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CHAPTER VI
MIGRATION PARTICULARS

VI.1 Migration particulars

This chapter analyses the respondents' birth places, last residential places, reasons for leaving birth and last residential places, number of previous moves, age at the time of coming to Tiruchirappalli city, reasons for coming, information sources and causes for settling in the particular places at Tiruchirappalli city as well.

VI.2 Birthplaces of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Respondents' birthplaces</th>
<th>Respondents' previous residential place</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rural within district</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rural other districts within state</td>
<td>52 (52%)</td>
<td>18 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rural other states within India</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Urban within district</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
<td>16 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Urban other districts within state</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>47 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Urban other states within India</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data on birthplaces of the respondents show that 36 per cent of rural migrants' birthplaces are other rural areas of Tiruchirappalli district. Likewise, 52 per cent of rural migrants' birthplaces are rural areas of other districts within the state of Tamil Nadu. Further, 5 per cent of rural migrants' birthplaces are rural areas of other states within India. Other urban areas of Tiruchirappalli district have formed to be the birthplaces to 4 per cent of rural migrants. Urban areas of other districts within the state of Tamil Nadu have formed to be the birthplaces to 3 per cent of rural migrants. More over, 47 per cent of urban migrants' native places are urban areas of other districts within the state of Tamil Nadu. 18 per cent of urban migrants have born at rural areas of other districts within the state of Tamil Nadu. 16 per cent of urban migrants have born at other urban areas of Tiruchirappalli district. 10 per cent of urban migrants have born at other rural areas of Tiruchirappalli district. The percentages of urban migrants, who born at urban areas of other states within the Union, are very limited (7%). Only 2 per cent of urban migrants have born at rural areas of other states within the
Union. From the above data, it is inferred that 95 per cent of rural migrants are belonging to the state of Tamil Nadu and only 5 per cent of rural migrants are belonging to the other states. Similarly, 91 per cent of urban migrants are pertaining to the state of Tamil Nadu and only 9 per cent of urban migrants are pertaining to the other states.

**VI.3 Reasons for leaving the birthplaces**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Reasons for leaving the birthplaces</th>
<th>Respondents’ previous residential place</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No job</td>
<td>15 (15%)</td>
<td>16 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No job according to qualification</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lack of educational facility</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low income</td>
<td>6 (6%)</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Moved with family</td>
<td>36 (36%)</td>
<td>32 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Family problem</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
<td>7 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Affected by drought</td>
<td>6 (6%)</td>
<td>6 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Affected by flood</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Social conflict</td>
<td>8 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hard social control</td>
<td>6 (6%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Due to marriage</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>8 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>To get desired education</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Job appointment</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
<td>8 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Job transfer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Personal reasons</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moved with family (36 per cent for rural migrants and 32 per cent for urban migrants) and no job (15 per cent for rural migrants and 16 per cent for urban migrants) have formed to be the prime causes for leaving the birthplaces as well. Owing to low income 6 and 4 per cent of rural and urban migrants respectively have departed from their birthplaces. Lack of educational facility has ousted 2 and 3 per cent of rural and urban migrants respectively. The natural disasters namely floods and droughts have evacuated 3 and 6 per cent of rural migrants and 4 and 6 per cent of urban migrants respectively. Social conflict and hard social control have forced 8 and 6 per cent of rural migrants respectively to quit from their birthplaces. The contribution of these factors among urban migrants is very meager (1 and 2 per cent respectively). Due to the marriage 3 and 8 per cent of rural and urban migrants
respectively have displaced from their native places. 5 per cent of urban migrants have left from their birthplaces for getting education. Similarly, the share of this factor seems to be very low in rural group (just 1%). 5 and 8 per cent of rural and urban migrants respectively have quit from their birthplaces due to the job appointment. 5 and 1 per cent of rural and urban migrants have quoted personal reasons for their evacuation. The contribution of two factors unavailable of job according to qualification (1 per cent for urban migrants only) and job transfer (2 per cent for urban migrants only) is very limited. In concise, 62 and 51 per cent of rural and urban migrants respectively have displaced from their birthplaces due to the social causes and 26 and 31 per cent of rural and urban migrants respectively owing to the economic causes and 9 and 10 per cent of rural and urban migrants respectively because of the socio-economic causes.

