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CHAPTER VII
FAMILY AND NUPTIAL STATUS

VII.1 Family and nuptial status

This chapter analyses the migrants’ family and nuptial status such as types of family, number of dependents at Tiruchirappalli city, age at marriage, reasons for high or low age at marriage, marriage occurrence, using contraceptive methods and number of children ever born etc. Further, in this chapter, the migrants, those who are not in the marital life at the time of survey namely unmarried (24 rural and 13 urban migrants) and marriage-broken migrants (6 rural and 10 urban migrants) are not included into the nuptial analyzing.

VII.2 Types of family of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Types of family of respondents</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>Joint family</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nuclear family</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Extended family</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Truncated family</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, the term “the types of family” indicates that the migrants’ existing family at Tiruchirappalli city. Although the nuclear families comprising of husband, wife and unmarried children, are prevalent in both rural and urban groups, the percentages of urban migrants, pertaining to nuclear families, are higher (67%) than the rural migrants (39%). On the contrary, the percentages of joint families comprising of husband, wife, married children, daughter-in-laws, grand sons, grand daughters and other relatives, are higher among rural migrants (21%) than the urban migrants (11%). Persons, having had their families at places of origin but residing alone in the Tiruchirappalli city, are considered to be members of the truncated families. 34 per cent of rural migrants are seemed to be the members of truncated families. But, only 10 per cent
VII.3 Number of dependents at Tiruchirappalli city

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Number of dependents</th>
<th>Respondents’ previous residential place</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at Tiruchy</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>38 (38%)</td>
<td>13 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>15 (15%)</td>
<td>48 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>25 (25%)</td>
<td>28 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>13 (13%)</td>
<td>6 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>9 (9%)</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the time of survey, 2 rural migrants’ wives have departed from Tiruchirappalli city to elsewhere for getting training. Another 2 rural migrants’ dependents have gone to other districts due to the job. Therefore, the above-mentioned four rural migrants with 34 truncated migrants, as a total of 38 per cent of rural migrants have not possessed any dependent at Tiruchirappalli city at the time of survey. 15 per cent of rural migrants have had 1-3 dependents and 25 per cent 4-6 dependents and 13 per cent 7-9 dependents. Only 9 per cent of rural respondents have had 10-12 dependents. With regard to urban respondents’ dependents, 3 members’ wards with their mothers have gone to other districts for getting education and one respondent’s wife has gone to other district due to the job transfer. Thus, the above-mentioned three urban migrants with the 10 truncated migrants, as a total of 13 per cent of urban migrants have not had any dependent at Tiruchirappalli city at the time of survey. 48 per cent of migrants have possessed 1-3 dependents. Thus, it highly varies to its counterparts. 28, 6 and 5 per cent of urban migrants with 4-6, 7-9 and 10-12 dependents respectively are residing at the study area. Barring nil dependents, the mean number of dependents is 5.77 (S.D.±2.947) for rural migrants and 3.90 (S.D.±2.537) for urban migrants.
VII.4 Marital status of the respondents

Distribution of the respondents by their marital status (Table No-7-3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>24 (24%)</td>
<td>13 (13%)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>70 (70%)</td>
<td>77 (77%)</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Widowers</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
<td>7 (7%)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 100 rural migrants 70 per cent of migrants are married persons, whereas 24 per cent are unmarried persons. 4 per cent of migrants are widowers. Only two migrants are separated persons. Among the 100 urban migrants, 77 per cent of migrants are married persons, whereas 13 per cent are unmarried persons. 7 per cent of migrants are widowers. Only three migrants are separated persons.

VII.5 Respondents' age at marriage

Distribution of the respondents by their marriage age groups (Table No-7-4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Respondents' marriage age groups</th>
<th>Respondents' previous residential place</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>4 (5.71%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>46 (65.71%)</td>
<td>7 (9.10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22-25</td>
<td>15 (21.43%)</td>
<td>12 (15.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26-29</td>
<td>4 (5.72%)</td>
<td>35 (45.46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30-33</td>
<td>1 (1.43%)</td>
<td>22 (28.57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>34-37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1.29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
<td>77 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without spouse</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean age at marriage of the rural migrants is 20.75 years (S.D.±8.458). But, the average age at marriage of the urban migrants is 27.40 years (S.D.±3.701). Hence, the present study arrived at a conclusion that the rural migrants have entered into the marriage bond very earlier than the urban migrants.
VII.6 Reasons for high age at marriage

Reasons for high age at marriage (Table No7-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Reasons for high age at marriage</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>Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (6.90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unavailability of job</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>3 (5.17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unavailability of good job</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6 (10.34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Can’t earn enough income</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
<td>7 (12.07%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Physical condition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1.73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Family burdens</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11 (18.97%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Waited for suitable persons</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (5.17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Waited for elders’ marriage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (6.90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Waited for sisters’ marriage</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>10 (17.24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>No standard income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6 (10.34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Personal reasons</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (5.17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
<td>58 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low marriage age</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without spouse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the comprehensive and profound analysis, the age at marriage 26 and above has been considered to be the high age at marriage in the present study. Of the 5 rural migrants, those who have had the high age at marriage, 60 per cent of migrants have referred “can’t earn enough income” to the high age at marriage. Each 20 per cent of migrants have mentioned that the reasons of “the unavailability of job” and “waited for sisters’ marriage” respectively for the high age at marriage. Of the 58 urban migrants, 18.97 and 17.24 per cent of migrants respectively have mentioned the reasons of “family burdens” and “waited for sisters’ marriage” to their high age at marriage. 12.07 per cent of migrants have married at high age due to the factor of “can’t earn enough income”. Each 10.34 per cent of migrants have married at their later age due to “the unavailability of good job” and “no standard income” respectively. Because of “the education” and “waited for elders’ marriage” each 6.90 per cent of migrants have put off their marriages respectively. Each 5.17 per cent of migrants have been lingered by the causes of “unavailability of job” and “waited for suitable persons” respectively. Only one migrant has put off his marriage
due to “the physical conditions”. 5.17 per cent of migrants have delayed their wedding owing to “personal reasons”. To sum up, among the urban migrants economic causes are at top (37.92%) followed by social (29.31%), socio-economic (24.14%) and to the least is educational (7%).

VII.7 Reasons for low age at marriage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Reasons for low age at marriage</th>
<th>Respondents’ previous residential place</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No or low education</td>
<td>Rural (30.77%) Urban (21.05%)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Parents’ pressure</td>
<td>Rural (41.54%) Urban (63.16%)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Society’s pressure</td>
<td>Rural (7.69%) Urban (5.26%)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Afraid of missing good persons</td>
<td>Rural (6.15%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>To give the way to younger</td>
<td>Rural (6.15%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Personal reasons</td>
<td>Rural (4.62%) Urban (10.53%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No idea</td>
<td>Rural (3.08%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Rural (100%) Urban (100%)</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High marriage age</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without spouse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the extensive analysis, the age at marriage up to 25 years has considered to be the low age at marriage in the present study. Due to “the parents’ pressure” 41.54 per cent of migrants, of the 65 rural migrants, have joined in the wedlock very early. “No or low education” that has forced 30.77 per cent of migrants to early entry in the marriage. Owing to “society’s pressure” namely, competition, scarcity for bride etc. 7.69 per cent of migrants have married at the low age. Each 6.15 per cent of migrants have referred to the causes of “afraid of missing good persons” and “to give the way to younger” to the low age at marriage. 4.62 per cent of migrants have mentioned the “personal reasons” to the low age at marriage. Only 3.08 per cent of migrants are reluctant to reveal any reason to their low age at marriage. Of the 19 urban migrants, 63.16 per cent of migrants have married earlier owing to “the parents’ pressure”. 21.05 per cent of migrants have joined in the wedlock because of “no or low education”. 10.53 per cent of migrants have mentioned “the personal reasons” for their low age at marriage. Only 5.26 per
cent of migrants have pointed out “the society’s pressure” for their low age at marriage. To sum up, among rural migrants social reasons are at top (65%) and to the least is educational (31%)

