This chapter presents a review of relevant literature to this research. Literature cited includes some general studies in migration, selection of migration, determinants, migration and family ties and impact of migration on fertility.

Population growth of a country at the sub-national level is generally influenced by 'Migration or population movement'. The size of population may grow by an inflow of people and it may decline by an outflow of its members. The study of migration has traditionally been taken place dating back to the early work of Revenstein (1885; 1889). Until quite recently, the study of rural-urban migration and growth of cities has attracted attention because of growing
economic and structural imbalances between urban and rural areas.

In developing countries like India, rural-urban migration has largely taken place as a result of the push factors. The more rapid natural increase in the rural areas led to population growth that could not be absorbed in the agriculture sector (Oberai, 1990). Adding to this, low income and seasonal employment in agriculture are major factors to the acceleration of rural-urban migration.

Migration is an economic problem and it is one of the main causes of population shift which is due to economic imbalances between areas/regions. The poor migrant labourers from rural areas are predominantly employed in the informal sector of urban economy (Papola, 1980). Economists have suggested various models to explain the volume and direction of labour mobility (Lewis, 1954; Todaro, 1968, Maries and Todaro, 1970).

Population movement responds to economic change in addition to the other demographic variables such as population growth. Such movement may condition the nature and the pace of economic growth and can cause for major changes in the distribution of jobs, income and welfare (Farooq, 1985; Uthoff and Pernla, 1986). Hence, there is a
need to examine the process and the impact of the migration phenomena.

SELECTIVITY OF MIGRATION

Certain proportion of a population only moves. So it can be said that migration is selective. Bear (1983:13) stated that migration is selective of certain basic characteristics of the general population. Bogue supports this statement by stating that migration is selective of persons with particular characteristics such as age, education and marital status (Bogue, 1969:753).

AGE AND MIGRATION

The propensity for rural residents to migrate to urban areas in third world countries is mostly of adolescents and young. The adolescents and youth predominate among voluntary migrants both with respect to internal and international. Rapid population growth may be one of the factors that encourage the migration of young people from rural areas. Usually, among the migrants, persons between the ages of 15-35 years dominate almost all migration streams. Shaw (1975:8) stated that

"persons in their late teens, twenties and early thirties have high rate of migration".

Several studies around the world identified different age groups with different migration patterns and

A study of rural-urban migration in Ghana by Caldwell (1969) noticed that most of migrants first left between the ages of 15 and 19 years. In urban Kenya, Rempel (1970) observed a preponderance of migrants in the 20-25 years of age. Similarly in Africa, Songre, et al., (1974) found that 42 per cent of all respondents from upper Volta were in the age between 10 and 39 years. Senay (1985) noticed that about three-fourths of migrants were in the age group of 22-44 years in Lesotho (Africa). In Egypt, Fergany (1986) found that nearly all (97 per cent) labour emigrants were in the age group of 20-25 years and average age was 23 years. In Bangladesh, Tulshisaha (1988) identified a high positive correlation between age (20-25 years) and net-migration rate (significant at 0.01 level). Another study in Nigeria, Odaman (1989) observed that more than one-third (36 per cent) of migrants were in the age group of 20-34 years. A study on recent in-migrant heads of households in Nepal, Bhakhiprasad (1990) observed that majority (59 per cent) respondents were concentrated in 20 years span covering 30-49 years of age. A recent study in Ghana by Nelson, et al., (1991) indicated that about two-thirds (61.7 per cent) of
migrants were as above the age of 40 years and mean age at migration was 45 years.

Adding to above studies, several Indian studies from various parts also revealed that majority of migrants were in the younger ages (Connell, et al., 1976; Grewal and Sidhu, 1981; Oberai and Singh, 1983; Narayana, et al., 1985; Kothari and Visaria, 1985; Gupta, 1988; Paul, 1989; Cheriyan, 1990; Naidu, 1991).

A study in North India by Connell, et al., (1976) found that with in the adult migration group three-fifths (60 per cent) were aged 15-24 years. In Punjab, Grewal and Sidhu (1981) observed that nearly three-fourths (73 per cent) of migrant agricultural labourers were in the adult age of 20-24 years. Another study in Punjab by Oberai and Singh (1983) revealed that an overwhelming proportion (73 per cent) of out-migrants were in the age group of 15-24 years. In rural Garhwal district of Uttar Pradesh, Narayan, et al., (1985) concluded that more than three-fifths (65 per cent) of male migrants were in the age group of 20-49 years. Based on 1971 census data of Gujarat, Kothari and Visaria (1985) observed that majority (34.6 per cent) of male rural-urban migrants were in the age group of 15-29 years as against 18.8 per cent were in 0-14 years; 26.2 per cent were in 30-44 years and rest (20.4 per cent) were in 45 and above
years. Similarly, rural to rural migration study in Punjab by Gupta (1988) noticed that majority (55.8 per cent) of immigrants were found in the age group of 21-30 years and their mean age being 25.08 years. Another study in Punjab, Paul (1989) observed that more than three-fourths (76.7 per cent) of migrants were in the age group of 15-24 years as compared to 32.6 per cent of non-migrants. A study on emigrants to Gulf countries from Kerala, Cheriyan (1990) noticed that majority (64.2 per cent) of migrants were in the age group of 20-29 years. A recent study on slum migrants in Tirupati town of Andhra Pradesh (Naidu, 1991) revealed that nearly three-fifths (56 per cent) of migrants were in the age group of 20-29 years. Thus, the principal demographic characteristic of urban migration in third world countries is age. The migrants tend mostly to be in younger age between 15 and 25 years (Prime working age).

MARITAL STATUS AND MIGRATION

Marital status of an individual, plays an important role not only in the personal life of a migrant, but also in his working life. Among others, it may be expected to have influenced on commitment, mobility, motive for work or absent from work. Singh (1985:52) points out that

"... married persons having higher responsibilities usually try to move to shorter distance or do not go to longer
distance with a view to visiting their family easily and frequently."

Single migrants delay their marriage because to increase economic status, increase of attitude towards life, aspiration for better living and urbanism, which leads to lower fertility level. On the other hand, married migrants may be generally less inclined to change from one place to another as compared to single migrants. However, marital status and migration are not clear-cut. The following National and International studies (Caldwell, 1969; Connell, et al., 1976; Oberai and Singh, 1983; National Statistical Office, 1988; Paul, 1989; Cheriyan, 1990) revealed that single persons are more prone to migrate than married persons.

A study on rural-urban migration in North Indian villages by Connell, et al., (1976) found that majority of migrants were single at the time of migration. Another study in the Indian Punjab by Oberai and Singh (1983) observed that more than three-fifth (65.9 per cent) out-migrants were single as against 34 per cent were married. In Bangkok, National Statistical Office (1988) noticed that seven-tenths (69.8 per cent) of migrants were single as against 26.9 per cent were married and the remaining (2.3 per cent) were widowed, divorced and separated. In the rural-urban
migration study of the Punjab by Paul (1989) noticed that majority (80.5 per cent) of migrants were un-married. Similarly a recent study on emigrants to Gulf countries from Indian state of Kerala, Cheriyan (1990) observed that a higher proportion of (86 per cent) emigrants were unmarried at the time of migration.

Contrary to the above, the following studies (Agarwala, 1968; Kothari and Visaria, 1985; Rastogi, 1986; Atemie, 1987; Gupta, 1988; Singh and Yadava, 1990; Naidu, 1991) concluded that majority of migrants were married at the time of migration. In Maharashtra, Agarwala (1968) noticed that nearly three-fifths of (58.6 per cent) migrants were married followed by 35.8 per cent were single, 4.9 per cent widowed and rest (0.7 per cent) were divorced and separated. Based on 1971 census data of Gujarat, Kothari and Visaria (1985) found that three-fifths (58.4 per cent) of rural-urban male migrants married and two-fifths (39.5 per cent) were single.

In Nigeria, Atemie (1989) observed that three-fifths (60 per cent) of men and about 66 per cent of women were ever-married at the time of migration. Similarly in two cities of Uttar Pradesh, Rastogi (1986) found that an overwhelming proportion of migrants (92.2 per cent and 90.9 per cent for Lucknow and Kanpur cities respectively) were
married at the time of migration. Gupta (1988) in his rural-rural migration study in Punjab identified that a substantial proportion (70.2 per cent) of migrants were married. A study in Varanasi city of Uttar Pradesh by Singh and Yadava (1990) observed that in remote and growth centre villages three-fifths (60 per cent) of men were married but migrated without their wives. This percentage (46 per cent) was slightly less in semi-urban villages. Similarly a recent study by Naidu (1991) on slum migrants found that majority (88.4 per cent) of migrants were married before coming to Tirupati town.