VI.4 Respondents’ last residential places

Distribution of the respondents by their last residential places (Table No-6-3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Respondents’ last residential places</th>
<th>Respondents’ previous residential place</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No second residential place</td>
<td>20 (20%)</td>
<td>9 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rural within district</td>
<td>36 (36%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rural other districts within state</td>
<td>36 (36%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rural other states within India</td>
<td>8 (8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Urban within district</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Urban other districts within state</td>
<td></td>
<td>57 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Urban other states within India</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 100 rural migrants, 36 per cent of rural migrants’ last residential places are rural areas of other districts within their own states. Another 36 per cent of rural migrants’ last residential places are other rural areas of their own districts. Only 8 per cent of rural migrants’ last residential places are rural of other states within India. 20 per cent of rural migrants have not possessed any second residential place, as they have directly migrated to Tiruchirappalli city from their birthplaces. Of the 100 urban migrants, 57 per cent of urban migrants’ last residential places are urban areas of other districts within their own states. Moreover, 24 per cent of urban migrants’ last residential places are other urban areas within
their districts. 10 per cent of urban migrants’ last residential places are urban areas of other states within Union. Only 9 per cent of urban migrants have not possessed any second residential place, as they have directly migrated to Tiruchirappalli city from their birthplaces.

VI.5 Reasons for leaving the last residential places

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Reasons for leaving last residential places</th>
<th>Respondents’ previous residential place</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No job</td>
<td>14 (17.5%)</td>
<td>26 (28.57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No job for qualification</td>
<td>1 (1.25%)</td>
<td>1 (1.10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lack of educational facility</td>
<td>5 (6.25%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low income</td>
<td>28 (35%)</td>
<td>19 (20.88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Moved with family</td>
<td>5 (6.25%)</td>
<td>3 (3.30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Family problem</td>
<td>2 (2.5%)</td>
<td>4 (4.39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Affected by drought</td>
<td>5 (6.25%)</td>
<td>2 (2.20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Affected by flood</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (2.20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Social conflict</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (1.10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hard social control</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (1.10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>To get desired education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (2.20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Job appointment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (2.20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Work contract finished</td>
<td>1 (1.25%)</td>
<td>8 (8.79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Job transfer</td>
<td>2 (2.5%)</td>
<td>5 (5.49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Personal reasons</td>
<td>9 (11.25%)</td>
<td>15 (16.48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80 (100%)</td>
<td>91 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No second residential place</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 80 rural migrants, 35 per cent of migrants have left from their last residential places owing to the low income, but the share of this factor seems to be little low in urban group (20.88%). On the contrary, 28.57 per cent of urban migrants have displaced from their last residential places because of the unemployment, but when comparing the contribution of this factor with rural group, despite being a second major factor for evacuating the 17.50 per cent of rural migrants, it has been lower than the urban group. 11.25 and 16.48 per cent of rural and urban migrants respectively have migrated because of personal reasons. The lack of education facility has urged 6.25 per cent of rural migrants to move to the study area. Due to the finishing of work contract 8.79 per cent of urban migrants have quit from their last residential places. But, the contribution of this factor is very low (1.25%) in rural group.
Owing to social conflict and hard social control each 5 per cent of rural migrants respectively have flitted to the study area. But, the contributions of these factors are very low in urban group (each 1.10 per cent respectively). Because of the job transfer 5.49 and 2.25 per cent of urban and rural migrants respectively have moved to the study area. Due to the job appointment and for getting desired education each 2.20 per cent of urban migrants respectively have quit from their last residential places. Famine has evacuated 6.25 and 2.20 per cent of rural and urban migrants respectively from their last residential places. There are not many variations among other cliques for evacuating the migrants from their last residential places. In short, 30.10 and 26.35 per cent of rural and urban migrants respectively have left from their last residential places due to the social causes and 57.50 and 67.02 per cent of rural and urban migrants respectively because of the economic causes and 6.25 and 4.40 per cent of rural and urban migrants respectively owing to the socio-economic causes.

VI.6 Number of previous moves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Number of previous moves</th>
<th>Respondents' previous residential place</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural (100%)</td>
<td>Urban (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No movement</td>
<td>20 (20%)</td>
<td>9 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>65 (65%)</td>
<td>77 (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Two</td>
<td>7 (7%)</td>
<td>9 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Three</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Four</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Five</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data on previous moves of the respondents reveal that 20 and 9 per cent of rural and urban migrants respectively have directly migrated to Tiruchirappalli city from their birthplaces. Although one-step migration is prevalent in both groups, urban migrants (77%) have preponderated than the rural migrants (65%) in one-step migration. Similarly, two-step migration seems to be higher in urban group (9%) than the rural group (7%). On the contrary, three and four-step migration are higher in rural group (5 and 2 per cent respectively) than the urban group (4 and 1 per cent respectively). Only 1 per cent of rural migrant has come to
Tiruchirappalli city after making five movements from his birthplace. The trends direct to city and one move may be explained that a huge majority of in-migrants had some relatives or family members or friends at Tiruchirappalli city, which motivated them to join with them. The migrants, who made multi-migration, did not have such social network. Hence, they have struggled to settle in one particular place.