VII.8 Marriage occurrence

Distribution of the respondents by marriage occurrence (Table No7-7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Marriage occurrence</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>Before migration</td>
<td>49 (70%)</td>
<td>30 (38.96%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>After migration</td>
<td>21 (30%)</td>
<td>47 (61.04%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
<td>77 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without spouse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 70 rural migrants, 70 per cent of migrants’ marriage has occurred before coming to Tiruchirappalli city and 30 per cent after coming to Tiruchirappalli city. On the contrary, 61.04 per cent of urban migrants, of the 77 urban migrants, have taken the marriage after coming to the Tiruchirappalli city and only 38.96 per cent before coming to the Tiruchirappalli city. Thus, the marriage after migration occurs more in the case of urban migrants than the rural migrants.

VII.9 Spouses’ age at marriage

Distribution of respondents by their spouses’ marriage age groups (Table No7-8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Spouses’ marriage age groups</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>14-17</td>
<td>36 (51.43%)</td>
<td>4 (5.19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>30 (42.86%)</td>
<td>19 (24.68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22-25</td>
<td>3 (4.28%)</td>
<td>33 (42.86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26-29</td>
<td>1 (1.43%)</td>
<td>16 (20.78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30-33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (5.19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>34-37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1.30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
<td>77 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without spouse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean age at marriage is 17.73 years (S.D.=2.586) for rural spouses and 23.47 years (S.D.=3.673) for urban spouses. So, the rural spouses have entered into the marital life very
earlier than the urban spouses. This shows the unchanging trend of age at marriage of rural women.

VII.10 Spouses' previous residential places

**Distribution of respondents by their spouses’ previous residential places (Table No-7-9)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Spouses’ previous residential place</th>
<th>Respondents’ previous residential place</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural (90%)</td>
<td>Urban (37.66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural (10%)</td>
<td>Urban (62.34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
<td>77 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without spouse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 70 rural spouses, 90 per cent of spouses belonged to rural areas and 10 per cent to urban areas. Of the 77 urban spouses, 62.34 per cent of spouses have had urban areas as their previous residential places and 37.66 per cent rural areas.

VII.11 Desirable family size

**Desirable family size (Table No-7-10)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Desirable family size</th>
<th>Respondents’ previous residential place</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural (24.28%)</td>
<td>Urban (75.32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited (Up to 2)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unlimited (3 and above)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No idea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
<td>77 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without spouse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of 70 rural migrants, 74.29 per cent of migrants have not intended for limiting their family size. On the contrast, out of 77 urban migrants, 75.32 per cent of migrants have intended for limiting their family size. Only 1.43 and 5.20 per cent of rural and urban migrants respectively have not revealed any intention about their family size. Hence, it is concluded that urban migrants are keen on limiting their family size. On the other hand, rural migrants do not care to limit their family size.
VII.12 Reasons for limited family size

Reasons for limited family size (Table No-7-11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Reasons for limited family size</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>Better standard of living</td>
<td>3(17.65%)</td>
<td>10(17.24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Better education to children</td>
<td>5(29.41%)</td>
<td>16(27.59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To give better care to mothers</td>
<td>1(5.88%)</td>
<td>5(8.62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To give better care to children</td>
<td>3(17.65%)</td>
<td>6(10.35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>For sending remittance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3(5.17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Low earning job</td>
<td>3(17.65%)</td>
<td>5(8.62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>To lead a happy life</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5(8.62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>To avoid mothers’ inability to work</td>
<td>2(11.76%)</td>
<td>8(13.79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Wanted unlimited family</td>
<td>17(100%)</td>
<td>58(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No idea</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without spouse</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of the 17 rural migrants, 29.41 per cent of migrants have approved the small family size owing to “give better education to children”. Each 17.65 per cent of migrants have preferred to the small family size due to the following three causes of “better standard of living”, “to give better care to children” and “low earning job” respectively. 11.76 per cent of migrants have admitted the small family size due to “avoid the mothers’ (respondents’ wives) inability to work”. Only 5.88 per cent of migrants have favoured towards the cause of “giving better care to mothers” (respondents’ wives). Of the 58 urban migrants, 27.59 per cent of migrants have preferred to the small family size due to “give the better education to children”. For “the better standard of living” and “to avoid mothers’ (respondents’ wives) inability to work”, 17.24 and 13.79 percent of migrants have selected the small family size. “To give better care to children” has forced 10.35 per cent of migrants to choose the small family size. Each 8.62 per cent of migrants have adopted the small family size owing to “give better care to mother” (respondents’ wives), “low earning job” and “to lead a happy life” respectively. Only 5.17 per cent of migrants
have favored towards the small family size due to “remittance purpose”. To sum up, social reasons are at top (38.01%) and to the least is economic (20.78%).

VII.13 Reasons for unlimited family size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Reasons for unlimited family size</th>
<th>Respondents’ previous residential place</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>More children imply large income</td>
<td>Rural: 23 (44.23%) Urban: 2 (13.33%)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Old age support</td>
<td>Rural: 6 (11.54%) Urban: 3 (20%)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Greater social domination</td>
<td>Rural: 3 (5.77%) Urban: 2 (13.33%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To avoid reduction in caste, community members</td>
<td>Rural: 12 (23.08%) Urban: 6 (40%)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>To avoid the interference of sexual life</td>
<td>Rural: 4 (7.69%) Urban: 1 (6.67%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Unnatural</td>
<td>Rural: 4 (7.69%) Urban: 1 (6.67%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wanted limited family

| No idea | Rural: 1 | Urban: 4 | Grand total | 5 |
| Unmarried | Rural: 24 | Urban: 13 | Grand total | 37 |
| Without spouse | Rural: 6 | Urban: 10 | Grand total | 16 |

Grand total

| Total | Rural: 52 | Urban: 15 | Grand total | 67 |
| Wanted limited family | Total | Rural: 17 | Urban: 58 | 75 |
| No idea | Total | Rural: 1 | Urban: 4 | 5 |
| Unmarried | Total | Rural: 24 | Urban: 13 | 37 |
| Without spouse | Total | Rural: 6 | Urban: 10 | 16 |
| Grand total | Total | Rural: 100 | Urban: 100 | 200 |

As “more children may help for generating more income”, 44.23 per cent of migrants, of the 52 rural migrants, have preferred to the large family size. 23.08 per cent of migrants have adopted the large family size to “avoid the reduction of their caste or community members”. For the “old age support” 11.54 per cent of migrants have favoured towards the large family size. Each 7.69 per cent of migrants have desisted the small family size as it would “interfere their conjugal relationship” and also “unnatural” respectively. Only 5.77 per cent of migrants have admitted the large family size for “acquiring the greater domination in their society or groups”. Of the 15 urban migrants, 40 per cent of migrants have preferred to the large family “to avoid the reduction of their caste or community members”. 20 per cent of migrants have chosen the large family size for the “old age support”. Each 13.33 per cent of migrants have admitted the large family size “to earn more income from their wards” and “greater social domination” respectively. Each 6.67 per cent of migrants have discarded the small family size due to the
“unnatural” and “interference of conjugal relationship” respectively. To sum up, social causes are at top (55%) and to the least is economic (45%).