**TYPE OF FAMILY AND MIGRATION**

Most indications, suggest that migrants tend to come from relatively large families; i.e., from families in which both need and earning capacity have expanded relatively to local earning opportunity. Big families produce larger proportion of migrants, to overcome the reduction in the risk of lesser per capita income and output from farming land, insufficient to support large family members. Hence, they are more likely to have their siblings in towns and to support parents in the old age. Eames (1967:163) concluded that

"... the joint family system in the village enhances the movement of the married male member than hindering"
Studies conducted at National and International levels revealed a positive relationship between large families and migration and vice-versa (Wilkening, et al., 1967; Caldwell, 1969; Grewal and Sidhu, 1981; Vidyasagar, 1986; Gupta, 1988). In Brazil, Wilkening, et al., (1967) concluded that

"... the extended family extends its influence whenever it can do so to the advantage of the family".

Similarly a study on rural-urban migration in Ghana, Caldwell (1969) noticed that members of large families are more likely to have siblings in town; so that chain migration is most likely to occur. In Punjab, Grewal and Sidhu (1981) observed that majority of labour migrants came from joint families. On the basis of 1971 census data of Karnataka, Vidyasagar (1986) found that nearly half (49 per cent) of migrants came from joint families as compared to little more than a quarter (28 per cent) from the nuclear families. A study on rural-rural migration in Punjab, (Gupta, 1988) revealed that nearly seven-tenths (68.2 per cent) of labourers came from joint families and rest (31.8 per cent) were from nuclear families.

Contrary to the above studies, some studies (Nair, 1978; Bhakhiprasad, 1990; Naidu, 1991) found that the propensity to migrate by members in nuclear families is more
than that of the members in joint family. In Poona, Nair (1978) noticed that three-quarters (76 per cent) of migrant families were from nuclear and have only their wives and children living with them. Similarly in Nepal, Bhakhiprasad (1990) found that majority (62 per cent) of recent immigrants were from nuclear families, about one-third (32 per cent) were from extend families and remaining (6 per cent) were from single member families. A study on slum migrants in Tirupati town, Naidu (1991) observed that nearly four-fifths (78 per cent) were from nuclear families as compared to one-fifth (22 per cent) from joint families. Therefore, the type of family has its influence on migration propensity.

HOUSEHOLD SIZE AND MIGRATION

Household size has been noted as a characteristic in the study of migration. Generally, migrants have less household size when compared to non-migrants, because migrants left their older persons at origin and migrate with younger family members to educate or make them to participate in work force. In the present study an attempt has been made to know dependency and work participation in migrant families by place of birth. Several studies (Rao, et al., 1978; Rastogi, 1986; Atemie, 1987; Gupta, 1988; Bhakhiprasad, 1990; Naidu, 1991) have attempted in the study of migration and household size.
A study on slum migrants in Visakhapatnam of Andhra Pradesh by Rao, et al., (1978) noticed that the average household size of the migrants was four, while the actual size ranged between one to ten members. Similarly in Uttar Pradesh, Rastogi (1980) found that the lower average household size for migrants (4.8 persons in Lucknow city and 5.7 persons in Kanpur city) than non-migrants (6 persons in Lucknow city and 6.6 persons in Kanpur city). A study on rural-rural migration in Punjab by Gupta (1988) revealed that the average household size, earners and dependents were 7.16, 2.80 and 4.36 persons respectively. In Nepal, Bhakhiprasad (1990) found that the average household size of recent migrants were 5.8. A study on slum migrants of Tirupati town by Naidu (1991) observed that majority (59.6 per cent) of respondent were having a household size of 3-4 members.

CASTE AND MIGRATION

Caste is a very powerful indices to measure social hierarchy in Indian society. It is a most important variable in the study of rural to urban migration. It determines the socio-economic, cultural and political diversities with in the villages of India. In rural areas, caste is an important determinant of occupation, education and social status in the community and it may, therefore, be one of the important
factors responsible for migration. As Kothari (1980) points out,

"it is not only the economic position of the people that is very much linked with caste to which they belong to the settlement pattern within the village but also reflects the fundamental importance of the caste structure to the social life of the village"

Caste and migration is not clear-cut. Rural-urban migration consists both upper and lower caste people. Generally upper caste people are mostly literate, economically strong and have better contacts with urban areas. They migrate to urban areas to improve social status and have comfortable life as well as better schooling for children. On the other hand low caste people (like Backward, scheduled caste and scheduled tribe) migrate to urban areas to improve economic status and to escape from the tyranny of caste system (particularly for schedule castes), which is more prevalent in rural areas of India. However, in general, low caste people tend to migrate mostly when compared to the other caste groups.

The following studies have highlighted that upper/forward caste people had higher mobility than other caste groups (Agarwala, 1968; Yadava, 1977; Sharma, 1984; Narayan, et al., 1985; Rastogi, 1986; Naidu, 1991). A study in
greater Bombay, Maharashtra by Agarwala (1968) found that about 47 per cent of migrants belonged to Maratha followed by 17.6 per cent scheduled caste, 10 per cent Maratha lower caste and 8.4 per cent belonged to Lingayats. Similarly Narayan, et al., (1985) noticed that over three-fifths (63 per cent) of migrants belonged to upper caste Hindus as against 14.73 per cent were scheduled caste and rest were (12.04 per cent) other caste groups. Another study, in Uttar Pradesh, Rastogi (1986) observed that majority (61 per cent in Lucknow city and 42 per cent in Kanpur city) of migrants were upper caste as compared to non-migrants (24 per cent in Lucknow and 34 per cent in Kanpur city) in both of the selected cities. A study conducted in Varanasi city of Uttar Pradesh by Yadava and Singh (1988) found linear positive relationship (0.415 per cent) between the value of migration and caste diversity. A recent study on slum migrants by Naidu (1991) noticed that an overwhelming proportion (94 per cent) of migrants were Hindus and remaining (6 per cent) were Muslims. Among Hindus, majority (58 per cent) were non-scheduled castes and tribes and rest (42 per cent) belonged to scheduled castes and scheduled tribes.

Contrary to the above studies, the following studies have shown that backward or intermediate castes had higher proportion of migrants as compared to other castes (Katti, 1966; Gupta, 1988; Paul, 1989). A study in Karnataka
state of Dharwar, Katti (1966) observed that an overwhelming proportion (97 per cent) of migrants belonged to the backward caste of Hindu religion. A study on rural-rural migration in Punjab by Gupta (1988) noticed that the intermediate caste group was dominated (40.6 per cent) followed by lower caste group (25.8 per cent) and tribals (22.4 per cent). Similarly, a recent study on rural-urban migration in Punjab by Paul (1989) revealed that nearly three-fifths (58.5 per cent) of migrants were backward caste followed by higher caste (25.8 per cent) and lower caste (15.7 per cent).

Some of the other studies in India revealed that majority of migrants were always low caste than the upper and middle caste groups (Katti and Haslkar, 1971; Rao, et al., 1978, Oberai and Singh, 1983). A study conducted in Shimoga district of Karnataka by Katti and Haslkar (1971) observed that more than two-fifths (42 per cent) of in-migrants belonged to scheduled caste and scheduled tribe groups. Similarly in Andhra Pradesh, Rao, et al (1978) found that nearly seven-tenths (68 per cent) of slum migrants belonged to the scheduled caste and the rest (32 per cent) were from peasant caste groups. In Punjab, Oberai and Singh (1983) noticed that the proportion of low caste people among migrants was gradually increasing.
While the following studies (Salvi and Bhoite, 1969; Singh, 1986; Yadava, 1989) revealed no significant difference in migration rate among different caste groups and reported a slight higher rate of migration from households belonging to the muslim and business castes. Therefore, based on the review of studies, it can be said that caste is an important determinant of migration.

EDUCATION LEVEL AND MIGRATION

Education acts as a catalyst in the process of human movement, particularly in rural to urban migration. It is an indicator of socio-economic status as well as quality. Hence, schooling is used specifically to gain 'better' employment for a child/person and the location of such employment usually in urban areas, which entails migration. Shaw (1975:23) concluded that

"... migrating people include proportionately more of the better educated persons than non-migrants, regardless of age, sex, colour or direction of movement".

Studies conducted around the world showed a significant positive relationship between education and migration (Caldwell, 1969; Rempel, 1970; Todaro, 1971; Chaudhury, 1978; Hussein, 1986; Atemie, 1987; Bhakhiprasad, 1990). In Ghana, Caldwell (1969) noticed that from rural-urban migrants in urban areas of Ghana, they had gone to the
big town 'because they were educated'. In Kenya, Rempel (1970) found an increased tendency for members of particular age-groups to migrate if they had primary or secondary school certificates. Similar findings were noticed by Todaro (1971) in Kenya. Another study in Bangladesh by Chaudhury (1978) observed that "migrants to urban areas were much higher among the literate than illiterate". On the basis of 1976 census data of Egypt, Hussein (1986) identified a strong positive relationship between in-migration rate and literacy rate (0.55). In Nigeria, Atemie (1987) found that the mean years of education attainment was 8.7 years for men and 7.0 years for the women. A recent study in Nepal, Bhakhprasad (1990) found that majority (80 per cent) of recent in-migrants were literate.