VI.7 Any one joined after migration (Except wife and children)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Any one joined after migration (Except wife and children)</th>
<th>Respondents' previous residential place</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51 (51%)</td>
<td>29 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>49 (49%)</td>
<td>71 (71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above data show that 51 and 29 per cent of rural and urban migrants respectively have reported that some persons have jointed with them, either from their birthplaces or last residential places, after coming to Tiruchirappalli city.

VI.8 Number of persons joined after migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Number of persons joined after migration</th>
<th>Respondents' previous residential place</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>40 (78.43%)</td>
<td>23 (79.31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Two</td>
<td>5 (9.80%)</td>
<td>4 (13.79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Three</td>
<td>3 (5.88%)</td>
<td>2 (6.90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Four</td>
<td>2 (3.93%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Five</td>
<td>1 (1.96%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>No one joined</td>
<td>51 (100%)</td>
<td>29 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among rural migrants each 2 persons have joined with 5 migrants (9.80%). The turned up persons are mostly brothers and cousins. Each one person has joined with 40 migrants (78.43%). The turned up persons are mostly family members such as elder or younger brothers. Each three persons have joined with 3 migrants (5.88%) and each four persons have joined with 2 migrants (3.93%). Five persons have joined with one migrant (1.96%). In the above three groups, the turned up persons are mostly relatives and co-villagers. So, totally 51 migrants have pulled 72 new migrants from their respective
starting points. To share the job, to fill the vacancies of working institution, and to assist the jobs have formed as the basic reasons for inviting the new migrants. Among urban migrants, each one person has joined with 23 migrants (79.31%). The turned up persons are mostly brothers. Each 2 persons have joined with 4 migrants (13.79%). The turned up persons are mostly friends and brother in laws. Each three persons have joined with 2 migrants (6.90%). The turned up persons are mostly friends, relatives and marriage contacts. To assist the job, to recruit at working institution, to support the family has formed as the prime causes of pulling the new migrants. Thus, the 29 urban migrants have pulled 37 new migrants from their respective starting points.

VI.9 Age at the time of coming to Tiruchirappalli city

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Age at the time of coming to Tiruchirappalli city</th>
<th>Respondents' previous residential place</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>57 (57%)</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>24 (24%)</td>
<td>39 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>10 (10%)</td>
<td>37 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>13 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 100 rural migrants, 57 per cent of migrants have migrated to Tiruchirappalli city at the age group of 16-20 that has been followed by the other age groups of 21-25 (24%) and 26-30 (10%). The percentages of rural migrants stepping into Tiruchirappalli city at the age of below 16 and above 30 is very low that has denoted a fact that migration has been at peak between the age group of 16-30 among rural migrants. Of the 100 urban migrants, majority of migrants (76%) have displaced to Tiruchirappalli city at their age group of 21-25 (39%) and 26-30 (37%). Considerable percentages of urban migrants have come to Tiruchirappalli city at the age group of 31-35 (13%). The percentages of urban migrants stepping into Tiruchirappalli City at the age of below 21 and above 35 is very meager.
Rural migrants' reasons for coming to Tiruchirappalli city

- To get job
- To get better job
- To get better income
- Moved with family
- To get education
- To get medical treatment
- To start business
- Job appointment
- Job transfer
- Personal reasons

Urban migrants' reasons for coming to Tiruchirappalli city

- To get job
- To get better job
- To get better income
- Moved with family
- To get education
- To get medical treatment
- To start business
- Job appointment
- Job transfer
- Personal reasons
(ranging 1 to 5 per cent), which has illustrated the existing fact that migration has been at peak between the age group of 21-35 among urban migrants. The mean age at the time of coming to Tiruchirappalli city is 21.65 years (S.D.=6.514) for rural migrants and 27.25 years (S.D.=5.717) for urban migrants. The higher number of migrants in younger age groups at the time of coming to Tiruchirappalli city is due to easy mobility of the search for employment, better job and better income etc. It is due to the absence of all these causes that the number of migrants in upper age groups at the time of coming to Tiruchirappalli city is very low.