VII.14 Current practice on contraception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Now practicing any contraceptive method</th>
<th>Respondents’ previous residential place</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural (34.29%)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53 (68.83%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24 (34.29%)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>46 (65.71%)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 (31.17%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without spouse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentages of respondents, who have adopted the contraceptive methods at the time of survey, are 68.33 per cent in urban group and 34.29 per cent in rural group. From the above break up of data, it is distinctly observed that the adoption of the contraceptive methods is rife among urban migrants than the rural migrants.

VII.15 Currently using contraceptives methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Practicing contraceptive methods</th>
<th>Respondents’ previous residential place</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural (20.84%)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Condom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 (11.32%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>IUD</td>
<td>2 (8.33%)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 (20.75%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Orals pills</td>
<td>1 (4.17%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (7.55%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Safe period</td>
<td>2 (8.33%)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 (13.21%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Withdrawal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1.89%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Abstinence</td>
<td>2 (8.33%)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 (9.43%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vasectomy</td>
<td>3 (12.50%)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (5.66%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tubectomy</td>
<td>9 (37.50%)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 (30.19%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24 (100%)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not practicing</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Without spouse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for the terminal methods, 30.19 and 37.50 per cent of urban and rural spouses respectively have adopted the tubectomy method. 12.50 and 5.66 per cent of rural and urban migrants respectively have been sterilized by the vasectomy method. With regard to the natural
methods, 13.21 per cent of urban spouses have practiced the safe period method. But, it has been followed by very limited rural spouses (8.33%). 7.55 per cent of urban spouses have used oral pills to desist the conception. The share of this method is very meager among rural spouses. Only 4.17 per cent of rural spouses have utilized this method. The other two natural methods namely abstinence and withdrawal have been practiced by 9.43 and 1.89 per cent of migrants respectively. But, these methods are followed by very limited rural migrants (nil per cent for withdrawal and 8.33 per cent for abstinence). As for the conventional methods, 20.75 per cent of urban spouses have adopted the IUD. But, only 8.33 per cent of rural spouse have practiced this method at the time of survey. There is not much difference among rural and urban migrants in using the condom. 11.32 and 20.84 per cent of urban and rural migrants have utilized the condom as a contraceptive method.

### VII.16 Reasons for not practicing the contraceptive methods

**Reasons for not practicing the contraceptive methods (Table No-7-15)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Reasons for not practicing the contraceptive methods</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>Sin</td>
<td>4 (8.70%)</td>
<td>1 (4.17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Against religion</td>
<td>5 (10.87%)</td>
<td>2 (8.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Children are god’s gift</td>
<td>2 (4.35%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not interested</td>
<td>5 (10.87%)</td>
<td>2 (8.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>3 (6.52%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Not known how to use</td>
<td>9 (19.57%)</td>
<td>1 (4.17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Costly</td>
<td>3 (6.52%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Wanted more number of children</td>
<td>3 (6.52%)</td>
<td>1 (4.17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Wanted specific sex of children</td>
<td>1 (2.17%)</td>
<td>1 (4.17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>No need at this stage</td>
<td>10 (21.74%)</td>
<td>7 (29.16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yet no baby</td>
<td>1 (2.17%)</td>
<td>6 (25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Practicing | 46 (100%) | 24 (100%) | 70  |
| Unmarried        | 24        | 53        | 77  |
| Without spouse   | 24        | 13        | 37  |
| Grand total      | 6         | 10        | 16  |

Of the 46 rural migrants, 21.74 per cent of migrants have not used any contraceptive method due to “the old age”. 19.57 per cent of migrants have not adopted any method due to “the
ignorance of utilizing”. 10.87 per cent of migrants have deemed that the utilizing of contraceptive methods as “against their religion”. The next group of 8.70 per cent migrants have deemed that the using contraceptive methods as “sin”. Due to “the fear”, “costly” and “interest in more children” are the reasons for which each 6.52 per cent of migrants have not utilized any method. The belief of “children by god’s gift” is a reason for 4.35 per cent of migrants who have averted the contraceptive methods. Of the 24 urban migrants, 29.16 per cent of migrants, who crossed the age of 45 years, have not utilized any contraceptive method due to “the old age”. The contraceptive methods are unnecessary for the 25 per cent of “barren” urban migrants. Due to the “fear” and “against religion” 12.5 and 8.33 per cent of urban migrants have not practiced any method. Another 8.33 per cent of migrants have “not interested” in using any method.

VII.17 Migrants’ reproductive behaviour

The data on previous residential places of migrants reveal that Tiruchirappalli city is influenced by the migrants having hailed from both rural and urban areas. As the reproductive behaviour of rural people totally differs from the reproductive behaviour of urban people, it is necessary to scrutinize the migrants’ reproductive behaviour in order to find out that among the migrants, which migrants, (whether rural migrants or urban migrants) have produced more number of children and why? This would help us to amend the migration as well fertility policies.

Here, the present study has to remember a significant point that our society is a patriarchal society in which not only the status of housewives but also the status of working women is very deplorable. Most of the women are devoid of any decisiveness. They have to act in accordance with their husbands’ decrees. The milieu is very worst in the reproductive behaviour that is mostly dominated by the husbands or mother in laws and the women have to
act as live machines to give birth to children. For instance, just after the wedlock husbands or mother in laws or relatives in the family often devolve tremendous pressure on young wives to have children as soon as possible and thus accomplish the traditional role of motherhood. Taking into the consideration of the role of males on reproductive behaviour, here the present study has made an attempt to study the reproductive behaviour of male migrants as well as their consorts.

Human reproduction is unique in a sense that even though it is mostly biological but the performance of which is greatly determined by the socio-economic and demographic factors such as age, religion, community, education, income, occupation and age at marriage. By studying these factors, it could be inferred that the diverse behaviour of reproduction. Further, leaving 24 rural and 13 urban unmarried migrants this part presents the reproductive behaviour of 76 rural and 86 urban migrants respectively (including of 6 rural and 10 urban marriage-broken migrants) those who have sibling at the time of survey.

VII.17.1 Religion and fertility

In religious countries like India, religions have a strong effect on fertility. For instance, Hindus by and large practice monogamy. Further, Hindu religion that does not permit the couples to copulate during certain auspicious times in the year by separating them temporally, which may contribute some what to lowering fertility. On the other hand, Musilm religion that galvanizes polygamy among its religious members and ritual abstinence is also very low, which may result in higher fertility levels. M.E. Khan and Bella C. Patel (1995) have found that total fertility rate of Muslims ranged between 5.6 and 5.9 as compared with 4.3 and 5.2 among Hindus.110

---

Religion and fertility (Table No-7-16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents’ previous residential place</th>
<th>Respondents’ religion</th>
<th>Number of children ever born</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
<th>Average CEB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>1 1 8 16 14 10 4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>- - 2 3 3 3 1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christians</td>
<td>- - 1 1 3 1 -</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jains</td>
<td>- - 2 1 - - -</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Unmarried</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 13 22 20 14 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>4 7 30 10 12 2 -</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>- - - 3 2 1 -</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christians</td>
<td>2 1 5 2 2 - -</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jains</td>
<td>- - 3 - - - -</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Unmarried</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rural: Calculated chi square value: 11.753 df: 24 Table value for $X^2_{0.05}$: 36.4
Urban: Calculated chi square value: 18.623 df: 20 Table value for $X^2_{0.05}$: 31.4

Standardized average number of children ever born of the three majority religions (Hindus, Muslims and Christians) is found to be 3.61, 3.83 and 3.66 respectively in the rural group and 2.38, 3.66 and 2.08 respectively in the urban group. Religion-wise, rural migrants have had higher average number of children ever born than the urban migrants. As the calculated Chi square values are less than the table values in both rural and urban groups, the null hypothesis, “Religion and reproductive behaviour are not associated” is accepted.

