardisation is the first step in the factor analysis in which the original data is converted into unitless data, so that they become comparable. In the standardisation, the new transformed data will have a mean of zero and a variance of one. The standardisation influences the structure of variance-covariance and the results of factor analysis.

The elements of the factors are referred to as factor loadings. They are in effect the correlation between the old and the transformed data. While arranging the factor loadings in the factor matrix form, the elements are squared and summed within each variable. The totals so derived for the variables are the amount of variance each variable retains in the factors which have eigenvalues greater than one. These sums are referred to as the communalities, which are equal to the original variance.
The meaning of factors may be rather difficult to deduce because of reduction of dimensions. Hence, using Kaiser's varimax (maximisation of variance), the loadings are rotated. This first estimates the contribution of different factors to each original observation and the factor scores themselves are estimated from the same data. The results of factor scores are not unique, for the matrix of scores reflect both the covariance structure of the raw data and the structure of the common factors.

This method is used because its utility is judged by performance and not by theoretical considerations. In the application of the method, deciding to extract a suitable number of factors is possible prior to analysis, just as it is possible to allow the technique to choose the number based on eigenvalues. It is assumed that the analyst is generally capable of discerning the number of underlying dimensions in the problem he analyses. Hence, a selection prior to analysis and extracting that many factors is within the scope.

The method is as objective as statistical methods can be and thus is devoid of subjectivity in the selection and also computed values. Hence, the method is appropriate for any given multivariate analysis requiring the reduction of dimensions so as to make interpretation possible.

In sum, the Common Factor Analysis, as the method is often called, is a method for investigating the interdependence of the variables. The method puts the emphasis on explaining the covariance structure in the data set. This model states that a small number of common factors generates the covariance in the data, while one specific factor for each variable accounts for the unique variance. This specific factor also includes the variance caused by random uncorrelated errors, such as measurement errors. Several methods for extracting factors exist. For this study, the maximum
likelihood method has been adopted as it has the attractive property of being scale-independent, that is, using covariance or correlation matrix as input will give equal results, except for a scaling constant.

Normally, the assumption of normal distribution is imposed on variables subjected to maximum likelihood method. Common factor analytic structures should be more stable when several samples are drawn from the same locations, or when different respondents are interviewed from the same area.

Dimensions of the Boya Migration: Causes and Consequences and Decisions and Perceptions

The factor matrix is extracted, with eigenvalues, per cent of contribution or, in other words, the variance is explained by each of the factors, and the cumulative variances and the unique variances, is presented in table 4.2. The interpretation of the factor structure, as is usual, follows the two basic rules below:

1. Only variables loading high, here $\pm 0.40$, on factors extracted are considered for analysis, primarily to avoid confusion in the interdependence interpretation.

2. The variables loading highly on any given factor are considered in designating the factors so that the dimension may be properly understood.

As can be seen from the table, then, the total variance explained by the seven-factor model is 63.05 per cent to the total and as such the structure is significant. In the selection of the number of factors to be retained in the analysis, the eigenvalue has been used as the yardstick. That is, the factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 have
Table 4.2: Causes, Consequences, Decisions and Perceptions of migrants: Factor Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>FI</th>
<th>FII</th>
<th>FIII</th>
<th>FIV</th>
<th>FV</th>
<th>FVI</th>
<th>FVII</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>68.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Period unemployed</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>47.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reasons for migration</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Members accompanying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Member(s) making decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>68.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Type of assistance</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Member(s) who followed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Improvement in living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Number of visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>58.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>83.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Perceived prospects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>72.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Male wage differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>63.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Female wage differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Perceived length of job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>54.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Male annual expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Female annual expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>81.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Decisions in the family</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Decisions on finance</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Decisions on family matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigen value | 3.92  | 1.99  | 1.45  | 1.32  | 1.19  | 1.07  | 1.05  |
Percent Contribution | 20.62 | 10.45 | 7.63  | 6.92  | 6.27  | 5.61  | 5.55  |
Cumulative Contribution | 20.62 | 31.07 | 38.70 | 45.62 | 51.89 | 57.50 | 63.05 |