VI.10 Reasons for coming to Tiruchirappalli city

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Reasons for coming to Tiruchirappalli city</th>
<th>Respondents' previous residential place</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To get job</td>
<td>23 (23%)</td>
<td>34 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To get better job</td>
<td>18 (18%)</td>
<td>13 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To get better income</td>
<td>35 (35%)</td>
<td>12 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moved with family</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>To get education</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>To get medical treatment</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>To start business</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>11 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Job appointment</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
<td>11 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Job transfer</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>7 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Personal reasons</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conceptually, reasons for leaving the birth and last residential places are different from the reasons for coming to Tiruchirappalli city. However, overlapping is found in some cases. Albeit both in rural and urban groups, to get job, to get better job and to get better income have formed to be the prime causes to displace to Tiruchirappalli city, some significant variations have been found among these factors as well. The factor, to get better income is higher among rural migrants (35%) than the urban migrants (12%). This has denoted that the existing low-income patterns of rural areas than the urban areas. The reason, to get better job, is also higher among rural migrants (18%) than the urban migrants (13%), which has confirmed the existing fact that due to the under employment combined with the dearth of modern and novel occupations rural areas that have ousted the more number of rural
folks, those who are engaged in farming and allied activities. On the contrast, the cause to get job that is higher in urban group (34%) than the rural group (23%), which have denoted that unemployment is more prevalent at urban areas than the rural areas. The causes of job appointment and job transfer are higher in urban group (11 and 7 percent respectively) than the rural group (4 and 2 per cent respectively). This may be due to the urban migrants' higher employability skills than the rural migrants. The factor to start business is higher among urban migrants (11%) than the rural migrants (2%). This has illustrated that some urban migrants from affluent families, have displaced to Tiruchirappalli city with considerable sum of money. The cause, to get education or to educate children is very limited (5 per cent in rural group and 4 percent in urban group). There are not many differences between rural and urban in the three factors of coming to get medical treatment, moved with family and personal reasons, as these factors are neutral to any human group.

VI.11 Causes for selecting Tiruchirappalli city

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Causes for selecting Tiruchirappalli</th>
<th>Respondents' previous residential place</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Family members</td>
<td>13 (13%)</td>
<td>12 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td>39 (39%)</td>
<td>17 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>10 (10%)</td>
<td>28 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Marriage contacts</td>
<td>8 (8%)</td>
<td>12 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Own community people</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
<td>11 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Co-villagers</td>
<td>17 (17%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>8 (8%)</td>
<td>20 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the rural migrants (39%) have preferred to Tiruchirappalli city as their destination place because of the presence of relatives. But, the contribution of relatives as a stimulator to urban migrants is very low (17%). Similarly, the share of co-villagers in alluring the migrants is also higher in rural group (17%) than the urban group (Nil per cent). This may be the aftermath of firm relationship of rural populace with their kith and kin. On other hand, major proportions of urban migrants have selected Tiruchirappalli city due to the presence of friends (28%), but the share of this factor is very low among rural migrants (10%). This is the
classical instance of emerging novel relationship of urban people. Likewise, the percentages of own community people are higher among urban migrants (11%) than the rural migrants (5%). This may be the result of urban people’s passion over communalism. The percentages of marriage contact as pull factor are just higher among urban migrants (12%) than the rural migrants (8%). This is so because, while the migrants are at the verge of leaving their residential places, the spouses have forced them to move to the places where their parents or relatives have already settled. 8 and 20 per cent of rural and urban migrants respectively have not mentioned any specific cause for selecting Tiruchirappalli city, as they have displaced to Tiruchirappalli city due to the job appointments, job transfer, personal reasons and moved with family.