In India, also several studies have been conducted on education and migration. In North Indian study by Connell, et al., (1976) inverted 'U' shaped relationship, while in Uttar Pradesh Yadava, et al., (1988) obtained J-shaped relationship between educational diversity and migration. The following studies also found positive relationship between level of education and migration (Salvi and Bhoite, 1969; Rao, et al., 1978; Oberai and Singh, 1983; Kothari and Visaria, 1985; Paul, 1989; Singh and Yadava, 1990; Naidu, 1991). In Poona, Maharashtra, Salvi and Bhoite (1969) observed that the per capita educational score was
significantly associated with migration (significant at 0.01 level). Similarly, in Andhra Pradesh, Rao, et al., (1978) found that about one-third (31 per cent) of migrants were illiterate and rest (69 per cent) had education varying from primary to college level. Based on the census data of Gujarat, Kothari and Visaria (1985) found that one-fourth (25.3 per cent) of rural-urban male migrants were illiterate followed by 22.0 per cent literate without any formal education, 32.1 per cent had middle or less level of education; 15.6 per cent secondary/technical and remaining (2.5 per cent) had college level of education. A study on rural-urban migration in Punjab by Paul (1989) revealed that an overwhelming proportion (88.7 per cent) of migrants were educated as against 30 per cent non-migrants. Among migrants, 56 per cent had higher level of education (i.e., 10 or more years of education). In Varanasi city of Uttar Pradesh Singh and Yadava (1990) observed that 39 per cent of migrants had primary or middle educational level followed by 30.8 per cent had high school/intermediate; about 16 per cent were graduates, post-graduates and the rest (14.5 per cent) were illiterate. A study by Naidu (1991) on slum-migrants noticed that only 34 per cent of migrants were illiterate and rest (66 per cent) had education level varying from primary to graduate level. The highest (30 per cent) percentage had secondary schooling.
Contrary to the above studies a few studies (Grewal and Sidhu, 1981; Gupta, 1988) revealed that majority of migrants were illiterate. A study in Punjab by Grewal and Sidhu (1981) noticed that nearly nine-tenths (88 per cent) of migrants were illiterate labourers. Similarly rural to rural migration study in Punjab by (Gupta, 1988) showed that three-fourths (75.6 per cent) of migrants were illiterate. Thus, education is an important variable in determining migration.

DISTANCE AND MIGRATION

Distance has been viewed as a barrier to migratory movements and, therefore, it would be expected that the probability of migration between two places diminishes as the distance increases. Ravenstein (1885-199) hypothesised that the migrants tried to minimize distance, though

"... migrants proceeding long distances generally go by preference to one of the great centres of commerce and industry and also stated that men moved longer distance than women."

Similarly Chaudhury (1978:4) stated that

"... the 'push' migrants are likely to travel a short distance mostly in the country side in search of unprecise prospects for work, because they are poor, they cannot afford the initial cost of movement over longer distance. In contrast, the better
'pull' migrants can afford to move to a selected town even if it is situated at a long distance".

Several studies conducted around the world revealed a negative relationship between distance and migration (Sahota, 1968; Rempel, 1970; Hussein, 1986; Tulshisaha, 1988; Nelson, et al., 1991). In Kenya, Rempel (1970) observed that distance was the most consistently significant variable in his regression analysis, acting as a determinant of migration. Sahota (1968) noticed a similar findings in Brazil. On the basis of 1976 census data of Egypt, Hussein (1986) observed a negative relationship between distance and migration for two regions of more developed (-0.27) and less developed (-0.17). Similarly, based on the 1974-78 Bangladesh census data, Tulshisaha (1988) identified a low insignificant correlation (0.13) between distance and migration. A recent study in Ghana by Nelson., et al., (1991) found that the large sized farmers moved on an average 13.5 miles as against 10.8 miles by medium land size farmers and 10.6 miles by small size farmers.

In addition to the above international studies, the following Indian studies also revealed negative relationship between distance and migration (Katti, 1966; Ashish Bose, 1967; Rao, et al., 1978; Singh, 1984; Naidu,
A study in Dharwar area of Karnataka, Katti (1966) observed that nearly three-fifths (57 per cent) of migrants had covered the shorter distance of 25-74 miles. On the basis of 1961 census data of India, Ashish Bose (1967) obtained an inverse relationship between distance and migration i.e., majority (67.8 per cent) of migrants moved short distance as against one-fifth (21.4 per cent) medium distance and rest (10.8 per cent) longer distance. Another study on slum dwellers in Andhra Pradesh, Rao, et al., (1978) found that 46.3 per cent of the migrants came from places with in the radius of 60 miles. Further, he noticed a consistent trend of inverse relationship between distance and migration. Similarly on the basis of 1971 Indian census data, Singh (1984) noticed that nearly seven-tenths (64.7 per cent) of migrants moved short distance as against one-fifth (21.50 per cent) medium distance and remaining (11.1 per cent) longer distance. A study by Naidu (1991) on slum migrants found that four-fifths (79.2 per cent) of slum migrants came from shorter distance (< 100 kms) as against 14.8 per cent medium distance (101-150 kms.) and rest (6 per cent) longer distance (151 and above kms). Thus, distance is an important intervening variable in the study of migration.

MIGRATION AND OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY

Occupational mobility of a migrant is viewed as a change in the occupation of an individual (migrant) as a
result of migration. It is always stressed that the process of migration in general and rural-urban migration in particular leads to occupational mobility. Rapid increase in population and declining size of land holding have adversely affected employment opportunities in rural areas and essential facilities for living. As a result, many agricultural labourers and landless poor are moving to urban centres primarily to make a living.

On the other hand, in urban areas with the increase in developmental activities in the public sector and its influence on the private sector, number of employment opportunities have been created, which are the major sources of initial employment to rural migrants. Thus, agricultural communities are moving to service, petty business and some other non-agricultural occupations. A causal connection between migration and social mobility is already established by Grastacarlson (1957). According to Kingsley Davis (1951:107-108)

"Suppression of social mobility tended to suppress the geographic mobility. But in recent years, again, the forces of modernization in general and the force of industrialization and urbanization in particular had reinforced the relationship between the migration and occupational mobility".
Therefore, rural-urban migration leads to a change in occupation, which in turn influences social and economic level of the migrants thereby affecting fertility behaviour of migrant. Hence, it is necessary to study the occupational mobility. Studies conducted around the world revealed that migration leads to change in occupation (Richmond, 1964; Zablan, 1977; National Statistical office, 1988; Bhakhiprasad, 1990). In Canada, Richmond (1964) noticed that migrant children of semi-skilled and unskilled workers may tend to have upward mobility in occupation. Another study in Cebu city of the Phillipines by Zablan (1977) found that four-fifths (80 per cent) of migrants have an upward occupational mobility. Similarly in Bangkok, National Statistical Office (1988) revealed that majority (56.4 per cent) of migrants had upward occupational mobility. A recent study in Nepal by Bhakhiprasad (1990) noticed that one-third (34 per cent) of migrants changed their occupation from agriculture to non-agricultural activities.

Several Indian studies revealed that migration and occupational change (Rao, et al., 1978; Nair, 1978; Jorapur, 1979; Oberai and Singh, 1983; Yadava, 1989). A study in Visakhapatnam of Andhra Pradesh by Rao, et al., (1978) found that only one-tenth (11 percent) of migrants were engaged in 'technical' occupations before migration, turned to twice (22.5 per cent) after migration. Further, about 15 per cent
of migrants were farmers before migration, while after migration there was none in this category. Another study in Dharwar, Karnataka by Jorapur (1979) noticed that the average number of jobs changed by a migrant worker was slightly higher (2.0) than a non-migrant worker did (1.6). Similarly in Punjab, Oberai and Singh (1983) observed that majority of those who were employed as own account workers before migration turned to wage employment after migration. Another study in Poona, Maharashtra, Nair (1978) noticed that nearly fourth-firths (79 per cent) of in-migrants had upward occupational mobility. A recent study in Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh, by Yadava (1989) observed that nearly three-tenths (29 per cent) of migrants were engaged in agriculture or other related jobs before migration; but negligible per cent (1.2 per cent) was found in corresponding occupation after migration.

Contrary to the above studies no occupational mobility was found by some studies (Sen, 1960, Mukerjee and Singh, 1965). A study conducted in Calcutta city of West Bengal by Sen (1960) revealed that there was not much shift in occupation for the majority. Another study in Greater Bombay, Maharashtra, Mukerjee and Singh (1965) found that nearly three-fourths (73 per cent) of old residents had no change in their occupation, the corresponding proportion for in-migrants was 51 per cent. Thus, rural-urban migrants have a change in occupation patterns.
JOB SATISFACTION

Job satisfaction refers to the migrants satisfaction with their job (occupation) at the time of survey. Job satisfaction involves a number of factors like monetary and non-monetary, occupation and environment. As Harrell (1967:260) says that

"... job satisfaction derived from and caused by many interrelated factors. If a migrant is not satisfied with any of these factors, he might think of leaving his job. The actual action taken by him may depend upon the intensity of that factor. Assuming that there is an 'open society' or equal opportunities for all, a worker may have the tendency to maximise his satisfaction, by changing his job or occupation. However workers have no uniform preference anywhere."