Source: Computer Analysis.
been retained in the analysis, following yet another rule of n-factor analysts. It is important to note that the factors have progressively declining variances, with the first or main dimension accounting for 20.61 per cent, the second 10.45, the third 7.63 and so on. It is seen that the individual variables account for varying variances, with the exception of reasons for migration accounting for just about 24.42 per cent. All others have a quite considerable variance and is higher than 40 per cent each. It may be that the reasons the migrants indicate are not significant enough as reasons for migration, although they have quite simply corroborated with one reason of this scholar's list of reasons: no job at origin, hence migration.

The first dimension consists of four variables loading significantly on the factor, namely, decision on finance (0.789), decisions in the family (0.681), female wage differences between origin and destination (0.581) and type of assistance at destination from friends and relatives (0.409). It appears therefore that it is the dimension of **Decision to Move** which is based primarily on finance and, strangely, in terms of large female wage differences than male wage differences, for this variable gets a loading of 0.207, insignificant statistically although being positive. In the decision to move, the migrants have been greatly motivated by the assistance expected from and rendered by friends and relatives at Coimbatore, the place of destination.

The corroborations for the conclusions we may derive from the main factor dimension are widely available in literature regarding this problem. For instance, almost all migration studies, economic reason, the need to better one's economic position and the need to find employment in the destination because jobs are hard to come by in the origin, as the most important in the decision to move (for example, IDRC, 1977; Goldstein, 1977; Byerlee, 1974; Greenwood, 1975, Todaro, 1969, 1976; Lee, 1966). But the literature of migration also indicates that the decisions have been
made by both men and women, together, in response to perceived differences in wages between rural and urban areas (ILO, 1981; Peek, 1981). And once a move has been made by a migrant, the migrant gets assistance from a relative or a friend until he gets a foothold and/or consolidates his position. This position has been made clear by many a study on sources of information and assistances as regards migration and migrants.

The second dimension, commonly known as the bipolar, has also four variables with significant loadings: male annual expenditures (0.786), female annual expenditures (0.743), male wage differences between origin and destination (0.454) and reasons for migrating to destination (0.474). The dimension is thus Improved Income from Employment at Destination so that personal wishes can be met in terms of demands. This is interdependent of course with male wage differences as well as the reasons for migrating, which is, as indicated before, 'no job' at origin. This conclusion that migration results in improved income from employment is again reinforced by literature, especially of economics (to cite a few others, Bilsborrow, 1976; Gaude, 1976, Stark, 1978, Cebula, 1979; DaVanzo, 1981). That expenditure is an indication of improved income and that the male expenditure is higher than the female expenditure can be accounted for by the differing needs between the sexes and also the male habits such as drinking and other indulgences.

The third dimension, explaining a variance of 7.63 per cent to the total, has four variables forming the factor with advice to friends and relatives at origin. These include a variable indicating a motivating force for migration, getting a very highly significant loading of 0.863, followed by decisions on family matters with 0.829, female annual expenditures 0.487 and period of unemployment at destination 0.409. The friends and relatives as Causes of Migration and their impact on decisions on family matters such as making moves to effect migration, even when there is some period of unemployment
at destination is borne out by this dimension. This dimension is important, in that it recognises the presence of friends and relatives in the city being causes for migration by the Boyas to the city of Coimbatore, validating in some sense the sociological researches in this regard (for example, Da Vanzo, 1981).

The structural dimensions up to the first three have all been positive, while the remaining four are negative in terms of loadings on them. The first of the negative dimensions, the fourth, has two variables, perceived prospects at destination loading -0.838 and improvement in living conditions at destination loading -0.582. The two variables are indicative of the fact that there is Risk in Migration, because both perceived prospects and perceived improvements in living conditions at the destination are still thought of as fluid. There is still a lurking doubt in the minds of the migrants about their futures and their prospects in life.