### VI.12 Sources of information

**Distribution of the respondents by sources of information (Table No-6-11)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
<th>Respondents’ previous residential place</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Family members</td>
<td>13 (13%)</td>
<td>12 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>10 (10%)</td>
<td>28 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td>39 (39%)</td>
<td>17 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Co-villagers</td>
<td>17 (17%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Own community people</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>7 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Returned migrants</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Marriage contact</td>
<td>8 (8%)</td>
<td>12 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dailies</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>8 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Magazines</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Inter net</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Television</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Person visited 1 or 2 times</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the comprehensive analysis, the information sources have been dismembered as human information sources comprising of family members, friends, relatives and co-villagers etc. and media information sources comprising of dailies, internet, radio and television etc. The present study aimed to derive only the first information source rather than the combination of many sources. As for human information sources, most of the rural
migrants (39%) have obtained the data about Tiruchirappalli city through their relatives. But, the contribution of relatives is very low (17%) among urban migrants. Further, the share of co-villagers and returned migrants is very higher among rural migrants (17 and 2 per cent respectively) than the urban migrants (nil and 1 per cent respectively). Similarly, the role of family members is little higher among rural migrants (13%) than the urban migrants (12%). On the other hand, the role of friends is very high among urban migrants (28%). But, this percentage is very low among rural migrants (10%). Similarly, the role of marriage contact is higher in urban group (12%) than the rural group (8%). With regard to media information sources, dailies and net have provided information to 8 and 2 per cent of urban migrants respectively. The role of magazines and radio is higher in urban group (3 and 2 per cent respectively) than the rural group (1 and nil per cent respectively). Similarly, the role of television is also higher in urban group (3%) than the rural group (1%). 3 and 4 per cent of rural and urban migrants respectively have come to Tiruchirappalli city one or two times before migration for various reasons, so that it is not necessary for them to obtain the information about Tiruchirappalli city from any source.

VI.13 Reasons for preferring to particular areas at Tiruchirappalli city

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Reasons for preferring particulars areas at Tiruchirappalli city</th>
<th>Respondents’ previous residential place</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Family members</td>
<td>10 (10%)</td>
<td>10 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td>28 (28%)</td>
<td>11 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>8 (8%)</td>
<td>9 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Marriage contacts</td>
<td>8 (8%)</td>
<td>10 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Own community people</td>
<td>6 (6%)</td>
<td>10 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Co-villagers</td>
<td>11 (11%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Affordable rent</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>6 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lot of business or job opportunities</td>
<td>7 (7%)</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sufficient transport facilities</td>
<td>6 (6%)</td>
<td>8 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Close to work place</td>
<td>8 (8%)</td>
<td>23 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the comprehensive analysis, the causes for selecting particular areas at Tiruchirappalli city have been bifurcated as human based causes comprising of family members, relatives, friends, marriage contacts, own community people, co-villager, colleagues and amenities based causes comprising of affordable rent, business or job opportunities, sufficient transport facilities and close to work place.

As for the human based causes, as relatives and co-villagers have already settled at the particular areas of Tiruchirappalli city, most of the rural migrants (28 and 11 per cent respectively) have preferred to that areas as their domiciles. But, these percentages are very low among urban migrants (11 and 1 percent respectively). Except relatives, each 10 per cent of urban migrants have preferred to the present areas as their abode due to the presence of own community people and marriage contact respectively. But, these percentages are low among rural migrants (6 and 8 percent respectively). The contributions of friends and colleagues are little higher among urban migrants (9 and 4 per cent respectively) than the rural migrants (8 and 1 per cent respectively). There is no difference in the clique of family members among rural and urban migrants (each 10%).

With regard to the amenities based causes, major proportions of urban migrants (23%) have preferred to the present residential areas, as they has been nearby to their working places. Similarly, the causes such as sufficient transport facility and affordable rent are also higher among urban migrants (8 and 6 per cent respectively) than the rural migrants (6 and 3 per cent respectively). The cause, lot of business or job opportunities, has forced 7 per cent of rural migrants to choose the present residential areas as their domicile. But, this percentage is low among urban migrants (5%).
Respondents' last residential places (Table No-6-13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents' birth places</th>
<th>Respondents' last residential places</th>
<th>No second residential places</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural within district</td>
<td>Rural other districts within state</td>
<td>Rural other states within India</td>
<td>Rural within district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural within district</td>
<td>27 (58.70%)</td>
<td>4 (8.70%)</td>
<td>2 (4.34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural other districts within state</td>
<td>7 (10%)</td>
<td>26 (37.14%)</td>
<td>3 (4.28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural other states within India</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (28.57%)</td>
<td>3 (42.86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban within district</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban other districts within state</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban other states within India</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of 46 migrants, those who born at rural areas of Tiruchirappalli district, 58.70 per cent of migrants have moved to other rural areas of their own districts and 8.7 per cent to rural areas of other districts within their own states. Only 4.34 per cent of migrants have gone to rural areas of other states within Union. Further, 15.22 and 4.34 per cent of migrants have gone to other urban areas of their own district and urban areas of other districts within their own state respectively. Only 8.70 per cent of migrants have not had second residential places. They have directly migrated to Tiruchirappalli city from their birthplaces.
Out of 70 migrants, those who born at rural areas of other districts within the state of Tamil Nadu, 10 per cent of migrants have moved the other rural areas of their native districts and 37.14 per cent to rural areas of other districts within their own state. 4.28 per cent of migrants have gone to rural areas of other states within the Union. 1.43 per cent of migrants have gone to other urban area within their native districts and 22.86 per cent to urban areas of other districts within their own state. Another 1.43 per cent of migrants have gone to urban areas of other states within the Union. Only 22.86 per cent of migrants have not had any second residential place. Out of 7 migrants, those who born at rural areas of other states within the Union, 28.57 per cent of migrants have moved to rural areas of other districts within their native states and 42.86 per cent to rural areas of other states within the Union. Another 28.57 per cent of migrants have gone to urban areas of other states within the Union.