VII.17.2 Community and fertility

In a stratified society, where many races, castes and other such social groups exist, the fertility differs. S.N. Agarwala (1972) found that the FC communities (such as Brahmins, Jats) had lower levels of fertility than the MBC and SC/ST communities (such as Bhangiour, Chamer)

Community and fertility (Table No-7-17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents' previous residential place</th>
<th>Respondents' community</th>
<th>Number of children ever born</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
<th>Average CEB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>0 1 4 2 - - -</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>1 6 5 4 3 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>- - 7 11 6 -</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>- 3 5 4 4 3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>- 3 1 1 1 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Unmarried</td>
<td>1 1 13 22 20 14 5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>- 3 6 - - - -</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>5 5 25 14 4 1 -</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>1 3 1 5 - -</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>- 5 - 4 1 -</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>- - 3 1 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Unmarried</td>
<td>6 8 39 15 16 3 -</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rural: Calculated chi square value: 40.972 df: 24 Table value for $X^2_{0.05}$: 36.4

Urban: Calculated chi square value: 47.858 df: 20 Table value for $X^2_{0.05}$: 31.4

Though the average number of children ever born of (ST) community is high in the both groups, urban ST migrants have given birth to the more children (4.25) than the rural ST migrants (4.00). Further the average number of children ever born of SC; MBC and BC communities is 3.95; 3.96 and 3.20 respectively in rural group 3.10, 2.90 and 2.16 in urban group. The average number of children ever born is low in the community of FC in both rural (2.14) and urban (1.67) groups. Community-wise, rural migrants (except ST clique of urban)

have had higher average number of children ever born than the urban migrants. As the calculated
chi square values are higher than the table values in rural and urban groups, the null hypothesis,
“Children ever born do not depend on community” is rejected. Hence, children ever born depend
on community.

VII.17.3 Educational level of the respondents and fertility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents’ previous residential place</th>
<th>Respondents’ education</th>
<th>Number of children ever born</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
<th>Average CEB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Illiterates</td>
<td>2 5 3 1 2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>- - 3 5 5 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>- - 5 5 4 -</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>- - 6 5 5 4 1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher secondary</td>
<td>1 1 1 2 - - -</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>- - 1 2 - - -</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>- - 3 1 - - -</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1 1 13 22 20 14 5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>- - - - - - 2 - - -</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>- - 1 - - - 3 -</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>- 1 - 2 5 - -</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>- 1 1 4 5 - -</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher secondary</td>
<td>1 - 3 6 3 - -</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>2 - 3 2 1 - -</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>2 3 16 - - -</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-graduates</td>
<td>- 1 6 - - - -</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional studies</td>
<td>1 2 9 1 - - -</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6 8 39 15 16 3 -</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>- - - - - - -</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rural: Calculated chi square value: 54.340 df: 36 Table value for $X^2_{0.05}$: 51
Urban: Calculated chi square value: 135.195 df: 40 Table value for $X^2_{0.05}$: 55.8

Although it is distinctly clear that unlettered women of both rural and urban groups have
possessed more number of children than the others, the average number of children is high in
urban group (4.00) than the rural group (3.69). The average number of children ever born of
primary, middle, high school, higher secondary and diploma educational levels is 4.40, 3.93,
3.47; 2.33 and 2.60 respectively in the rural group and 4.25, 3.38, 3.18, 2.77 and 2.00 respectively in urban group. The average number of children ever born is low among higher educated migrants of both groups (2.25 for rural graduates and 1.67, 1.86 and 1.77 for the urban graduates, post graduates and professional degree holders respectively). Educational level-wise, rural migrants (except illiterate clique of urban) have had higher average number of children ever born than the urban migrants. As the calculated chi square values are higher than the table values in rural and urban groups, the null hypothesis, “There is no association between education and children ever born” is rejected. Hence, there is association between education and children ever born.

VII.17.4 Total household income and fertility

An inverse relationship between total household income and fertility is found in the literature. Pillai and Namboothri (1972) in a study of a rural area in Madurai district found an inverse association between income level and fertility in that fertility was highest among the low paid agricultural labours and lowest among the owners of land and tenants of cultivators. It has also been found in some survey in India that the total number of children ever born declines with an increase in per capita expenditure of the household. The total household income here refers to the cumulative monthly income of respondents [such as respondents’ income, additional income and spouses’ income (if working)]. The main findings indicate that persons with low total household income have the highest fertility and persons with high total household income have the lowest fertility.

The higher average number of children has been found to be 3.88, 3.11 and 3.00 in rural group and 2.96, 2.52 in urban group to the migrants who have the monthly income of Rs. Up to 5000/-, Rs. 5001-10000/- and Rs. 10001-15000/- respectively. The low average number of children ever born has been found to be 3.28, 2.33 and 2.00 in rural group and 2.08, 2.50, 2.25 and 2.00 in urban group to the migrants who have had the higher monthly income of Rs. 15001-20000/-, Rs. 20001-25000/-, Rs. 30001-35000/- and Rs. 25001-30000/- respectively. Income level-wise rural migrants (barring the income cliques of Rs. 25001-30000/- and Rs. 30001-35000/-) rural migrants have had higher average number of children ever born than the urban migrants. As the calculated Pearson correlation (r) value is -.328 (P less than 0.01) for rural group and -.235 (P less than 0.05) for urban group, the null hypothesis, “Increasing household income does not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents’ previous residential place</th>
<th>Total household income (Rs.)</th>
<th>Number of children ever born</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
<th>Average CEB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 5000</td>
<td>1 - 2 17 16 11 4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001-10000</td>
<td>- 1 3 1 3 - 1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10001-15000</td>
<td>- - 2 2 - 1 -</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15001-20000</td>
<td>- - 3 1 1 2 -</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20001-25000</td>
<td>- - 2 1 - - -</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25001-30000</td>
<td>- - 1 - - - -</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1 1 13 22 20 14 5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 3 5 7 9 2 -</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 5000</td>
<td>1 3 5 7 9 2 -</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001-10000</td>
<td>2 1 8 5 4 1 -</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10001-15000</td>
<td>3 - 6 - - - -</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15001-20000</td>
<td>- 2 8 1 1 - -</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20001-25000</td>
<td>- - 3 - 1 - -</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25001-30000</td>
<td>- 2 2 2 - - -</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30001-35000</td>
<td>- - 7 - 1 - -</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6 8 39 15 16 3 -</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson correlation: Rural: -.328 P less than 0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban: -.235 P less than 0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
decrease the number of children even born” is rejected. Hence, increasing household income
decreases the number of children ever born.

VII. 17.5 Age at marriage of the respondents and fertility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents’ previous residential place</th>
<th>Respondents’ marriage age groups</th>
<th>Number of children ever born</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
<th>Average CEB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural 14-17</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 1 - - -</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural 18-21</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 6 13 14 9 3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural 22-25</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 7 3 2 - - -</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural 26-29</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 1 - - - -</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural 30-33</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 - - - - -</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unmarried</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 12 22 19 12 3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban 18-21</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 4 1 - -</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban 22-25</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 5 3 1 - -</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban 26-29</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 4 17 4 5 - -</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban 30-33</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 16 4 - - - -</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban 34-37</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - - - - - -</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unmarried</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 8 35 14 12 2 -</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson correlation Rural: -.391 P less than 0.01 Urban: -.414 P less than 0.01

The rural migrants having taken in the marriage at their early age groups of 14-17, 18-21
and 21-25 have had high average number of children ever born 4.00, 3.71 and 3.21 respectively.
Likewise, higher average number of children ever born has been found to be 3.71, 2.92 and 2.00
among urban migrants who have joined in the marriage life at their early age groups of 18-21, 22-25
and 26-29 respectively. At the marriage age cliques of 26-29 and 30-33 urban migrants (2.00 and 2.09 respectively) have had more number of children than the rural migrants (1.75 and 2.00 respectively), as these age cliques have formed to be the prime marriage age cliques for the urban migrants to step into the nuptial life. By contrast, these age cliques have formed to be the rare marriage age cliques for the rural migrants. As the calculated Pearson correlation value is -
.358 for rural group and .-426 for urban group (P less than 0.01), the null hypothesis, “Decreasing age at marriage does not increase the number of children ever born” is rejected. Hence, decreasing age at marriage increases the number of children ever born.

