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INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
A STUDY ON RURAL URBAN MIGRATION IN THOOTHKUDI DISTRICT

1. Name : 
2. Age : 
3. Marital Status : Married / Unmarried 
4. Educational Qualification : 
5. Type of family : 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of family</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Community : 
7. Religion : 
8. Pre-Migration Occupation : 
   a) Cultivators b) Agricultural Laborers c) Sheep Rearing d) Petty Trade e) Skilled Workers 
9. Pre – Migration Income : 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre – Migration Income</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below -1500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500-3000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000-4500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4500-6000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 6000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Information Migration : 
   a) Relatives b) Self c) Friends d) Caste members
11. Pattern of Migration:
   a) Single   b) With wife only   c) With wife children only   
   d) With wife children and parents only

12. Nature of Migration:
   a) Permanent   b) Temporary   c) Seasonal

13. Deciding authority in Migration:
   a) own   b) Spouse   c) Relatives   d) Parents

14. Migrated from:
   a) inter district   b) Intra district

15. Year of Migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Migration</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985-1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Reason for Migration:
   a) Education   b) Unemployed   c) Higher Wages   
   d) High cost of Cultivation   e) Urban life

17. Post Migration first employment:
   a) Coolies   b) House maid   c) Commercial Establishment   
   d) Skilled work

18. No of occupation changed
a) No change  b) Single  c) Two  d) More than two

19. Reasons for changing Occupation
   a) Dismissed  b) Highways  c) Better Working Conditions
   d) Personal Reasons

20. Employed Period

21. Post Migration Occupation

22. Present Occupational Satisfaction
   a) Satisfied  b) Not satisfied

23. Post Migration income

24. Type of Savings
   a) Self  b) Chitfunds  c) Employer d) Postoffice  e) Bank

25. Expenditure pattern
   a) Food Item  b) Non Food Item.

26. Reason for visiting native places

27. Frequency of visit
   a) Monthly  b) Once in 3 months  c) Once in 6 months
   d) Once in a year  e) Never visited

28. Sex : Male / Female

29. Type of work : Employer / Household Workers / Enterprise / Salaried / Casual Labour

30. Unemployment period : Less than 1 month
31. Willingness to return

Native Place : Yes / No

32. After Retirement :

33. Cost of living : Costly / Moderate / Not bothered

34. Any other Income Properly : Business / Wife Employed / Property

35. Any other family members

Migrated from your native

Place : Yes / No

36. If so how many :

37. Problems Acquisition of House : Social / Political / Health

38. Distance of migration : Less than 50 kms / 50-100 kms / more than 100 kms
Abstract

Most developing countries are experiencing the phenomenon of migration of the rural population to urban areas. This is attributed to industrialization and urbanization. Even developed countries, in their initial stages of development, had to experience rural migration. For instance, in England, migration took place in a wave-like fashion from villages to small towns to cities. This paper study about the causes for rural urban migration, the economic conditions of migration, migration-poverty interface in Thoothukudi district.

Keywords: Industrialization, Urbanization, Migration

Introduction

NATURE OF RURAL MIGRATION

The Harris - Todaro model of rural migration is basically a two – sector model. The two sectors are urban and rural sectors. The urban sector specializes in the production of manufacture goods, while the rural sector specializes in agriculture. The basic concept
behind the model is that rural urban migration will continue so long as the expected urban real income is more than real wage rate in the agricultural sector.

Even the developed countries, in their initial stages of development, had to experience rural migration. For instance, in England, migration took place in a wave-like fashion from villages to small towns and from small town to cities.

A unique feature of the Indian scenario is that rural-rural migration continues to be predominant. In the case of unskilled jobs, it is generally true that any shift from the primary to the secondary and tertiary sectors represents migration. Initially, this kind of migration is usually within the rural areas—from agricultural to non-agricultural and subsequently from rural to urban areas.

In India, 68.9 percent of the population lives in 6.40lakh villages. The share of agriculture to overall GDP in India has come down to 14 percent, while 66.2 percent of rural males and 81.6 percent of rural females are engaged in agriculture as cultivators or labourers. Inadequate diversification has taken place in rural occupations as many 66.2 percent of rural males and 81.6 percent of rural females, reporting agriculture as their principal economic activity. There is continuous migration from the rural to urban areas in search of better employment opportunities and living standard. During the last 50 years rural population has decreased from 82.0 to 68.9 percent. Migration from rural to urban areas is up from 27.8 to 31.1 percent since 2001. It is estimated that approximately 22 million people have migrated from rural to urban areas since 2001.
STUDIES ON MIGRATION

- A study conducted by Kartika Bhatia and Ashish Rajan (2009) shows that more than half (57 percent) of the sample workers stated that the NREGA “helped them avoid migration”.

- According to R.D.Maurya and Gadkar (2006) recognized researchers on migration at the Ambedkar institute of social research, MGNREGS has reduced migration by 15-20 percent.

- A study by Dreze and colleagues (2009) showed that, rural–urban migration leads to a misallocation of labour between rural and urban sectors in the sense that it raises urban employment, under-employment and poverty.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Since the last few decades, developing countries have been undergoing rapid transformation in the spatial distribution of population. The major factor behind the spatial changes in population has been the opportunity for employment. Migration therefore remains a major force which shapes the urbanization pattern in contemporary developing societies. Like other developing countries, India has experienced significant movement of population from rural to urban areas in search of income and employment opportunities. In other words, in India, rural poverty, among others has been a major push factor in the migration of people from rural to urban areas. Here the researcher has focused the inter district rural urban migration in Thoothukudi district.
OBJECTIVE

- To find out the causes for rural urban migration.
- To assess the economic conditions of migrants.
- To identify migration-poverty interface
- To suggest measures to control rural urban migration.