Out of 20 migrants, those who born at urban areas of Tiruchirappalli district, only 5 per cent of migrants have moved to rural areas of their own district and 10 per cent to rural areas of other districts within their own state. 50 per cent of migrants have gone to other urban areas within their own districts. 20 per cent of migrants have gone to urban areas of other districts within their native states. 5 per cent of migrants have gone to urban area of other state within the Union. Only 10 per cent of migrants have not had any second residential place.

Out of 50 migrants, those who born at urban areas of other districts within the Tamil Nadu state, only 2 per cent of migrants have gone to rural area of their native districts and 4 per cent to rural areas of other districts within their native states. 12 per cent of migrants have moved to urban areas of their native districts. 64 per cent of migrants have gone to urban areas of other districts within their native states. 4 per cent of migrants have gone to urban areas of other states within the Union. Only 14 per cent of migrants have not had any last residential place. Out of 7 migrants, those who born urban areas of other states within the
Union, 42.86 per cent of migrants have moved to urban areas of other districts within their native states and 57.14 per cent to urban areas of other states within the Union.

From the above discussions, it could be clearly pointed out that of the 103 migrants, those who born at rural areas, 71.85 per cent of migrants have gone to the other rural areas and only 28.15 per cent of migrants have gone to urban areas. Similarly, of the 68 migrants, those who born at urban areas, 91.18 per cent of migrants have moved to other urban areas and only 8.82 per cent of migrants have moved to rural areas. Hence, in the present study the classification of the migrants commensurate to their previous residential places as rural migrants and urban migrants is quite appropriate and vital.

### VI.14.1 Respondents’ previous residential places

From the above data, it is inferred that of the 100 rural migrants, 40 per cent of migrants’ previous residential places are “rural areas within district”. 52 per cent of migrants’ previous residential places are “rural areas of other districts within state”. 8 per cent of migrants’ previous residential places are “rural areas of other states within Union”.

Of the 100 urban migrants, 26 per cent of migrants’ previous residential places are “urban areas within the district”. 64 per cent of migrants’ previous residential places are “urban areas of other districts within state”. Only 10 per cent of migrants’ previous residential places are “urban areas of other states within Union”.
### Rural migrants’ reasons for leaving birth and last residential places (Table No-6-14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons leaving birthplaces</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No job</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (11.11%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 (11.11%)</td>
<td>1 (11.11%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (11.11%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of educational facility</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved with family</td>
<td>11 (31.43%)</td>
<td>1 (2.86%)</td>
<td>4 (11.43%)</td>
<td>13 (37.14%)</td>
<td>3 (8.57%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (5.71%)</td>
<td>1 (2.86%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family problem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected by droughts</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected by floods</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (33.33%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (33.34%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social conflict</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (16.67%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (33.33%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard social control</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For marriage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get desired education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got job</td>
<td>1 (33.33%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reasons</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (33.34%)</td>
<td>1 (33.33%)</td>
<td>1 (33.33%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI.15 Rural migrants' reasons for leaving birth and last residential places