In the present study a question is to be asked to migrants (i.e., Are you satisfied with present occupation, Yes/No). The migrants who say positively (Yes), they were considered to be job satisfied people and vice-versa if no.

Studies conducted in India revealed that majority of migrants were satisfied with their jobs at the time of survey (Saxena, 1970; Rao, et al., 1978; Raju, 1989). A study in Bombay, Maharashtra, Saxena (1970) noticed that majority of migrants liked their job. But as high as 52 percent of those stated had no other alternative. A study on urban slums in Visakhapatnam of Andhra Pradesh by Rao, et
al., (1978) found that nearly half (48 per cent) of migrants had satisfaction in their existing jobs. Another recent study on inter-state rural-rural migration by Raju (1989) observed that nearly three-fourths (72 per cent) of migrants said that they were feeling excited and very happy about their move and occupation and only one-tenth (10 per cent) had returned to original villages due to dissatisfaction at destination. Thus, rural to urban migration leads to occupational mobility and job satisfaction.

LAND HOLDING AND MIGRATION

In rural India, land is a sign of social prestige and it is an important source of production. Also a continuous source of income and security for livelihood. Therefore, land ownership (or possession of land) is one of the most important factors influencing the settlement of people. A major share of land remains in the hands of few land lords of upper caste people, even though they usually do not cultivate the land by themselves engage labourers for cultivation. Therefore, the possession of land is a major determinant of migration. Hill (1972:98) concluded that

"...the sons of smaller land owning farmers had a greater propensity to migrate than the sons of large land owning". On the otherhand Speare (1969:91) observed reverse pattern in Taiwan as "...migrants were more likely to come from large farmers than non-migrants".
Many studies identified around the world that the land less poor and low size of land owners are more likely to migrate (Shaw, 1974; Hajibakar, 1986; Tulshisaha, 1988; Nelson, et al., 1991). In Latin America, Shaw (1974) obtained a positive and significant relationship between the rate of out-migration and small farm size (percentage of farmers less than 5 hectares). Another study in West Malaysia, Hajibakar (1986) noticed that the average size of operated farm was found to be 1.04 hectares for migrants as compared to 1.84 hectares for the non-migrants. Similarly, Tulshisaha (1988) obtained a negative correlation (-0.22) between irrigated land and migration in Bangladesh. A recent study in Ghana by Nelson, et al., (1991) revealed that the proportion of subsistence holdings among the farmers who move was higher than that of the non-movers.

In addition to several International studies, many Indian studies (Salvi and Bhoite, 1969; Oberai and Singh, 1983; Vidyasagar, 1986; Vishwamittar, 1988; Cheriyan, 1990; Naidu, 1991) also revealed that land less/low size of land holders are more migratory in nature than those who have large land holdings. A study in Poona, Maharashtra by Salvi and Bhoite (1969) observed smaller number (33.4 per cent) of migrant families in high land holding size (11 and more acres) as compared to more than one half (54.17 per cent) of migrant families with low land holding size (upto 5 acres).
In Punjab, a study on out-migrants by Oberai and Singh (1983) found that more than four-fifths (82.3 per cent) of migrants had no land and only 13.4 per cent owned less than 5 acres. Similarly in Karnataka a study on labour mobility by Vidyasagar (1986) noticed that landless migrants were 29 per cent followed by about one-third (31 per cent) of migrants had 0-4 acres and 9 per cent with 15 and above acres. Another study in Punjab by Vishwanittan (1988) observed that half (50 per cent) of migrants had no land at the time of migration. Similarly in Kerala, Cheriyen (1990) revealed that majority (37.8 per cent) of migrants possessed one acre of land followed by one-third (30.8 per cent) had 1-4 acres, about 5 per cent had above four acres and 29.4 per cent had no land. A recent study on slum migrants in Tirupati town of Andhra Pradesh, Naidu (1991) found that more than three-fourths (76 per cent) of migrants had no land as against one-tenth (10 per cent) have upto one acre and the rest (12.4 per cent) have two to four acres.

Contrary to the above National and International studies, the following studies (Essang and Mabawonku, 1970; Narayan, et al., 1985) showed that the propensity to migrate will increase with an increase in the size of land holdings. In Western Nigeria, Essang and Mabawonku (1970) noticed that large proportion of households with migrant members had farms over ten acres. Similarly a study conducted in rural
Garwal of Uttar Pradesh by Narayan, et al., (1985) observed that the highest migration rate was for the 15-24 acres of land holdings and the lowest for no land group. Therefore, land ownership is one of the most important but independent factors for the study of migration.

**INCOME DIFFERENTIALS AND MIGRATION**

Income is one of the most important factors, which influence an individual to migrate. Regional differentials encourage workers to migrate from regions of low wages (usually in rural agriculture sector) to regions of higher wages (urban industrial and modern sector). Therefore, wage and employment levels became essential determinants to migrate. A significant proportion of land less and poor labourers were leaving rural areas and migrate to urban areas for their livelihood to improve their daily earnings or income, whereas rich people also migrate to urban to improve their socio-economic and political status in the society. Many studies on rural-urban migration had emphasised that economic factor being the most important motive leading to migration (Ravenstein, 1889:786). While Rabinproyar’s (1969:65) stated that

"... the level of economic development of a country is integrally linked with the nature and magnitude of employment opportunities and positive growth in these spheres is causally related to the initiation and development of migration patterns".
The evidence from International studies on income differentials of individual migrants suggests that both rich and poor move out from rural areas. The following studies noticed that the poor/low income status households had more propensity to migrate than rich/high income group (Mabogunje, 1970; Carvajal and Geithaman, 1974; Hajibakar, 1986; Odaman, 1989).

A study conducted in Nigeria, by Mabogunje's (1970) suggested a negative relationship between income differential and migration. Similarly in Costarica, Carvajal and Geithman's (1974) study concluded that specific income differences between regions for specific occupations are important factors in the decision to migrate. Another study on rural-rural peasant migration in West Malaysia Hajibakar (1986) observed that nearly one half (46 per cent) of migrants were very poor as compared with (about 11 per cent) non-migrants and the per capita monthly income for the migrants was 0.75 as compared with 1.28 for their non-migrant counterparts. A recent study in Nigeria by Odaman (1989) revealed that nearly half (49 per cent) of migrants belonged to a low income group (Naire 2500 per annum).

Contrary to the above studies, the following International studies showed that higher income group people have more propensity to migrate (Caldwell, 1968; U.N, 1968;
Bhakhiprasad, 1990). A study on rural-urban migration in Ghana, Caldwell (1968) noticed that majority of the economically better off households are mostly located in urban areas. The ECAFE summary report (U.N., 1968), concluded that "more migration from families in the higher income status than from low income group of landless poor with Kenyan data". A recent study in Nepal, by Bhakhiprasad (1990) identified that majority (56 per cent) of migrants were having an annual income of as more than Rs.24,000/- followed by about 27 per cent with Rs.21,600/- and 15 per cent with Rs.16,800/-. In general, rural-urban difference in per capita income has a significant and positive effect on migration.

Studies conducted in various states of India also noticed income differentials in relation to migration. The following studies showed that poor/low income groups have more propensity to migrate than rich/higher income groups (Katti and Haslakar, 1971; Rao, et al., 1978; Oberai and Singh, 1983, Rastogi, 1986; Yadava, et al., 1988, Oberai, 1990; Naidu, 1991). A study on rural in-migrants in Dharwar, Karnataka, by Katti and Haslakar (1971) found that low income (less than Rs.500/-) migrants accounted higher proportion. Similarly, in Andhra Pradesh, Rao, et al., (1978) observed that an overwhelming proportion cent) of migrants were in low income level at the
migration. A study in Indian Punjab by Oberai and Singh (1983) found that average annual income of those who in-
migrated during the three quinqueniums was Rs. 2494/- (1962-
63 to 1966-67); Rs. 1970 (1962-68 to 1971-72) and Rs. 2820/-
(1972-73 to 1976-77). A study in two cities of Uttar Pradesh
by Rastogi (1986) identified that majority (40 per cent in
Lucknow city and 52 per cent in Kanpur city) were poor
migrants (Rs. 1000-1500). In Varanasi city of Uttar Pradesh,
Yadava, et al., (1988) noticed that three-fifths (60 per
cent) of commuters belonged to low group of income as
against one-fifth (21 per cent) were in middle, about 16 per
cent in high and only four per cent commuters have very high
economic status. Another study conducted in three Indian
states by Oberai, et al., (1989) observed that poor had a
relatively high propensity to out-migrate from rural areas
and their average monthly income was Rs. 715, Rs. 1346 and
Rs. 655 for Bihar, Kerala and Uttar Pradesh respectively. A
study on slum migrants in Tirupati town of Andhra Pradesh by
Naidu (1991) noticed that majority (54.9 per cent) of
migrants were in low income group (upto Rs. 7000) as compared
to 16.8 per cent were in Rs. 7001-9000; 14.8 per cent were in
Rs. 9001-11000 income group and remaining (13.6 per cent)
were in the income group of Rs. 11000 and above. Therefore,
migration streams consist higher proportion of poor than
that of rich.
Contrary to the above Indian studies the following few Indian studies concluded that higher income group/rich have higher propensity to migrate than the poor (Connell, et al., 1976; Narayan, et al., 1985; Paul, 1989). A study conducted in sixteen North Indian villages by Connell, et al., (1976) concluded that both poor and rich migrants came from the same village. Similarly, a study in Rural Garhwal district of Uttar Pradesh by Narayan, et al., (1985) observed that with an increase in economic status migration rate also increased (31.6 per cent) as compared to low economic status (14.0 per cent). Another recent study on rural-urban migration in Punjab by Paul (1989) found that a higher proportion (36.5 per cent) of migrants were in high economic status as compared to (18 per cent) non-migrants. Thus rich people too migrate. In the study of migration, therefore, it is necessary to look into the income differentials.