METHODOLOGY

The present study is based on primary data collected from 100 migrant families with the help of the schedule to get information regarding nature of family, native place, migrant’s previous income and occupation, reason for migration post migration income and occupation, distance etc. It covers the areas of Thiruchendur, Srivaikundam, Villathikulam, and Kovilpatti. Purposive samplings have been used to select the sample households. For analytical purpose simple averages, percentages have been used.

TABLE-1
PRE-MIGRATION OCCUPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL.NO</th>
<th>PRE-MIGRATION OCCUPATION</th>
<th>NO.OF.FAMILIES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cultivators</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agricultural labour</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sheep rearing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Petty trade</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Skilled workers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Survey data

The above table shows the occupational pattern of the households before migration. Among the 100 respondents, 16(16%) households were
cultivators. 39 (39%) households were from agricultural laborers, only 8 (8%) households were doing sheep rearing, 28 (28%) households were from petty traders and 9 (9%) households were skilled workers.

TABLE-2

PRE-MIGRATION INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL.NO</th>
<th>PRE-MIGRATION INCOME</th>
<th>NO.OF.FAMILIES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Below-1500</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1500-3000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3000-4500</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4500-6000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Above-6000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Survey data

The above table shows the annual income of head of households before migration. Among the 100 respondents, 28 families belong to the income category below Rs. 1500, 26 (26%) families receive income of Rs. 1500-3000, 23 (23%) families earned monthly income of Rs. 3000-4500, 15 (15%) families belong to the income category of Rs. 4500-6000, and 8 (8%) families come under the income of above Rs. 6000 per month.
Table 3 reveals that out of 100 migrant families, 13 respondents migrated as single, 28 respondents migrated with wife only and 49 respondents migrated with wife children. 10 respondents migrated with wife children and parents. Most of migrant families have dependents.

### TABLE-3

**PATTERN OF MIGRATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL.NO</th>
<th>PATTERN OF MIGRATION</th>
<th>NO.OF.FAMILIES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>With Wife only</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>With Wife Children</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>With Wife Children and Parents</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Survey data

### TABLE-4

**MIGRATION BY ORIGIN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL.NO</th>
<th>NAME OF THE ORIGIN</th>
<th>NO.OF. FAMILIES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Villathikullam</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Thiruchendur</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Srivaikundam</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kovilpatti</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Survey data
The above table shows the origin of migration of families out of 100 families. 15 (15%) families migrated from Villathikulam, 23 (23%) families migrated from Thiruchendur, 26 (26%) families migrated from Srivaiikundam, 36 (36%) migrated from Kovilpatti.

**TABLE-5**

**REASONS FOR MIGRATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL.NO</th>
<th>PRIORITY REASON FOR MIGRATION</th>
<th>NO. OF FAMILIES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Higher Wages</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>High cost cultivation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Urban life</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Survey data

The table reveals that out of 100 families 26 families migrated mainly for the reason of education, 28 families for getting employment. 22 families migrated for higher wages (good salary), 11 families migrated for high cost of cultivation, and 13 families migrated to taste urban life. Mainly they are migrating for getting employment.
TABLE-6
MIGRANTS FIRST EMPLOYMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL.NO</th>
<th>TYPE OF WORK 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; OBTAINED</th>
<th>NO.OF FAMILIES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coolies</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>House maid</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Commercial Establishments</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Skilled work</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Survey data

Table 6 shows the type of work first obtained by the migrant families. Out of 100 families, 31 families worked out as coolies, 14 families worked as house maids, 40 families worked in established commercial jobs and 15 householders worked as skilled workers.

TABLE-7
POST MIGRATION INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL.NO</th>
<th>POST MIGRATION INCOME(in Rs)</th>
<th>NO.OF.FAMILIES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1000-3000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3000-6000</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6000-9000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9000-12000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Survey data

The above table shows the post migration income levels of the migrants among 100 respondents. There was 26 families belong to income category between Rs1000-3000, 33
families belong to income category between Rs3000-6000, 21 families income range between Rs6000-9000 and 20 families income range between Rs9000-12000.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

39% of the respondents were agricultural laborers before migration the pre-migration of income of the respondents showed that 92% received less than Rs.6000 per month. The pattern of migration showed that 49% migrated with their wife and children. The migrant revealed that 28% migrated for seeking employment. 40% of the migrant got their first employment in commercial establishment. The post migration income of the respondent showed that 20% of the received income between Rs.9000 to 12000.

CONCLUSION

It is hardly surprising that an enormous amount of labor moves from rural to urban areas. They are an outcome of both the push from agriculture, because of extreme poverty and growing landlessness, and the perceived pull of the urban sector. The pulls are reinforced by a variety of factors, ranging from the comparatively high wages and workers protections offered in the organized urban sectors. The enormous services sectors in developing countries are symptomatic of the development of the unorganized or informal sector. This sector is the home of last resort the shelter for the millions of migrants who have made their way to the cities form the rural sector.
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