The Table No.6-14 presents the data about rural migrants' reasons for leaving birth and last residential places. Out of 9 rural migrants, those who flitted from their birthplaces due to the “no job”, 55.56 per cent of migrants have again departed from their last residential places owing to “low-income”. Of the 2 migrants having moved from their birthplaces due to “the lack of educational facilities”, 50 per cent of migrants have moved from their last residential place due to “the no job” and another 50 per cent of migrants for “personal reasons”. Owing to low-income 2 migrants has left from their birthplaces, of which 50 per cent of migrants have left from their last residential places to escape from “the hard social control” of the last residential places. Another 50 per cent of migrants have migrated to study area owing to the “work contract finished”. Of the 35 migrants, those who left from the birthplaces due to the “moved with family”, 37.14 and 31.43 per cent of migrants have left from their last residential places due to “the low income” and “no job” respectively. Of the 4 migrants, those who left from their birthplaces due to the family problems, 50 per cent of migrants have left from their last residential places due to “the low income” and each 25 per cent of migrants have displaced from their last residential places due to “the family problems” and “personal reasons” respectively. 3 migrants (100%), those who moved from their birthplaces due to the “marriage”, have left from their last residential places due to the “loss of spouses”. Another 3 migrants, who have moved from their birthplaces due to the “job appointment”, 66.67 per cent of migrants, have left from their last residential places due to “the job transfer”. Due to loosing the job 33.33 per cent of migrants have left from their last residential places. Migrants, who left from their birthplaces due to the “affected by droughts or floods” or “social conflict” or “hard social control”, did not leave their last residential places for the same reasons. This implies that migrants carefully planned first migration as well.
### Urban migrants' reasons for leaving birth and last residential places (Table No-6-15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for leaving birth place</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No job</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(46.16%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(7.69%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(23.08%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No job for qualifications</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of educational facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(33.34%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved with families</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(53.12%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(15.62%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(6.25%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3.13%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(6.25%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3.13%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Problems</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(71.42%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(14.29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected by Drought</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(16.66%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(16.66%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected by Floods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Conflict</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard social control</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For marriage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get desired Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(33.34%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(33.33%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(33.33%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(16.67%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(16.67%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Reasons</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI.16 Urban migrants' reasons for leaving birth and last residential places

The Table No.6-15 presents the data about urban migrants' reasons for leaving the birth and last residential places. Of the 13 migrants who displaced from their birth places due to the “no job”, 46.16 per cent of migrants have moved from their last residential places due to “the low income”. 15.38 and 23.08 per cent of migrants have left from their last residential places owing to the “work contract finished” and “personal reasons” respectively. Of the 3 migrants, who left from their birthplaces due to the “lack of educational facilities”, each 33.34 per cent of migrants have displaced for their last residential places due to the “job” and “low income” respectively. Of the 4 migrants, having left their birthplaces due to the low income, 50 per cent of migrants have afresh left from their last residential places due to the “low income” and 25 per cent of migrants for “family problem” and another 25 per cent of migrants for hard social control. Of the 32 migrants, those who displaced from their birth places due to the moved with family, 53.12 per cent of migrants have left from their last residential places due to the “no job” and 15.62 per cent of migrants for the “low income”. Of the 7 migrants, those who left from their last birthplaces due to the family problems, 71.42 per cent of migrants have left from their last residential places due to the “no job” and each 14.29 per cent of migrants have left from their last residential places due to the “droughts” and “personal reasons” respectively.

8 migrants, those who left from their birthplaces for marriage, after loosing their spouses once again they have displaced from their last residential places. Of the 6 migrants, having left from their birthplaces due to the job appointment each 33.33 per cent of migrants have left from their last residential places due to the “work contract finished” and “job transfer” respectively. Most of the migrants, having left from their birthplaces due to the hard social control or social conflict or affected by drought or affected by flood, have displaced from their last residential places due to the “occupational related reasons”.

## Age groups and reasons for coming to Tiruchirappalli city (Table No-6-16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous resident place at coming to Tiruch</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Better job</th>
<th>Better income</th>
<th>Moved with family</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Medical treatment</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Job Appointment</th>
<th>Job Transfer</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Total no of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23 (100%)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34 (100%)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI.17 Age groups and reasons for coming to Tiruchirappalli city

The Table No.6-16 presents the data about respondents’ age at the time of coming to Tiruchirappalli city and reasons for coming to Tiruchirappalli city. 57 rural migrants, those who came at the age group of 16-20, majority of migrants have migrated to Tiruchirappalli city for occupational purposes such as for job (22.81%); for better job (19.30%); for better income (35.09%); for business (3.51%) and job appointment (another 3.51%). Only each 5.26 per cent of migrants have migrated to Tiruchirappalli city for getting medical treatments and to educate children respectively. Similarly, at the age group of 21-25 years, most of the migrants have come to Tiruchirappalli city for the occupational purposes such as for job (12.50%); for better job (20.84%); for better income (37.50%); job appointments (8.33%) and job transfer (another 8.33%). Like wise, at the age group of 26-30 and 31-35 years, all the migrants have come to Tiruchirappalli city for occupational purposes. But, at the age groups of 36-40, 41-45 each one migrant has migrated to Tiruchirappalli city to educate their children and at the age group of 56-60 years one migrant has migrated to Tiruchirappalli city to get medical treatment.