VII.17.6 Age at marriage of the spouses and fertility

United Nations, Mysore Population Studies (1961) found that females marrying between the age of 14 and 17 give birth to 5.9 children while those marrying between the age of 18 and 21 give birth to 4.7 children. Puvanarajan (2002) found that the mean number of children ever born to Sri Lankan Tamil Women, those who married before the age of 20 is 4.55 and it is 2.86 for the women, those who married after the age of 20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marriage age groups of the spouses and fertility (Table No-7-21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents' previous residential place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without spouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without spouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson correlation Rural: -.358 P less than 0.01 Urban: -.426 P less than 0.01

In rural group, high average number of children ever born has been found to be 3.92, 3.10 and 3.00 to the migrants those who married at the early marriage age groups of 14-17, 18-21 and 22-25 and low average number of children ever born has been found to be 2.00 to the migrants those who married at the high marriage age group of 26-29. In urban migrants, those who have had the low marriage age groups of 14-17, 18-21 and 22-25 have had high average number of children ever born (3.50, 3.05 and 2.12 respectively). Migrants, those who married at the high marriage age group of 30-33 and 34-37, have had low average number of children ever born (each 2.00 respectively). Age at marriage-wise; rural migrants (barring marriage age groups of 30-33 and 34-37 of urban group) have had higher average number of children ever born than the urban migrants. As the calculated Pearson correlation (r) value is -.358 for rural migrants and -.426 for urban migrants (P less than 0.01), the null hypothesis, “Increasing age at marriage does not decrease the number of children ever born” is rejected. Hence, increasing age at marriage decreases the number of children ever born.

VII.17.7 Educational level of the spouse and fertility

The sixteenth round of National Sample Survey (1967) brought out a clear cut relationship between the educational attainment of the married urban women and their completed family size that was 6.10 and 6.32 for the illiterates, for those whose educational did not go beyond the primary school level and for those who had completed their primary school educational and for those who had the secondary school education the average family size was 4.25 and 2.62 respectively. Kazerooni et al. (2000) found that among the women in Shiraz, the mean number of children born to illiterate women was 6.76. The figure was 3.36 for women.

with a high school or university education.\textsuperscript{117} David Shapiro and Olenko Tambašhe (1997) found that women in Kinshasa, with upper level secondary schooling or university education have distinctly lower numbers of children ever born when compared to other women.\textsuperscript{118}

### Educational Level of the Spouses and Fertility (Table No-7-22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents' previous residential place</th>
<th>Spouses' education</th>
<th>Number of children ever born</th>
<th>Tota no. of respondents</th>
<th>Average CBE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Illiterates</td>
<td>- 1 2 3 4 5 4 3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>- - 5 6 5 -</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>- 1 4 6 5 3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>- - 3 4 2 -</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher secondary</td>
<td>1 - 4 2 1 -</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-graduates</td>
<td>- - - 1 - - -</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Unmarried Without spouse Grand total</td>
<td>1 1 12 22 19 12 3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Illiterates</td>
<td>- - - 3 - -</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>- - 1 - 1 2 -</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>- - 1 5 5 -</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>- - 1 3 1 -</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher secondary</td>
<td>2 2 6 4 2 -</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>1 2 3 - - -</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>2 2 9 1 - - -</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-graduates</td>
<td>- - 5 1 - - -</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional studies</td>
<td>1 2 9 - - - -</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Unmarried Without spouse Grand total</td>
<td>6 8 35 14 12 2 -</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rural: Calculated chi square value: 39.988 df: 30 Table value for $X^2_{0.05}$: 43.8
Urban: Calculated chi square value: 100.08 df: 40 Table value for $X^2_{0.05}$: 55.8

The higher average number of children ever born has been found in the illiterate cliques of both groups (4.24 in rural group and 4.00 in urban group). The average number of children ever born to the semi-educational cliques of primary, middle, high school and higher secondary has formed to be 4.00, 3.26, 2.89 and 2.25 respectively in rural group and 4.00, 3.36, 2.40 and 2.13 respectively in urban group. Further, the higher educational urban migrants have had the very low average number of children ever born than the others (1.33 for diploma holders, 1.64 for graduates; 2.16 for post-graduates and 1.66 for professional degree holders). In the primary and middle school cliques urban migrants have outweighed the rural migrants with more number of children. By contrast, in high school and higher secondary cliques rural migrants have produced more number of children than the urban migrants. As the calculated chi square value is less than the table value in the rural group, the null hypothesis, “spouses’ educational level and number of children ever born are not associated” is accepted. On the other hand, as the calculated chi square value is higher than the table value in urban group, the null hypothesis, “Spouses educational level and number of children ever born are not associated” is rejected. Hence, spouses’ educational level and number of children ever born are associated.

VII.17.8 Occupation and children ever born

Agarwala found that cultivators and labourers had, on an average, 7.4 children, and those who reported their occupation as “service” and those who were professionals had, on an average, 6.6 children.\(^{119}\) Driver’s findings indicated that the wives of unskilled workers, agriculturists and artisans had higher fertility than the wives of clerks.\(^{120}\)

### Rural migrants' present occupation and children ever born (Table No-7-23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural migrants’ present occupations</th>
<th>Number of children ever born</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
<th>Average CEB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business employers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried artisans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed artisans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried white-collars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed white-collars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried blue-collars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed blue-collars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed production edible things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed production non-edible things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coolies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street vendors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons living in pension or remittances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unmarried</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculated chi-square value: 107.035  df: 78  Table value for $X^2_{0.05}$: 99.8

In business, employees (3.40) have had higher average number of children ever born than the employers (3.10). Among artisans, self-employed artisans (3.0) have had higher average number of children ever born than the salaried artisans (2.50). But, among white-collars, salaried white-collars (3.00) have possessed higher average number of children ever born than the self-employed white-collars (2.00). Similarly, among blue-collars salaried blue-collars (3.75) have had higher average number of children than the self-employed blue-collars (3.50). Among low-paid jobs, service workers (4.18) have had higher average number of children ever born than the coolies (3.85) and street vendors (3.43). As the calculated chi square value is higher than the...
table value, the null hypothesis, “There is no relationship between occupation and number of children ever born” is rejected. Hence, there is a relationship between occupation and number of children ever born.