The fifth dimension with five variables of significant negative loadings - members following migrants into destination (-0.703), type of assistance at destination (-0.685), members accompanying migrants to destination (-0.650), number of visits to origin (-0.584) and decisions in the family (-0.496) - are indicative of further doubts. Therefore the feeling of Uncertainty as to improvements in living conditions persists even with taking members into the destination and asking them to follow to the destination. There are also the facts of doubtful assistance from friends and relatives at the destination and visits to origin and thus retaining ties with the world that they know better.

The sixth dimension is yet again negative with age loading significantly with -0.777 and perceived length of job availability at destination -0.646. This can only mean that if we go by the interdependence that we wish to see in factor dimensions, we find
that with age there is greater doubt as to the length of job availability at destination. The dimension can therefore be designated as **Perceived Non-availability of Jobs** with aged migrants. Conversely, the younger migrants feel that the jobs at destination would last longer.

In the last dimension, the two variables loading negatively significantly are members who made decisions to move (-0.730) and period of unemployment at destination (-0.519). The dimension is perhaps a reiteration of **Risks and Uncertainties** still felt because the decisions made to move to destination is of doubtful authority but the risks of unemployment at destination is not so severe. It should be noted that the latter appears again in the seventh dimension and has already made an appearance with a positive loading in the second.

Underlying the causes of migration to urban areas from the rural areas is the poverty, manifested in low agricultural incomes and productivity and unemployment (ILO, 1976; Peek, 1981). In the case of the Boyas, the causes have been that of non-availability of employment in the villages of the Dharmapuri district from where the migrants moved out and the general indebtedness of the Boyas population because of long-term economic deprivation. To a certain extent, the pressure of population on land, with the consequent low man-land ratios, giving rise to low agricultural employment, and hence low incomes from agricultural labour, has pushed the Boyas away from their villages. The advertisement in the papers in 1976 became an only opportunity to redeem themselves from the clutches of poverty and debt.

Until recently, however, much of the literature, particularly sociological, on the consequences of migration for individual migrants was characterised by a pessimistic view about the opportunities for migrants in their places of destination. Difficulties in
adjusting to an urban environment and culture, economic disadvantages compared to native population, inability to move occupationally upward in the cities and anomalies and frustration were commonly cited. However, in recent years, most studies based upon survey data, have observed that migrants have been able to increase their welfare as a result of migration inspite of adjustment difficulties and urban unemployment (Findley, 1977; Yap, 1977 and White, 1979). Individual migrants and their families not only seem generally better off as a result of migration but migrants also appear to be quickly assimilated and become similar in socioeconomic status to urban natives in remarkably brief periods of time.

The varimax rotated factor scores make possible the classification of migrants into definable groups in terms of extracted dimensions. The dimensions extracted are:

1. Decision to Move
2. Improved Income from Employment at Destination
3. Causes of Migration
4. Risk in Migration
5. Uncertainty
6. Perceived Non-availability of Jobs
7. Risks and Uncertainties

The dimensions do provide for a good argument on migration of the Boyas to the city of Coimbatore in that they explain the nature of risks and uncertainties more than improvement in living conditions at the moment. There is a certain perception of fears related to the unknown in a city environment which is borne out by the dimensional designations.
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The rotated scores can be interpreted in a way to show how divided the respondent-migrants are in respect of the dimensions: that is, whether they see the dimensions as positive or as negative and whether the fear of risk and uncertainty is widespread, or only confined to certain sections of migrants. It is often construed in the context of factor scores that a positive score speaks of the good while the negative speaks of the bad. In the context here, the rotated scores could only mean that there are migrants who see migration as the only way out while others are apprehensive of the threats and fears it brings. So we may say that the positively scored migrant sees migration as the bright spot in his life and the negatively scored, a reverse picture. A particular characteristic of the rotated factors, invariably, is that a majority of the migrants get low scores and remain thus about the score 0.0, thus providing a support for normal distribution, since the migrants may be assumed to have been chosen from such a population. In all, the four graphics representing the varimax scores, there is some corroboration for the normal distribution while at the same time, in the case of decision to migrate for example, there is a positively skewed decisions in most cases.