ECONOMIC STATUS AFTER MIGRATION

The main aim of the poor, landless and agricultural labour move to urban areas is to improve their livelihood by getting higher wages. Recently, however, with the emergence of a stabilised modern industrial sector in most urban areas many job opportunities are created with better wages, which lead to pull the rural poor to engage in formal and informal sectors, which in turn leads to an
increase in economic status of the poor migrants. The migration process, is an integral part of modern industrialisation, economic development and social change. Husain (1969: 39) said that

"... the most important factor responsible for the equalization of economic opportunities as well as for social, cultural integration and increase in productivity is inter-regional population management."

Studies conducted in various parts of the world (Zablan, 1977; Fergany, 1986; Atemie, 1987) indicated that the economic status of migrants increased due to migration. A study conducted in Egypt by Fergany (1986) found that there was a slighter increase in income status (10.9 per cent) of emigrants than (10.4 per cent) non-emigrants. Further, he observed that emigrant households showed a higher level of increase in parameters of the asset ownership as compared to non-emigrant households (6.6 and 15.1 co-efficient of skewness respectively). Another study in Nigerian Atemie (1987) noticed that before migration the mean income per month for men and women was 179.4 and 182.4 Naire respectively. It increased to 318.8 Naire for men and 282.2 Naire for women per month after migration.

Several studies in India also revealed that migration was having effect on economic status of the
respondents (Nair, 1978; Oberai and Singh, 1983; Vidyasagar, 1986; Vishwamittar, 1988; Raju, 1989; Cheriyan, 1990). In Poona, Maharashtra, Nair (1978) observed that more than four-fifths (86.5 per cent) of in-migrants had an increase of monthly income ranging from Rs.400/- to Rs.1200/- after migration. Similarly in Punjab, Oberai and Singh (1983) observed that three-fourths of in-migrants were able to improve their income after migration. In Karnataka, Vidyasagar (1986) noticed that as a result of migration wages of migrants has increased by 50-60 per cent, which in turn led to improvement in the economic position of migrants. Another study by Vishwamittar (1988) in Punjab, revealed that there was an increase in income by one-fourth (24.5 per cent) of the migrants after migration. There was no change in the income level for one-sixth (17 per cent) of the migrants. For another one-sixth, there was decline in income level. The rest (41 per cent) were unpaid family workers. A study on rural-rural inter state migration by Raju (1989) observed that three-fifths (60 per cent) of migrants had an increase in the annual income (Rs.1000/- and above) after migration. A recent study on emigrants to Gulf from Kerala by Cheriyan (1990) noticed that the average income of migrant household was Rs.2026/- before migration. It increased to Rs.5477/- after migration. Therefore, it can be confirmed based on the above studies that the income of migrants will increase due to migration.
People who in-migrate to city areas are expected to remain in contact with the persons living at their native place. It is also expected that many of these in-migrants will go back to their home places for ultimate settlement. A study conducted in Lesotho by International Labour Organisation (1982:9) states that

"... a migrant develops the feeling that rural areas is a place to live, a place to preserve traditional ties and norms, an insurance against some body going wrong with the migration option and a place to retire but not a place to depend on for sustenance and income".

The return migrants often act as intermediaries between the village and the outside world, and as leaders of the community. Return migrants bring with them financial resources, skills, social, cultural values and lifestyle. They transmit them to rural people. Adding to this, generally, rural-urban migrants maintain regular contact with their native villages. They often transmit knowledge about urban socio-economic setting and modern social values to their kith and kin. Migrants also provide economic support by making remittance to their members of family and relatives living at their native place. It helps some of the poor families to improve their economic and social position, eventually to meet their needs of shelter, schooling of
children, and enable them to make some investment on land out of remittance received from the towns. Therefore, rural-urban migration and familial ties leads to socio-economic and demographic change.

The global studies have identified migration and links with origin (Caldwell, 1969; Senay, 1985; Atemie, 1987). In Ghana, Caldwell (1969) noticed that those whose entire family migrated to town, two-thirds visited their native village. Another study in Lesotho by Senay (1985) observed that one-fifth of emigrants men made two or more visits and only one-fourth of them did not visit their home after six months of migration. A recent study in Nigeria by Atemie (1987) found that a considerable percentage of migrants (35.9 per cent of men and 40.3 per cent of women) visited fellow ethnics and friends between one to three times a month.

Several studies on migration conducted in India also revealed migration and family ties (Rao and Desai, 1966; Nair, 1978; Banerjee, 1986; Vidyasagar, 1986; Rastogi, 1986; Vishwamittar, 1988). A survey carried out in Delhi, Rao and Desai (1966) observed that, 69 per cent of migrants visited their villages regularly. Of these 90 per cent visited for social or family reasons, about half of (54 per cent) their spouses, children and parents stay outside Delhi.
and 61.2 per cent had some property outside Delhi. Similarly, in Poona, Maharashtra, Nair (1978) noticed that 32 per cent of migrants visited their native place every year as against 38.5 per cent visited once in two years, 26 per cent visited during functions and festivals and rest (3.5 per cent) did not visit their native places at all. Banerjee (1986) from his Delhi study reported that two-fifths (40 per cent) of migrants maintained with rural residents through visits. On the basis of 1971 census data of Karnataka in India, Vidyasagar (1986) identified that migrants who had gone for longer periods came to their native place twice or thrice in a year, for important festivals like Ugadi (Kannada and Telugu new year day) and communal festivals like Jataras etc. While in the case of land holding migrants, the majority visited only once in a year during harvest and leasing out of land. It is done by some relatives in the village. Another study in Punjab, by Vishwamittar (1988) observed that half (52 per cent) of migrants visited their native place at least once in a year; four per cent twice in a year; five per cent more than twice and 39 per cent did not visit their native place. A study by Rastogi (1986) noticed that in both Lucknow and Kanpur cities of Uttar Pradesh, 73 and 75 per cent respectively of rural born migrants reported that they used to visit their place of origin at least once in a year as against 46 and 62
per cent of urban born migrants. Thus, most of the migrants maintain close and frequent contacts with place of origin, through sending money to home and visits.

KINSHIP AND MIGRATION

Migrants are attracted to areas where they can find friends, relatives and members of their own ethnic group. Kinship ties lead to the migratory process that has been described as Chain migration. The earlier migrants help the fresh ones in getting jobs, houses and initiate them into urban way of life. Migrants belonging to particular region, language, religion, caste and tribe tend to live together in separate neighbourhoods in cities and they also build their places of worship and maintain their culture. In western Nigeria, Essang and Mabawonku (1974) found that

"...the availability of relatives and friends in urban centers is positively associated with the rate of rural-urban migration."

Studies conducted around the world revealed that kinship ties were important determinants of migration (Caldwell, 1968; Balan, et al., 1973; Zablan, 1977, Hajibakar, 1986). Rural-urban migration study of Ghana by Caldwell (1968) found that there was a very strong statistical association among migrants and presence of relatives in urban areas. Another study by Balan, et al.,
(1973) revealed that over four-fifths (84 per cent) of migrants had the presence of relatives, friends in Mexico city at the time of migration. Similarly, Zablan (1977) observed that most (67 per cent) migrants stayed with their relatives. A recent study in West Malaysia, Hajibakar (1986) indicated that the average kin relationship among the migrants was 9.93, while for the non-migrants it was 13.24 points.

Many studies in India also revealed that kinship in urban areas led to migration (Rao, et al., 1978; Nair, 1978; Vishwamittar, 1988; Naidu, 1991). Migrants of the same faith/culture were welcomed by the earlier migrants. They provided board and shelter at least for the period of adjustment (Singh and Yadava, 1981; Singh, 1985). A study on slum migrants in Visakhapatnam of Andhra Pradesh by Rao, et al., (1978) found that nearly half (48 per cent) of the migrants had invitation to migrate from friends and relatives living in the towns. Another study in Poona, Maharashtra, Nair (1978) observed that about 45 per cent of in-migrants had relatives in Bombay at the time of migration. A study in Punjab by Vishwamittar (1988) observed that out of 56 migrants from whom he collected data, 52 had either relatives or friends at destination and 48 migrants received assistance in one or another form from them. A study on slum migrants in Tirupati town by Naidu (1991)
showed that about 45 per cent of migrants had a presence of relatives at destination and three-fourths (74 per cent) of them received encouragement from relatives. Thus, earlier migrants (Relatives/friends) diffuse employment opportunities to people, those who initially remain behind. The origin people are represented and motivated by prior migrants to move to urban areas. Therefore, kinship ties is an important variable in the study of migration, especially rural to urban migration.