### Urban migrants’ present occupations and children ever born (Table No-7-24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban migrants’ present occupations</th>
<th>Number of children ever born</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
<th>Average CEB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business employers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried artisans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed artisans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried white-collars</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed white-collars</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried blue-collars</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed blue-collars</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed production non-edible things</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coolies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street vendors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons living in interest or remittances person</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculated chi square value: 100.778  df: 65  Table value for $X^2_{0.05}$: 84.8

In business, employees (2.33) have had higher average number of children ever born than the employers (2.27). Among artisans, self-employed artisans (2.43) have had higher average number of children ever born than salaried artisans (2.33). Similarly, among white-collars, salaried white-collars (1.71) have possessed higher average number of children ever born than self-employed white-collars (1.67). Further, among blue-collars salaried blue-collars (3.67) have possessed higher average number of children ever born than the self-employed blue-collars (3.00). Among low-paid jobs, coolies (4.00) and service workers (another 4.00) have had higher average number of children ever born than the street vendors (3.00). As the calculated chi square
value is higher than the table value, the null hypothesis, “There is no relationship between occupation and number of children ever born” is rejected. Hence, there is a relationship between occupation and number of children ever born.

### VII.17.9 Years in migration and children ever born

**Years in migration children ever born (Table No-7-25)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents' previous residential place</th>
<th>Respondents' years in migration</th>
<th>Number of children ever born</th>
<th>Total no of respondents</th>
<th>Average CEB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1 - 3 14 16 10 4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>- - 1 2 1 - -</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>- 1 2 - - - -</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>- - 2 2 2 2 -</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>- - 2 1 1 - 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>- - 4 1 - 1 -</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unmarried</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 13 22 20 14 5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>5 5 9 9 8 1 -</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>1 - 10 3 4 2 -</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>- 2 7 2 2 - -</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>- - 4 1 - - -</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>- - 2 1 - - -</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>- - 7 - - - -</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unmarried</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 8 39 15 16 3 -</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson correlation  
Rural: -.269  
Urban: -.061

Among rural migrants, the average number of children ever born is high in the duration of staying of 1-5 years (3.88) that is followed by the other duration of staying of 16-20 years (3.50); 21-25 years (3.40); 6-10 years (3.00) and 11-15 years (2.80). The average number of children ever born is low in the duration of 26-30 years (2.00). Further, among urban migrants the average number of children ever born is high in the duration of staying of 6-10 years (2.75) that is followed by the other duration of staying of 21-25 years (2.60), 1-5 years (2.35); 11-15 years (2.30) and 16-20 years (2.20). Moreover, the average number of children ever born is
low in the duration of staying of 26-30 years (2.00). Duration of staying-wise, rural migrants have had higher average number of children ever born than the urban migrants. As the calculated Pearson correlation value \( r \) is -.269 \( (P < 0.05) \), in rural group, the null hypothesis, “Years in migration and number of children ever born are independent” is rejected. Hence, years in migration and number of children ever born are associated. On the other hand, as the calculated Pearson correlation value is -.061 (not significant) in urban group, the null hypothesis, years in migration and number of children ever born are independent” is accepted.

**VII.18 Completed family size**

Children ever born provide information on average number of children born per married woman up to a certain age. But, the average number of children born compiled for women, those who are beyond the reproductive ages, is known as completed family size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed family size of the rural migrants (Table No-7-26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spouses’ age groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without spouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the spouses of rural migrants, the average number of children ever born for currently married women in the age groups of 16-20; 21-25; 26-30; 31-35; 36-40 and 41-45 is 3.00; 3.59; 3.33; 3.40; 3.66 and another 3.66 respectively. For the women 46 years and above were 3.20, which may be considered as the completed family size of rural migrants.
Completed family size of the urban migrants (Table No-7-27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spouses’ age groups</th>
<th>Number of children ever born</th>
<th>Total no. of spouses</th>
<th>Average CEB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 and above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unmarried</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the spouses of urban migrants, the average number of children ever born for currently married women in the age group of 21-25, 26-30, 31-35, 36-40 and 41-45 is 2.88, 2.11, 2.26, 2.55 and 1.80 respectively. For the women 46 years and above were 2.45, which may be considered as the completed family size of urban migrants. From the above discussion, it could be distinctly pointed out that urban migrants’ completed family size (2.45) is certainly lower than the rural migrants’ completed family size (3.20).

VII.19 Linear regression analysis

Combined estimate of parameters and test statistics of linear regression analysis (Table No-7-28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Regression co-efficient (β)</th>
<th>Std. error</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>significance</th>
<th>r square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Religion&lt;sup&gt;u&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>-1.156</td>
<td>.250&lt;sup&gt;+&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Community&lt;sup&gt;u&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>7.041</td>
<td>.000&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Respondents’ education&lt;sup&gt;0&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.367</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-10.370</td>
<td>.000&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Total household income</td>
<td>-.279</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>-5.005</td>
<td>.000&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Respondents’ age at marriage</td>
<td>-.641</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-8.350</td>
<td>.000&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Spouses’ age at marriage</td>
<td>-.663</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>-8.061</td>
<td>.000&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Spouses’ education&lt;sup&gt;0&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.362</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-10.671</td>
<td>.000&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Respondents’ occupation&lt;sup&gt;u&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>6.085</td>
<td>.000&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Previous residential place&lt;sup&gt;0&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.1178</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>-6.103</td>
<td>.000&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Years in migration</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>-2.209</td>
<td>.029&lt;sup&gt;**&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>0</sup>Values are given to variables according to the number of children ever born (See Annexure-III)
Dependent variable: Children ever born
* Significant at 1 per cent level  ** Significant at 5 per cent level  + Not significant
Religion, as a variable, has a negative sign (-.124) and the coefficient is not statistically significant. Community, as a variable, has a positive sign (.614) and the regression coefficient is statistically significant at 1 per cent level. Further, r square value is 0.235. It indicates that the linear trend line obtained provides 23.5 per cent of precision which means that 23.5 per cent of variability in the dependent variable (average number of children ever born) is explained by the independent variable (community). Education of the respondents, as a variable, (-.367) appears to have a strong negative influence on average number of children ever born. Further, the r square value is 0.400. It indicates that 40 per cent of precision which means that 40 per cent of variability in the dependent variable (average number children ever born) is explained by the independent variable (education of the respondents). Total household income of the respondents, as a variable, has a negative association (-.279) with average number of children ever born. Further, the r square value is 0.135. It indicates that 13.5 per cent of precision which means that 13.5 per cent of variability in the dependent variable (average number of children ever born) is explained by the independent variable (total household income). Age at marriage of the respondents, as a variable, has strong negative sign (-0.641) and the coefficient is statistically significant at 1 per cent level. Moreover, the r square value is 0.325. It indicates that the linear trend line obtained provides 32.5 per cent of precision, which means that 32.5 per cent variability in the dependent variable is explained by the independent variable. Age at marriage of the spouses, as a variable, has a strong negative sign (-.663) and the coefficient is statically significant at 1 per cent level. Moreover, the r square value is 0.309. It indicates that the linear trend line obtained provides 30.9 per cent of precision which means that 30.9 per cent of variability in the dependent variable is explained by the independent variable. Educational level of spouses, as a variable, has a negative sign (-.362) and statistically significant at 1 per cent
level. Moreover, the $r$ square value is 0.440, which means that 44 per cent of variability in the dependent variable is explained by the independent variable. Regression results show that occupation of the respondents has a strong positive effect on fertility (.143) and significant at the 1 per cent level. Further, the $r$ square value is 0.187. It indicates that the linear trend obtained provides 18.7 per cent of precision which means that 18 per cent of variability in the dependent variable is explained by the independent variable. The previous residential place of respondents, as a variable, has a negative sign (-1.178) and the coefficient is statistically significant at 1 per cent level. Further $r$ square value is 0.188. It indicates that the linear trend line obtained provides 18.8 per cent of precision which means that 18.8 per cent of variability in the dependent variable is explained by the independent variable. Years in migration, as a variable, has a negative sign (-1.41) and the coefficient is significant at the 5 per cent level.

