1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Preamble

Migration is known as shifting of an individual, or a group of individuals, from one place to another, and the gradual settling down, more or less permanently in a new place. Webster's New World Dictionary defines migration as "the act or instance of moving from one place, region and community to settle in another in search of work". From history, it is clear that people belonging to different races have moved from one place to another for food, shelter or other various reasons. Thus, migration can be referred to as an induced process as old as mankind itself. Though the main factors that induce migration may be only a few, the consequences are speculative in the beginning as the individual or a group has to face the situation in a new place.

The process of migration involves primarily, necessitating, facilitating, and accommodative factors. While food, shelter and employment opportunities are the fundamental necessitating factors, the drive for obtaining better social, economic and cultural gains also induces migration. The existence and availability of anticipated things, or opportunities, in a new locality and accessibility, either directly or through certain medium facilitates migration. Conditions like hospitality or congenial set up in a new locality also often determines migration. Thus, migration is a complex process symptomatic of basic economic and social change and associated with complex social and psychological problems. Kalin and Berry (1980) have stated that migration is pragmatic and universal and that it has two major forms viz., Internal and International. 'Internal migration' is commonly referred to as the shifting of an individual, or a group, from one rural area to another, to an urban area, or vice versa and from an urban area to another. Shifting from one country to another is referred to as 'international migration'.
1.2 Migration scene in India

Indians are thought to be less mobile as compared to people from most western countries and the U.S. (Davis 1951 and Zacharaiah 1964). Davis has observed, on the basis of the 1931 census, that only 3.6% of the Indian population (Table 1.1) has lived outside the state while more than about 22.5% of the native population of the U.S. has lived outside the state. However, in recent years, the mobility of Indians has been progressively increasing (Bose, 1978). From Table-1.2, it is clear that, in 1981, rural-rural migration was 65.2%, rural-urban 17.7%, urban-urban 11.1% and urban-rural 6.0%. It is also clear from Table-1.2 that the rural-rural migration has reduced while rural-urban and urban-rural has increased, although, the rural-rural migration in terms of volume, dominates other type of migration streams in India.

According to Nair (1986) who estimated the rate of migration in India between 1971-81, the states with highest immigrants were Haryana (3.24%), Maharashtra (2.88%) and West Bengal (1.71%), while the states with highest emigrants were U.P. (1.8%) and Karnataka (1.43%). According to scholars like Zacharaiah (1964), Mitra (1967), Gupta & Sen (1968), Kaur (1971), Premi (1976), Singh (1980) and the U.N. (1961) migratory flow has been from the area of limited economic opportunities and related social aspects to the developed and fast developing areas where immigrants can expect greater pecuniary gains, and consequently, a better living and socio-economic status.

In India, where more than 70% of the population is engaged in agriculture and allied activities, the predominance of rural-rural migration cannot be over emphasized. Modernisation in the agricultural sector could be considered as the main reason for rural-rural migration which dominates the scene. Generally, it is the agricultural labourer who migrates more. Migration of agricultural labour gives rise to a different set of problems related to the condition of work, nature of their exploitation by the middle men and their relationship with the farmers (Rao 1986). Migrant labourers are
commonly exposed to the problems of adjustment, non co-operation and cool behavioural treatment from the locals and experience feelings of relative deprivation (Arora & Kumar 1980, Russell and Straclan 1980 and Rank and Voss 1982).

1.3 Studies on migration

Numerous studies have been conducted all over the world on the migration of people from time to time. The studies which cover some aspects of migration have laid emphasis on:

- The characteristics of the immigrants,
- The determinants of migration,
- The problem of immigrant adjustment in the new socio-economic milieu and
- The method of recruitment and wage payment.

Therefore the survey of literature has been presented in accordance with the aspects covered by each study.

1.3.1 Characteristics of immigrants

Most of the early studies concentrate on the social characteristics of population like, age, sex, marital status, caste, literacy, family size, family type and the occupation which have an association with migration or induce it.

Age


Studies in developing countries have shown that migrants in general are likely to be in the young, working age group of 15-34 years (Chamratrithirong et.al 1979, Hugo 1982, Standing 1985, and Prothero & Chapman 1985). Shaw (1975), while giving an account of different studies conducted in different parts of the US, Chile, Ghana, Rhodesia, U.K, France, Mexico, Brazil, Guatemala, Taiwan has supported the age group selectivity of 20 - 29 years.

However, contrary to the above statements, in Sri Lanka there is neither a strong selectivity of dominance of young people nor the dominance of a particular group (ESCAP 1980). Swanson et. al, (1979) opine that the age of migrants was negatively correlated with the willingness to move. Thus, it is evident that the age factor has some influence on migration.

**Sex**

Ravenstein's (1889) generalisation about sex selectivity in migration states that females appear to predominate in short distance migration. This holds good only in case of rural - rural migration due to a feministic reason i.e., marriage. Premi (1986), Mitra (1967) and Singh (1978) observe that in intra-district migration females are predominant, while in inter district and inter-state migration it is dominated by
males. A survey, conducted by the International Institute for Population Studies in four nations, on internal migration, has indicated that in Japan (1950 - 55) and the Philippines (1939 - 40), a majority of migrants were females who migrated due to availability of work in light industries, while in India, marriage is the main cause for female migration.