MIGRATION AND REMITTANCE

Migration is a response to improve the status of individual and income. A major consequence of migration is the transfer of cash or other resource between the migrant and members of family remaining in the origin. Migrants send remittance to maintain, or enhance his position in the place of origin. If the migrant comes from a poor family the usual tendency is for the remittance to be used first to repay debts, increase food consumption, improving and extending family residential building and buying property. Nevertheless Bienefeld (1974:32) concluded that

"... regular remittance to home indicated that this trait is related to income levels as well as more generally to the ties with the country".
Remittance reflects the poverty and lack of investment opportunities from which the migrant came. High remittance led to heavy investment in agriculture, commercial crops, animal husbandry and in other sectors; which led to higher productivity and also favourable to rural development. Remittance can also act as potent means of social mobility. Upward mobile families have received significant larger remittance than other families.

Various studies conducted around world revealed relation between migration and flow of remittance to origin (Dahya, 1973; Jhonson and Whitelaw, 1974; Rempel, and Lobdell, 1978; Senay, 1985; Atemie, 1987). In Britain, Dahya (1973) observed that five Pakistani migrants, who remitted more than half of their earnings, sent £ 49.3 million thousand through official channels. Similarly, a study conducted in Nairobi by Jhonson and Whitelaw (1974) noticed that nine-tenths (89 per cent) of migrants sent back money regularly to their villages. In Kenya, Rempel and Lobdell (1978) concluded that the remittance had an influence on rural development. On the basis of NSS data of 1978-79 in Lesotho, Senay (1985) found that seven-tenths (71 per cent) of the male emigrants were sending the money. Another recent study in Nigeria by Atemie (1987) revealed that an overwhelming proportion of migrants (92 per cent men and 85 per cent women) reported sending of remittance.
The studies conducted in India also revealed the relation between migration and flow of remittance (Rao and Desai, 1966; Srivastava, 1968; Connell, et al., 1976; Nair, 1978; Oberai and Singh, 1983; Banerjee, 1986; Vishwanath, 1968; Cheriyan, 1990). A study conducted in Greater Delhi by Rao and Desai (1966) observed that of total remittance about 55 per cent of the remittance was sent to parents; 33 per cent to spouses and four per cent to children, while others accounted for eight per cent. Similarly in Rampura village of eastern Uttar Pradesh, Srivastava (1968) noticed that the out-migrants sent at least half of their income to the village as remittance, and of this one-fourth (25 per cent) was spent in the improvement of agriculture. Connell, et al., (1976) in their North Indian study found that nearly three-fifths (57 per cent) of all working migrants sent remittances to their places of origin. In Poona, Maharashtra, Nair (1978) observed that about 28 per cent of migrants sent money to home every month and another one-fifth (21.5 per cent) did the same occasionally. Another study in Punjab by Oberai and Singh (1983) observed that nearly three-fifths (57 per cent) of the out-migrants sent remittance. Further they noticed that major (93 per cent) share of remittance was spent on consumption (Family expenses); only a small proportion of households (6.1 per cent) used remittance for productive investment; one per
cent of household spent on children's education. In Delhi, Banerjee (1986) found that two-thirds of migrants were remitting. The remitter sent on an average of Rs. 69/- per month. Similarly a study conducted in Karnataka by Vishwamittar (1988) found that out of the total (56) in-migrants, half (28) of them sent remittance. The mean value of remittance worked out to be Rs 1573/-. A recent study on emigrants to Gulf from Kerala, Cheriyan (1990) observed that more than two-fifths (45 per cent) of migrants sent remittance upto the value of Rs.1000/- per month. Therefore, the migration patterns determine the flow of remittance from urban to native places.

THE IMPACT OF MIGRATION ON FERTILITY

Of the three components of population growth, migration has been studied least. In the recent years, the study of relationship between fertility and migration has aroused considerable interest.

Zachariah (1968:148-154) stated that migration might influence

"... change in marriage pattern, such as shift in the age at marriage, people marrying at later ages, changes in the proportion of ever married, marital abstinence, i.e., husband-wife separation etc.,."
In the light of several socio-economic and demographic situations, it has been established that migration may influence fertility behaviour at the micro (family) and macro (society) levels (Pathak, 1986:2). At the family level, migration may influence fertility by separation of husbands from wives, delayed marriages, postponement of child bearing, inducing greater participation in the labour force, and reducing the size of their desired fertility, while at the societal level, it affects fertility through changes in the level and distribution of income, education, occupation and by altering the age-sex structure of the rural and urban population.

There is a general feeling that in the process of rural-urban migration the fertility of migrants lies between the fertility of urban natives and rural non-migrants. One of the explanations as to why the fertility of migrants is lower than that of the natives has been shown that migrants to an urban area constitute a literate and more enterprising class of population with better level of socio-economic conditions (Bulsara, 1964). No doubt, migrants bring a higher fertility level to urban areas, but at the same time, it is also true that migrants tend to adopt the fertility patterns of urbanites who have relatively low fertility (Ankrah, 1979).
Fertility in urban areas is often lower than in rural areas (Farooq and Simmons, 1985). Migration from rural to urban areas may, therefore, reduce overall fertility. Some authors opined that rural-urban migration leads to increase in fertility. Although, urbanisation may reduce overall fertility, migrants who are socialised in an area of large family size norms and high fertility behaviour are still likely to have higher fertility than the other urban residents. Moreover, if migrants are relatively more likely to participate in 'informal sector' income earning activities, they may make greater use of their children as workers. This would increase the economic benefits of children and tend to encourage fertility (Oberai, 1990:66). Urban way of life may also lead to the relaxation of their cultural taboos and values, by the way of reduction in the breastfeeding and post-natal obstinence from the coitus and hence will increase their natural-fertility (Rabinson, 1961:30). Many studies (Rele and Kanitkar, 1980; Jolly, 1980, Oberai and Singh, 1983; Karim, 1985; RamLogi, 1986) have dealt with fertility of migrants by residential background. These studies concluded that rural born migrants had higher fertility when compared to the urban born counterparts. There are authentic data on fertility of migrants and non-migrants, which are not relevant to this research, hence not reviewed.
DIFFERENTIALS IN FERTILITY

Study of fertility patterns among the different groups in society is one of the most important areas of research on fertility. The explosive population growth attracting much attention from the demographers, planners and policy makers to know the factors which are responsible for influencing higher fertility. The identification of the groups of higher fertility, along with the underlying causes, would be of great utility from the point of view of the family planning programme. It is good for planners to see where exactly the impact of family planning is great and to locate groups which would need great attention and such kind of knowledge will help to make policy for control fertility. The different variable and their effect on fertility are discussed briefly in the following paragraphs.

RELIGION AND FERTILITY

Often we find the operating force behind religious differentials affecting fertility to be the different cultural values by different religious teachings. The value system attached to various factors (i.e. widow remarriage, abstinence and religious celibacy, adoption of mechanical contraceptives, and so on) in different religious can be regarded as responsible for fertility differentials to a certain extent. Generally, fertility among Muslims has been observed to be higher than among Hindus in India. Davis
(1951) found that Muslim communities show higher population growth than Hindus, while studies by Mukherjee and Singh (1961), Rele (1963) and El Badry (1967) Audinarayana (1986) have corroborated the finding of higher fertility among Muslims over Hindus. Rele and Kanitkar (1980) noticed higher standardized average fertility (3.50) for Muslims followed by Hindus (3.06), Christians (3.04) and Zoroastrians (1.60).

CASTE AND FERTILITY

Caste is one of the important stratification variables or status indicators. In Hindu society caste plays an important part both in social interaction and in the ideal scheme of values. Members of different castes are expected to continue to remain as part of human nature. It is a very important factor to bring out substantial difference in the level of fertility. The major fertility difference by caste lies between the upper and the lower castes, which shows that upper caste people tend to have small family size and bear fewer children than lower caste people. There are authentic data to show a clear pattern of relationship between caste and fertility (Desai, 1969; Arora, 1983; Oberai and Singh, 1983; Audinarayana, 1986; Yadava, 1989).

In Delhi a study by Desai (1969) found that upper caste had lower total fertility rate (5.6) than the lower caste (8.3). Similarly a study on socio-economic
determinants of fertility by Arora (1983) revealed that upper caste had lower mean live births (MLBs) 3.0 as compared to those of middle (3.5) and lower caste groups (4.4). Another study in Ludhiana district of Punjab by Oberai and Singh (1983) found that, the rural born women of lower caste had higher MLBs (3.8) as compared to higher caste (3.5); artisan caste (3.4) and cultivating caste (3.1). The corresponding live births for urban born women was 3.4; 3.1; 3.2; and 3.0 respectively. In rural Andhra Pradesh Audinarayana (1986) noticed that Muslims had higher MLBs (4.81) as against upper caste of Hindus (3.79) and Harijans (3.92). A recent study on rural-urban migration in Varanasi city of Uttar Pradesh, Yadava (1989) observed significant difference between fertility and caste diversity. He found that upper caste respondents had lower MLBs (separated, 2.64; both migrated, 2.87 and non-migrant, 2.70) than the scheduled caste (separated, 2.95, both migrated, 3.86 and non-migrants, 3.02). Based on these studies it can be said that caste is an important factor in determining the fertility.