**VII.20 Migrants' age at marriage**

The data on reproductive behaviour of migrants reveal that the influence of age at marriage on reproductive behaviour is very strong. Hence, this part tries to study the age at marriage of the migrants by some deciding factors of age at marriage such as religion, community, education, marriage occurrence and occupation. By studying these factors, it is inferred that which factors are responsible for the low age at marriage? and which factors are responsible for high age at marriage?. For this purpose, this part has taken only the migrants, those who are in the marital life at the time of survey, for analyzing and has carefully desisted the unmarried migrants and marriage-broken migrants such as widowers and separated migrants, as analyzing these marriage-broken migrants might have been futile.
VII.20.1 Religion and age at marriage

**Religion and age at marriage (Table No-7-29)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents' previous residential place</th>
<th>Respondents' religion</th>
<th>Respondents' marriage age groups</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
<th>Average marriage age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>22-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sikhs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jains</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Unmarried</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Urban                                  | Hindus                | -     | 2     | 7     | 28    | 18    | 1     | 56 | 28.14 |
|                                        | Muslims               | -     | 4     | -     | 1     | 1     | -     | 6  | 22.83 |
|                                        | Christians            | -     | -     | 2     | 6     | 3     | -     | 11 | 27.86 |
|                                        | Sikhs                 | -     | -     | -     | 1     | -     | -     | 1  | 23.50 |
|                                        | Jains                 | -     | 1     | 2     | -     | -     | -     | 3  | 22.16 |
|                                        | Total Unmarried       | -     | 7     | 12    | 35    | 22    | 1     | 77 | -     |
|                                        | Without spouse        |       |       |       |       |       |       | 13 | -     |
|                                        | Grand total           |       |       |       |       |       |       | 10 | -     |

Rural: - Calculated chi square value : 29.724  df : 16  Table value for $X^2_{0.05}$ : 26.3
Urban :- Calculated chi square value : 43.19  df : 16  Table value for $X^2_{0.05}$ : 26.3

Barring Sikhs and Jains, among rural migrants the mean age at marriage is high in Hindu religion (20.72 yrs) that is followed by Muslim religions (19.83 yrs). The mean age at marriage is low in Christian religion (19.50 yrs). Further, as like the rural migrants the mean age at marriage is high in Hindu religion (28.14 yrs) among urban migrants that is followed by Christian religion (27.86 yrs). The mean age at marriage is low in Muslim religion (22.83 yrs).

Religion-wise, (barring Sikhs and Jains) rural migrants’ age at marriage is lower than the urban migrants’ age at marriage. As the calculated chi square values are higher than the table values in both rural and urban groups, the null hypothesis, “Age at marriage is uniformly distributed over the religions” is rejected. Hence, age at marriage is not uniformly distributed over the religions.
### VII.20.2 Community and age at marriage

#### Community and age at marriage (Table No-7-30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents' previous residential place</th>
<th>Respondents’ community</th>
<th>Respondents’ marriage age groups</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
<th>Average marriage age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>22-25</td>
<td>26-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried Without spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried Without spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rural: Calculated chi square value: 46.73  df: 16  Table value for $X^2_{0.05}$: 26.3
Urban: Calculated chi square value: 29.351  df: 16  Table value for $X^2_{0.05}$: 26.3

Among rural migrants, the mean age at marriage is high in FC community (25.50 yrs) that is followed by BC community (20.76 yrs) and MBC community (20.59 yrs). The mean age at marriage is low in the ST community (18.83 yrs) and SC community (19.97 yrs). Further, among urban migrants, as like the rural migrants, the mean age at marriage is also high in FC community (28.00 yrs) that is followed by BC community (27.73 yrs), MBC community (27.50 yrs) and SC community (26.92 yrs). The mean age at marriage is low in ST community (22.50 yrs). Community-wise, rural migrants’ age at marriage is lower than the urban migrants’ age at marriage. As the calculated chi square values are higher than the table values in rural and urban groups, the null hypothesis, “There is no significant difference between the five communities in
the age at marriage” is rejected. Hence, there is a significant difference between the five communities in the age at marriage.

VII.20.3 Educational level and age at marriage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents’ previous residential place</th>
<th>Respondents’ educations</th>
<th>Respondents’ marriage age groups</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
<th>Average marriage age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Illiterates</td>
<td>2 9 - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>- 12 2 - -</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle school</td>
<td>2 9 3 - -</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>- 12 6 1 -</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher secondary</td>
<td>- 3 1 1 -</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>- 1 2 - -</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>- - 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unmarried</td>
<td>4 46 15 4 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Illiterates</td>
<td>- 1 - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>- 1 2 - -</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle school</td>
<td>- 2 4 - -</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>- 2 1 6 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher secondary</td>
<td>- 1 3 5 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>- - 1 5 -</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>- - - 4 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduates</td>
<td>- - - - 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional studies</td>
<td>- - - 2 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unmarried</td>
<td>- 7 12 35 22 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural: Calculated chi square value:</td>
<td>47.274</td>
<td>df: 24</td>
<td>Table value for $X^2_{0.05}$: 36.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban: Calculated chi square value:</td>
<td>73.005</td>
<td>df: 32</td>
<td>Table value for $X^2_{0.05}$: 46.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among rural migrants, illiterates have had the very lower mean age at marriage (19.50 yrs) than the others. In the semi-educated groups, the migrants who studied up to primary (20.07 yrs) and middle school (19.79 yrs) have the lower mean age at marriage than the migrants who studied up to high school (21.18 yrs). Further, diploma holders have had the higher mean age at marriage (22.16 yrs) than the migrants who have studied up to higher secondary level (21.90 yrs).
Moreover, among urban migrants, illiterates have had the very lower mean age at marriage (19.50 yrs) than the others. In semi-educated groups, the migrants, those who have studied up to primary level, have had the lower mean age at marriage (22.16 yrs) than the migrants, those who have studied up to middle school (23.50 yrs) and high school (25.90 yrs) levels. In the higher educated groups, professional degree holders (30.83 yrs) and post-graduates (29.79 yrs) have had the higher mean age at marriage than the graduates (28.50 yrs). Educational level-wise (barring, illiterates, post-graduates and profession degree holders) rural migrants’ age at marriage is lower than the urban migrants’ age at marriage. As the calculated chi square values are higher than the table values in both rural and urban groups, the null hypothesis, “Age at marriage is not associated with educational attainment” is rejected. Hence, age at marriage is not associated with educational attainment.

### VII.20.4 Marriage occurrence and age at marriage

Marriage occurrence and age at marriage (Table No-7-32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents’ previous residential place</th>
<th>Marriage occurrence</th>
<th>Respondents’ marriage age groups</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
<th>Average marriage age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Before migration</td>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>22-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After migration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Before migration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After migration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rural:- Calculated chi square value: 14.179 df: 4 Table value for $X^2_{0.05}$: 9.49
Urban:- Calculated chi square value: 17.478 df: 4 Table value for $X^2_{0.05}$: 9.49

In rural group, the migrants, those who married before coming to Tiruchirappalli city, have had lower mean age at marriage (19.91 yrs) than the migrants, those who married after
coming to Tiruchirappalli city (22.74 yrs). Similarly, in urban group, the migrants, those who married before coming to Tiruchirappalli city, have also had lower mean age at marriage (25.63 yrs) than the migrants, those who married after coming to Tiruchirappalli City (28.52 yrs). As the calculated chi square values are higher than the table value in rural and urban groups, the null hypothesis, “There is no relationship between marriage occurrence (before or after migration) and age at marriage” is rejected. Hence, there is relationship between marriage occurrence and age at marriage.