Of the 403 migrants, some 271 see the Decision to Move as the right decision while the rest (132 migrants) see it as the wrong one, primarily because the migration itself is risky (Figure 4.1). On the other hand, 252 of the migrants interviewed see improved income from employment at destination as a positive sign for staying on while the others (151) regard it in a negative context because of fears of non-availability of jobs (Figure 4.2).

It is however an irony that only 187 respondents think positively of the causes of migration whereas the others think (216) otherwise. More than half the respondents (214) have a positive outlook of the risk in migration which is quite a comfortable margin, while the rest (189) have a negative outlook. This can mean that the majority
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wish to take risks, preferring a life at risk than one without it. Uncertainty is also positively felt by 205 of the respondents while the rest (198) look upon it as problematic (Figures 4.3 and 4.4). The positive outlook is in the minority in the last two dimensions. A little more than half the respondents are negatively poised as far as perceived availability of jobs, while 187 feel the other way round and the pattern repeats itself with the dimension risks and uncertainties.

In sum, the rotated factor scores show positive inclination on the part of the migrants in four of the seven dimensions considered while in the other three, the majority gets a negative scores meaning negative poise. So, it may be concluded that by their own measurement, migration to the city of Coimbatore is still a risk, replete with uncertainty even though there is yet scope for change to overcome this.

Conclusion

The purpose of the chapter has been to analyse and understand the causes and consequences of migration and decisions, and the perceptions of the migrants, to the city of Coimbatore from the villages of the district of Dharmapuri. The data from the field survey involving 403 migrants to the city, with 19 variables item-selected from the coded data, have been subjected to factor analysis to extract seven dimensions, which together corroborate many of the findings of the earlier researchers, besides providing some additional insights into the process. The broad conclusions of the study are that rural poverty, manifest in low man-land ratio, non-availability of employment and indebtedness of the population are some of the causes of migration, although the primary initiative for migration, was the response to an advertisement. Once the initial group had migrated and secured a foothold, further migration followed merely as a consequence of information and assistances provided by 'friends and relatives' among
the migrants. Yet however there is a sense of risk and uncertainty in the migration. Doubts about jobs being available continually also rise in the minds of the Boya migrants. It is not however acting as a deterrent to the migrants to take risks and migrate in considerable numbers to the city, hoping that jobs in the construction sector would continue in the future. The implication of the analytical conclusions is that the migration is expected to continue occur with the same, if not renewed, vigour as long as 'friends and relatives' encourage the potential migrants to 'go over' with a promise of assistance until they find jobs in the city.
Chapter IV
Addendum

Variables loading significantly on the factor dimensions four to seven clearly merit reconsideration, being looked at from an interdependence viewpoint. The point meriting reinterpretation perhaps is that the extracted dimensions four and six indicate to the perceived nature of the Boya migration by the migrant Boyas themselves whereas dimensions five and seven represent the conditions pertaining to migration process, non-perceived and therefore real. As such, they merit being looked at individually rather than dependently. However, the fact that the perceptions normally emerge from the realities needs special emphasis. This being the case:

(a) there is a definite interdependence between the perceived risk in migration and the real risks and uncertainties in migration to Coimbatore by the Boyas.

The real risk and uncertainty for a migrant is in the period of unemployment at destination for the Boyas who made decisions to move to the city (dimension seven). This is because, even for an already migrated Boya, perceived prospects are much too limited and hence improvement in living conditions is at stake (dimension four). The relationships one may derive between dimensions five and seven (a real and a perceived) is therefore that of uncertainties (dimension five) because of which rarely do members of same families follow suit a migrant nor do they accompany him/her while migrating for they are unable to perceive before hand the length of job availability at Coimbatore (dimension six). This means that

(b) there is interdependence among the Uncertainty (real) and the (perceived) Length of job availability at the destination.