Among urban migrants, at the age groups of 16-20, 21-25, 26-30, 31-35, 36-40 and 41-45 years, majority of migrants (75, 89.74, 91.89, 92.31, 60 and 100 per cent respectively) have migrated to Tiruchirappalli city for occupational purposes. At the age group of 56-60 years, one migrant has come to the Tiruchirappalli city for getting the medical treatments as well. From the above data, it is inferred that most of the migrants have come to the Tiruchirappalli city for their livelihood purposes than the secondary purposes.
### Causes for selecting and settling in particular places at Tiruchirappalli city (Table No-6-17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Residential Place</th>
<th>Causes for selecting Trichy</th>
<th>Causes for settling at the particular places at Trichirappalli City</th>
<th>Total No of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family members</td>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td>Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members</td>
<td>10 (76.93%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td>28 (71.80%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage contact</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own community people</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-villagers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Family members</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8 (28.58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage contact</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own community people</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI.18 Causes for selecting and settling in particular places at Tiruchirappalli city

The Table No.6-17 present the data about the causes for selecting and settling in particular places at Tiruchirappalli city. Major proportions of rural (ranging from 58.82 to 100 per cent) and urban (ranging from 28.57 to 83.33 per cent), those who migrated to Tiruchirappalli City due to the presence of their family members, relatives, friends, marriage contacts, own-community people, co-villagers and colleagues, have settled at the particular areas of Tiruchirappalli city for the same reasons. Very small percentages of rural (ranging from 5.13 to 25 per cent) and urban (ranging from 5 to 35.71 per cent) migrants have preferred to the particular areas at Tiruchirappalli city due to the affordable rent, lot of available business or job opportunities, sufficient transport facilities and close to the work place as well. This implies that although migrants of both groups are living in the city, they have closely aggregated with their primary groups.

VI.19 Summing up

The data on birthplaces of respondents show that each over nine-tenths of rural (95%) and urban (91%) migrants' birthplaces are situated within the state of Tamil Nadu. About two-thirds (62%) of rural and a little more than one-half (51%) of urban migrants have displaced from their birthplaces due to the social causes and a little more than one-fourth (26%) of rural and about one-thirds (31%) of urban migrants due to the economic causes. Further, the data on last residential places reveal that about three-fourths (72%) of rural migrants' last residential places are other rural areas of their own districts (36%) and rural areas of other districts within their own states (another 36%). Over one-half (57%) of urban migrants' last residential places are urban areas of other districts within their own states and about one-fourths (24%) other urban areas of their own districts. Over one-half (57.50%) of rural and two-thirds (67.02%) of urban migrants have displaced from their last residential
places because of the economic causes and over one-fourth (30.10%) of rural and a little more than one-fourth (26.35%) of urban migrants owing to the social causes.

About two-thirds (65%) of rural and over three-fourths (77%) of urban migrants have made one move before coming to Tiruchirappalli city. A little more than one-half (51%) of rural and over one-fourth (29%) of urban migrants have reported that some persons (except wife and children) have joined with them after coming to Tiruchirappalli city. In nutshell, 51 rural migrants have pulled 72 new persons and 29 urban migrants have allured 37 new persons. Above nine-tenths (91%) of rural migrants have migrated to Tiruchirappalli city at the age group of 16-30. Above four-fifths (89%) of urban migrants have migrated at the age group of 21-35. Each over four-fifths of rural (84%) and urban (88%) migrants have come to the Tiruchirappalli city for livelihood purposes. Above nine-tenths (92%) of rural and four-fifths of (80%) urban migrants have selected the Tiruchirappalli city as their destination places because of the presence of their family members, relatives, friends, co-villagers, own community people and marriage contacts. The data on information sources reveal that nine-tenths (92%) of rural and over three-fourths (77%) of urban migrants have acquired information about Tiruchirappalli city from their social network. About three-fourths (72%) of rural and above one-half (55%) of urban migrants have preferred to the particular areas at Tiruchirappalli city due to the presence of their social network.