VII.20.5 Rural migrants’ present occupations and age at marriage age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural migrants’ present occupations</th>
<th>Respondents’ marriage age groups</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
<th>Average marriage age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>22-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business employers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business employees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried artisans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed artisans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried white-collars</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed white-collars</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried blue-collars</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed blue-collars</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed productions edible</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed production non-edible</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coolies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street vendors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons living in pension or</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remittances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculated chi square value: 76.31 df: 52 Table value for $X^2_{0.05}$: 69.9

In the business, mean age at marriage of employees (20.50 yrs) is lower than the employers (22.70 yrs). Among the artisans, the mean age at marriage of salaried artisans (another
20.50 yrs) is lower than the self-employed artisans (23.50 yrs). There is no variation in the mean age at marriage between salaried white-collars and self-employed white collars (each 27.50 yrs). Among the blue-collars, the mean age at marriage of salaried blue-collars (19.83 yrs) is lower than the self-employed blue-collars (23.50 yrs). Among the low-paid jobs, the mean age at marriage of coolies (another 19.50 yrs) is lower than the service workers (19.90 yrs) and street vendors (20.17 yrs). As the calculated chi square value is higher than the table value, the null hypothesis, “There is no relationship between occupational status and age at marriage” is rejected. Hence, there is relationship between occupational status and age at marriage.

### VII.20.6 Urban migrants' present occupations and age at marriage

**Urban migrants' present occupations and age at marriage (Table No-7-34)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban migrants' occupations</th>
<th>Respondents' marriage age groups</th>
<th>Total no. of respondents</th>
<th>Average marriage age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>22-25</td>
<td>26-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business employers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business employees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried artisans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed artisans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried white-collars</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed white-collars</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried blue-collars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed blue-collars</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed production non-edible things</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street vendors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons living in pension or interest or remittances</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculated chi square value: 89.124 df: 44 Table value for $X^2_{0.05}$: 60.5

In business, mean age at marriage of employees (25.50 yrs) is lower than the employers (26.97 yrs). Among the artisans, self-employed artisans’ mean age at marriage (24.50 yrs) is lower than the salaried artisans (27.50 yrs). But, among the white and blue collars, mean age at
marriage of salaried white-collars (29.67 yrs) and salaried blue-collars (25.28 yrs) is lower than
the mean age at marriage of self-employed white-collars (30 yrs) and self-employed blue-collars
(27.50 yrs). Among the low-paid jobs, mean age at marriage of service workers (19.50 yrs) is
lower than the mean age at marriage of street vendors (21.50 yrs). As the calculated chi square
value is higher than the table value, the null hypothesis, “There is no relationship between
occupational status and age at marriage” is rejected. Hence, there is relationship between
occupational status and age at marriage.

### Combined ANOVA between demographic, socio-economic variables and age at marriage (Table No-7-35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3.740</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>.617+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>148.722</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1.055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152.463</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>22.105</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.421</td>
<td>4.210</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>148.058</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1.050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>170.163</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>485.368</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97.074</td>
<td>41.778</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>327.625</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>2.324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>812.993</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Marriage occurrence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>10.033</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.007</td>
<td>10.673</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>26.511</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36.544</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>508.593</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>101.719</td>
<td>7.808</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1836.917</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>13.028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2345.510</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Previous residential place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>101.007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>101.007</td>
<td>142.14</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>103.034</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>204.041</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable: Age at marriage  * Significant at 1 per cent level  + Not significant
VII.21 Combined ANOVA between demographic, socio-economic variables and age at marriage

The ANOVA Table No7-35 presents some influences of demographic and socio-economic variables on the age at marriage. In the equation No-1, religion, as a variable, does not show any influence on the age at marriage. In other words, there is no significant difference in the mean age at marriage of the migrants belonging five different religions. In the equation No-2, community, as a variable, has strong influences on the age at marriage, which indicates that migrants pertaining to five different communities differ in taking marriage as measured by their mean age at marriage.

In the equation No-3, education, as a variable, has a powerful influence on age at marriage, which denotes that mean age at marriage of the migrants, belonging to various educational levels, differs significantly. In the equation No-4, marriage occurrence (before or after migration), as a variable, has a strong influence on age at marriage, which illustrates that there is a significant difference in the age at marriage between migrants those who married before migration and after migration.

In the equation No-5, occupation, as a variable, has a significant influence on the age at marriage, which denotes that migrants having engaged in different types of occupations differ in their age at marriage. In the equation No-6, previous residential place, as a variable, has powerful influence on the age at marriage, which indicates that migrants belonging to various residential back ground; differ in their mean age at marriage.

VII.22 Summing up

About two-fifths of rural migrants (39%) belong to the nuclear families and one-third (34%) to the truncated families. On the other hand, over two-thirds of urban migrants (67%) pertain to the nuclear families. Barring nil dependents, the mean dependents for rural migrants is 5.77 and for urban migrants 3.90. Above two-thirds of rural (70%) and about four-fifths (77%) of
urban migrants are married persons. The mean age at marriage for rural migrants is 20.75 years and for urban migrants 27.40 years. A little more than nine-tenths of rural migrants (92.85%) have entered into the marital life at the marriage age group of 14-25. Amid the reasons for low age at marriage, social causes are at top (65%) and to the least is educational (31%). By contrast, about three-fourths of urban migrants (74.02%) have entered into the marital life at the marriage age group of 26-33. Amid the reasons for high age at marriage, economic reasons are at top (37.92%) followed by social causes (29.31%), socio-economic (24.14%) and to the least is educational (7%).

Above two-thirds of rural migrants' (70%) marriage has occurred before coming to Tiruchirappalli city. On the contrary, about two-thirds of urban migrants (61.04%) marriage has occurred after coming to Tiruchirappalli city. Further, the mean age at marriage for rural spouses is 17.73 years and for urban spouses 23.47 years. Nine-tenths of rural spouses (90%) belong to the rural areas. By contrast, two-thirds of urban spouses (62.34%) pertain to the urban areas. About three-fourths of rural migrants (74.29%) do not care to limit their family size. Amid the reasons of large family size, social causes are at top (55%) and to the least is economic (45%). On the contrary, a little more than three-fourths of urban migrants (75.32%) are keen on limiting their family size. Amid the reasons of small family size, social causes are at top (38%) and to the least is economic (20.78%). At the time of survey, about two-thirds of rural migrants (65.71%) have not adopted any contraceptive method. The reasons for not following are sin, against religion, not interested, costly etc. On the other hand, above two-thirds (68.83%) of urban migrants have adopted the contraceptive methods. Among the rural migrants, the methods tubectomy and condom are more prevalent. On the other hand, the methods tubectomy, IUD and safe period are rife among urban migrants.
The data on reproductive behaviour of migrants reveal that of all the deciding factors of fertility such as religion, community, respondents' educational attainments, income levels, age at marriage of the spouses, occupations, years in migration (except age at marriage of the respondents and educational attainment of the spouses) rural migrants have had higher average number of children ever born than the urban migrants. The factors low age at marriage, very limited usage of contraceptive methods, no or semi-education, low income and poor standard of living might have contributed to the high level of fertility among rural migrants and vice versa to the urban migrants.

The data on age at marriage show that of all the deciding factors of age at marriage such as religion, community, educational attainment and occupation, rural migrants' age at marriage is lower than the urban migrants' age at marriage. The factors no or low education, parents' pressure, society's pressure and personal reasons have forced the rural migrants to enter into the wedlock early. On the other hand, the factors higher education, unemployment, meager income, family burdens and personal reasons have protracted the urban migrants, age at marriage.