FEMALE EDUCATION AND FERTILITY

Education of women provides them opportunities for personal advancement and awareness of social mobility. It also provides them a new outlook, freedom from tradition and develops relations in the society. It creates awareness
among them in the activities outside the home, particularly by entering into the labour market. Further, education causes them for better understanding of the reproductive process and access to modern and effective contraceptive methods. These factors influence their fertility in the negative direction by way of first creating awareness of the benefits of having a small family, which in turn induces the acceptance of birth control measures.

Bogue (1969) while reviewing the educational impact on fertility covering the US census data as well as international comparisons, concluded that throughout the world there seems to be a strong negative correlation between the amount of educational attainment and level of fertility. Several studies (Salazar, 1968; Desai, 1969; Mary and Thacker 1975; Jolly, 1980; Rele and Kanitkar, 1980; Arora, 1983; Oberai and Singh, 1983; Reddy, 1986; Yadava, 1989) revealed negative relationship between female education and fertility.

Based on 1965 Peruvian census bureau data, in Latin America, Salazar (1968) noticed that among those migrants with elementary education or less had higher fertility than natives, whereas the opposite is the case among those with secondary and some university education. In Delhi, Desai (1969) observed that illiterate wives had higher total fertility (7.6) than wives who had 10 years of
schooling (2.7). Based on the data of 1970-71 Delhi Demographic Survey, Jolly (1980) observed that, the total fertility of illiterate women was 6.5 live births as compared to 5.1 live births for wives who had schooling up to 2 years. Total fertility was least (3.3) among the wives having at least 10 years of schooling. Another study in the Bronze, New York by Mary and Thacker (1975) noticed that women with 8 years of schooling or less had 3.6 MLBs as compared to 2.9 MLBs for women, with 1-3 year of high school education and 2.4 MLBs for women with 4 years of high school or more. Rele and Ranjitkar (1980) in their fertility and family planning survey of Greater Bombay found that female education is having greater depressing effect on fertility. The standardized average number of children ever born was 3.4 for illiterate women or literate without formal education; 3.1 for women with primary/ matriculation and 1.9 MLBs for women having matriculation passed and above educational level. Studying the socio-economic determinants of fertility Arora (1983) noticed strong negative association between female literacy and fertility performance (significant at 0.01 level). In Punjab, Oberai and Singh (1983) noticed that women who were born in rural and having no formal education had higher MLBs (3.8) as against women who had less than high/higher secondary education (2.6) and high/higher secondary and above education (2.0). The corresponding live births for urban
born women were 3.8, 3.2 and 2.2 respectively. A study in Hyderabad city by Reddy (1968) found that the undergraduate non-slum women had lower MLBS (2.91) as compared to 3.34 MLBS for the illiterate non-slum women. While among slum dwelling women the corresponding live births were 3.25 and 4.42 respectively. Yadava's (1989) study in Varanasi city of Uttar Pradesh revealed that the average number of live births to separated, both migrated and non-migrants and illiterate women had higher fertility (2.74; 2.78 and 3.14 respectively). The corresponding live births for women with high school or intermediate education were 2.22; 2.85 and 1.75 respectively. Hence female education is an important factor in the study of differential fertility.

INCOME AND FERTILITY

Income has been found to affect reproductive motivation though there is an interesting controversy regarding the direction of this effect. Freedman (1959) puts forth certain explanations for its conventional inverse relationship. There are several possible factors that may have forced the higher income groups to have fewer children. The economic burden impending social mobility, the location of many of the couples with the higher incomes in large cities where fertility is usually low and another factor may be the less familialistic orientation of the economically advanced causes. The following studies revealed an inverse
relationship between income and fertility (Desai, 1969; Rele and Kanitkar, 1980; Arora, 1983, Oberai and Singh, 1983). A study in Greater Bombay by Rele and Kanitkar (1980) noticed standardized higher MLBs (3.34) for lower income group as compared to 2.68 MLBs for middle income, 2.34 MLBs for upper and upper middle income group. Another study by Arora (1983) found that the MLBs for respondents in the upper, middle and low income groups were 3.4; 3.22 and 4.26 respectively. Oberai and Singh (1983) observed that the number of live births were peak in the fifth and sixth deciles than other income groups. Kiser (1939) in a study using 1935 census data of United States found that except for the lowest income group, there was no well-established inverse relation between level of income and fertility among urban native white women, though the inverse relationship did apply for foreign born white women and was strong among non-white women.

Some studies did not show definite relationship between income and fertility (Driver, 1963; Reddy, 1986; Yadava, 1989). They indicated that, with the increasing urbanisation, the negative correlation between income and fertility may disappear, possibly to be replaced by a small positive correlation. Driver (1963) in the central Indian study, has not observed significant fertility differentials for low and higher income groups. A study conducted in
Hyderabad city on slum and non-slum dwellers by Reddy (1986) has not confirmed inverse relationship between income level and fertility. A recent study in Varanasi city of Uttar Pradesh, Yadava (1989) also did not find negative relationship. He obtained zig zag patterns between income and fertility.

**FEMALE AGE AT MARRIAGE AND FERTILITY**

Female age at marriage has been reported as a promising determinant of fertility. Malthus suggested late marriage as a preventive check for the growth of population. Agarwala (1968) estimated that the Indian birth rate might be reduced by 30 per cent by 1991-92, if all Indian women marry after the age of 19 years. The age at marriage is itself influenced by a number of factors such as caste, education, family income, employment status of women and residential status etc. Generally, urban women have better socio-economic status and marry at higher ages than the rural counterparts. Many studies (Satyendra Lal, et al., 1974; Rele and Kanitkar, 1980; Arora, 1983; Oberai and Singh, 1983; Audinarayana, 1986; Reddy, 1986) have revealed negative relation between age at marriage and fertility.

A study by Satyendra Lal, et al., (1974) on refugee settlers in West Bengal found an inverse relation between age at marriage and fertility (Significant at 0.01 level). In Greater Bombay, Rele and Kanitkar (1980) observed
that wives who had lower age at consummation of marriage have higher MLBs (5.49) as compared to wives who had higher age at consummation of marriage (3.48). Another study by Arora (1983) noticed that the MLBs in total reproductive span was the highest for those women married \( \leq 15 \) years of age and lowest for those marrying \( \geq 19 \) years. In Ludhiana district of Punjab, Oberai and Singh (1983) observed that women who were born in rural areas and married between 12-14 years have higher fertility (4.6) as against those married between 20-24 years (2.7). The corresponding live births for urban born women were 3.6 and 2.3 respectively. A study in Hyderabad city by Reddy (1986) observed that wives of slum dwellers who married at younger ages (\( \leq 14 \) years) had higher fertility (4.69) as compared to those who married at later ages (18 and above years) 3.35. The corresponding live births for non-slum dwelling wives were 3.43 and 2.73 respectively. In rural India, Audinarayana (1986) obtained significant (at 0.01 per cent level) inverse relationship between age of women at marriage and MLBs. Therefore, age at marriage affects fertility performance.

**DURATION OF MARRIED LIFE AND FERTILITY**

Marriage is the first step in the formation of a family. The duration of married life is determined by the age at marriage. Women with longer duration of effective married life had relatively higher fertility when compared
to those with shorter martial union, because the chances of conception seems to be greater in the former group. If married people migrate from one place to another, it will indirectly affect the marital fertility, because separation of husband and wife, exposed to new environment at destination. It has generally been observed that the urban living patterns tend to stimulate lower fertility due to better health practices, problem of accommodation, higher costs of rearing children and greater access to family planning. Several studies (Salazar, 1968; Satyendra Lal, et al., 1974; Oberai and Singh, 1983; Reddy 1986; Rastogi, 1988) have shown positive association between duration of married life and fertility.

Based on 1965 Peruvian census data of Latin America, Salazar (1968) noticed positive relation between duration of married life and fertility. Satyendra Lal, et al., (1974) study on refugee settlers in West Bengal found that the average number of live births for couples with lower duration of married life (1-3 years) was 0.48 as compared to longer duration of married life (≥ 22 years) with 6.02 MLBs. Similarly a study in Indian Punjab by Oberai and Singh (1983) revealed that the rural born wives and having 0-4 years duration of marriage had lower fertility (1.0) than wives with 20 and above years of duration of married life (5.4). The corresponding live births for urban
born wives were 0.9 and 4.9 respectively. In Hyderabad city, Reddy (1986) found that wives having longer duration of effective marriage had higher fertility than those with shorter effective marital duration. It was significantly confirmed for both the non-slum and slum dwellers (significant at 0.01 level). A study in Uttar Pradesh, Rastogi (1988) also observed that of the surveyed men with the longest duration of married life (i.e. more than 40 years) had 5.80 MLBs. The corresponding MLBs for non-migrants of urban natives was 6.36. Hence, migration affects the marital duration, which influences fertility.

PRESENT AGE OF WIFE AND FERTILITY

Age is considered as biological as well as personal factor. It plays an important role in the matter of behavior. Married women with older ages have higher fertility than those women in younger ages, because the chance of conception seems to be higher for the former group rather than that of the latter group. A number of studies (Satyendra, et al., 1974; Marey, et al., 1975; Rele and Kanitkar, 1980; Oberai and Singh, 1983; Reddy, 1986; Rastogi, 1988; Yadava, 1989) revealed positive relationship between present age of wife and fertility.

A study on refugee settlers in west Bengal by Satyendra Lal, et al., (1974) revealed that lower number of
live births (1.0) for younger age wives (15-19 years) as compared to 7.09 MLBs for older age wives (40-44 years) and it was 3.98 MLBs for all ages. Similarly another study in Latin America by Mary and Thacker (1975) found lower fertility (2.4) for younger age group of wives of (< 35 years) as compared to 3.6 MLBs for older ages (> 35 years) and 3.0 MLBs for all ages. In Greater Bombay, Rele and Kanitkar (1980) found that the average number of live births for wives below 15 years was 0.06, for older age groups (45 and above) it was 4.33 and for all ages 3.07 live births. In Ludhiana district of Punjab, Oberai and Singh (1983) observed that lower MLBs (0.09) for rural born wives of younger ages (15-19 years) as compared to 5.0 MLBs for wives with older ages (40-44 years) and 3.4 MLBs for all ages. The corresponding MLBs for urban born women were 0.4; 5.0 and 3.1 respectively. Another study on slum and non-slum population in Hyderabad city, Reddy (1986) noticed that lower fertility for younger age wives as compared to wives in older ages. In Uttar Pradesh, Rastogi (1988) found that wives aged 45 years and above and husband was a migrant had 4.8 MLBs as compared to 5.7 MLBs among corresponding group of couples where husband was non-migrant and lived in the city since birth. Similarly, in Varanasi city of Uttar Pradesh, Yadava (1989) notices significant (at 0.001 level) positive relation between present age of wife and fertility.
AGE AT ARRIVAL AND FERTILITY

The migrant socialization into urban way of life depends on the age at arrival. Age is highly correlated with mobility, having a peak mobility period occurring in the early thirties. Generally, migrants who arrive at younger ages will have lower fertility, because of their greater exposure to urban way of life than those who arrive at later ages. A study in Columbus and Syracuse by Kiser (1938.381) reports that

"... the urban marital fertility among native white individuals who moved from villages and rural areas to cities before marriage was not higher than that of the observed among city-born individuals of comparable age and social status".

In Harlem, the fertility of those originating in southern villages and rural areas was about the same as those of comparable age and social status born in the urban north. Goldstein (1973.235) stated that one possible explanation is that the more recent migration in Thailand is more innovative in character compared to earlier migration which was more conservative. Further, he suggested that the lower fertility of young and recent is due to husband-wife separation.

Generally, it can be assumed that migrants who arrived before the age of 15 years, majority might have come with their parents or relatives, while a substantial
proportion of the persons who arrived at age 25 or more were usually married and hence migrants accompanied with their spouse into the urban areas and they start reproductive span with origin characteristics. Some studies (Myers, 1966; Salazar, 1969; George, et al., 1975; Oberai, 1990) concluded that the earlier the age at arrival of migrants into urban areas had the lower fertility levels when compared to later age at arrival. A study in Buenos Aires of Latin America by George (1975) found that rural-urban migrants who arrived at younger ages (0-14 years) had lower fertility (1.81 MLB's) than those who arrived at later ages (25 and above years) with 2.31 MLBs. The corresponding MLBs for urban-urban migrants were 1.95 and 2.11 respectively. Based on the analysis of 1963-64 survey data of Latin America, Myers (1966) found that involuntary migrants (less than 15 years of age) were found to have lower fertility than voluntary migrants (above 15 years of age) with some exceptions among rural born migrants.

Similarly on the basis of 1965 Peruvian census, the analysis of first report (Peru, 1966) revealed that migrants who arrived after the age of 20 years have 3.65 MLBs. Similar findings were noticed by Salazar (1968) using the same data. Moreover, Oberai (1990:66) opined that the age at which migrants arrive into the urban areas, the more likely are their fertility levels to be the same as those of
urban natives. Contrary to this, in Santiago of Chile, Tabah and Samuel (1962) noticed that those who arrived under the age of 20 have higher fertility than those who arrived past this age. The latter are said to be selective of the population at place of origin. Hence, age at arrival in urban areas has greater impact on fertility.

MARITAL DISRUPTION AND FERTILITY

The important effect of migration on the family is the conjugal separation. Most of the men migrate leaving their family behind at least until initial adjustment in urban areas. Usually, a higher proportion of new migrants leave their wives in their place of origin as compared to old cohorts. Out-migrants visit their homes on the necessary occasions. The incidence of such a pattern of male migration increases the sex ratio of people existing in the reproductive age. The wives of such migrated husbands have less time of exposure to the risk of conception and hence this affects their fertility performance. The effect of such separation on fertility depends on other factors such as the proportion of wives who are thus separated from their husbands and the period of separation. In addition, migration also influences the marriage patterns. Single male migrants expose to urban culture, postpone the marriage. Hence, it affects fertility. Zachariah (1968) estimated about 12 per cent reduction in the overall fertility of
migrants due to delayed marriages and another 12 per cent further reduction due to husband-wife separation.

Many studies (Visaria, 1969; Goldstein, 1978; Singh, et al., 1981; Oberai and Singh, 1983; Yadava, 1989; Oberai, 1990) showed empirically that migrants who were separated from their wives had lower fertility than migrants who accompanied with their wives. A study in 23 villages in the two districts of Gujarat and Maharashtra by Visaria (1969) revealed that fertility of women whose husbands were absent for more than six months has found lower fertility than that of those wives with husbands present. Singh, et al., (1981) explored the impact of temporary separation due to migration of the men, leaving behind their wives at home in the villages on fertility through the application of a statistical model. They found that fertility of such separated couples was slightly lower than that of the couples living together, but their responsibility was quite high (0.18 against 0.05). Another study in Indian Punjab, Oberai and Singh (1983) showed that rural women whose husbands are out-migrants had lower fertility than non-migrants. Delayed marriage, separation, modernisation of attitude of the husbands were the major factors that exert influence on the reduced fertility of the out-migrants. Analysing the survey data of Varanasi city of Uttar Pradesh, Yadava (1989) found that the average number of children ever
born to a separated couples was 2.64 which is less than 2.71 for migrants who accompanied with their wives and 2.99 for non-migrants. Recently, studying the migration, urbanisation and development, Oberai concluded (1990:66) that the fertility behaviour of migrants differs from those of the non-migrants both at place of origin and destination on account of their selectivity, adoption and disruption in their marital fertility. Similar conclusions were drawn by Goldstein (1978) in studying the migration and fertility in Thailand. Therefore, migration affects the fertility in one or other ways.

**FAMILY SIZE NORMS**

The study of attitudes towards family size norms reveals future reproductive norms. It has been argued that after the occurrence of movement, migrants quickly adopt the attitudes and behaviour of their new surroundings including the lower fertility of urbanites that suit city life (Naidu, 1991:91). Several studies (Rele and Kanitkar, 1980; Goldstein, et al., 1982; Oberai and Singh, 1983; Rastogi, 1986; Reddy, 1986; Tiruvenkatamamy, 1992) have also studied migration in relation to family size norms. In Greater Bombay, Rele and Kanitkar (1980) found that the average ideal family size and actual family size was 3.81 and 2.40 respectively. Oberai and Singh (1983) analysed the responses of the couples (migrants in cities) regarding their desired
family size. After standardising for their current age, out-migrants and return migrants in the rural areas (and also the other in-migrants) were found to have preferred slightly lower average family size than did the non-migrants at the place of origin. In their urban survey too, women belonging to different migrant categories desired nearly the same number of children (between 3.3 and 3.4) as the natives did. Probably the act of migration tends to result in the migrant families declining to delay or postpone to have children rather than deciding to settle for a smaller family size. However, in the process of adjustments they may end up with lower completed family size than the non-migrants. But the desire for additional children was considerably stronger among the migrants than the non-migrants in Bangkok (Goldstein, et al., 1982). In Hyderabad city, Reddy (1986) noticed that the average ideal family size stated by non-slum dwellers was also less by one child as compared to that of the slum dwellers (significant at 0.01 level). Further, he studied additional, expected family size norms. A recent study in Tamil Nadu by Tiruvenkataasamy (1992) found that the average ideal and actual family size was 2.3 and 3.0 respectively. All the above variables reviewed found to be important in the study of fertility behaviour of migrants. Hence, they are considered for empirical validation in the present study. The next chapter deals with methodology relating to this study.