According to Zachariah (1964) internal migration in India is highly selective towards males, while it is not so in Western Countries. Davis (1977) and Zachariah (1964) observe that in many Asian countries males are more inclined towards rural - urban migration. Singh (1978) and Premi (1980) in their studies have observed that the number of female migrants was more than double that of males in rural - rural and inter district migration. Further, it is observed that as the distance increases, the ratio of migration falls sharply.

Rele (1969) has opined that in case of male migration, the economic factors are more important than social ones. Premi (1980) and Jain (1979) have observed that in some cases of female migration (rural - rural) economic factors are also responsible. Scholars like Agarwal (1968), Bose (1965) Narain (1975), Bhende (1976), Premi (1976), Kumar and Sharma (1979) have also upheld the view that there is preponderance of women in migration stream due to marriage.

**Marital status**

Various studies by scholars like Chauhan (1966), Zachariah (1968), Dhesi and Gumbar (1982), Joshi (1989), Klinger (1986) and Ledent and Liaw (1986) have indicated that a majority of the migrants are young and unmarried. This has also been supported by Hugo (1986) in Hungary and the U.S. Bureau of Census (1985), and in countries like Belgium, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Italy and Japan a similar status has been found.
Contrary to the above statement, Saxena (1977), Grewal et al. (1979), Chatterjee (1983), Upreti (1981), Premi (1976), Khan (1981), Gupta (1988), Raju (1989), Parameshwarappa (1981), Girald et al. (1970) and Hollingsworth (1970) have opined a majority of migrants were married. However, Sharma (1982) in his study has noticed that, due to the custom of child marriages in the place of origin, there can be a preponderance of married persons in the migration streams.

According to Kamath (1914), Chandrashekhar (1950), Davis (1951), Gosal (1961), D. Souza (1966), Suprunovich (1971), and Mujumdar and Mujumdar (1978) early marriage has hindered migration.

**Caste**

Persons belonging to a particular caste which is no longer functionally integrated into the village economy, are more mobile than those who are integrated into the village economy (Mishra 1952). According to Mishra's view, many low caste people migrate from rural areas to other places with a view to liberating themselves from age-old social discriminations, and to conceal their low social status in the hierarchy of the caste system (Mujumdar & Mujumdar 1978).

Domination of people belonging to the lower castes in migration has been studied by Sharma (1982), Bhakoo (1978), Grewal and Sidhu (1979), Arora & Kumar (1980), Gupta (1980) and Hegde (1996) and that of intermediary castes by Gupta (1988). However, a greater number of people belonging to the upper castes being involved in migration has been revealed in studies conducted by Mayere (1973), Joshi (1989), Gist (1955), Saxena (1977) D'Souza (1977), Bora (1987), Emes (1954), Joshi (1957), Emes and Scwab (1964) and Connell et. al (1976).

However, Parameshwarappa (1981) has observed, in his study on urban areas in Karnataka, that no particular caste group dominates in migration.
There has been no concrete evidence about the dominance of a particular caste group during migration. However, it is evident from many studies, that caste is instrumental in causing differential migration, the effectiveness of which depends upon the set-up in which the migrants are living.

**Literacy**

Gupta (1988) and Hegde (1996) in their study, observe that three fourths of the migrants are illiterate. Sen (1960) has stated that a majority of the immigrants in urban areas are educationally most backward. Lambert (1963), Grewal (1979), Arora & Kumar (1980) and Garkevich (1983) have revealed that the migrant's educational level, in general, was low.

Caldwell (1969) has observed that, in Ghana, migration dramatically increases on the completion of primary education. Wyon and Garden (1971) in a study of Punjab, observe that the completion of the third grade (before, and of primary level) was a critical stage associated with increased rates of migration. Harvey (1968), in a study in Colombia, has observed that persons with little or no education are more likely to be rural - rural migrants.

Bogue and Zacharaiah (1962) observe that in India, the propensity to migrate to urban areas is much higher among the literate as opposed to illiterates. Similar observations have also been made by Green wood (1971), Biplab Dasagupta and Roy Laishley (1975), Bora (1987), Raju (1987) and Joshi (1989). Sahota (1963) observes, that in Brazil, the educational level has a significant, positive relation to out-migration.

Scholars like Kamath (1914), Wattal (1934), Davis (1951), Chandrashekhar (1950), Gosal (1961), D'Souza (1966), Suprunovich (1971), Mujumdar and Mujumdar (1978),
and Singh and Yadava (1981) have opined that a low level of education hinders migration. Educated people are usually urban oriented, while illiterate migrants include most of the rural - rural, seasonal and short term workers in mines and plantations (Connell et. al 1976).

**Family size and family type**

The influence of family size and type on migratory behaviour has been dealt with by many scholars. These studies indicate that extended families show a higher tendency, than nuclear ones, towards migration. Wilkenning et al (1967) observe that migration is not likely to occur unless local opportunities are limited, but, given this factor, the extended family extends its influence whenever it can. The advantage of a broad structure of such families is that it allows and encourages the migration of its member as a means of spreading the family's investment opportunities. Raju (1989) has stated that, living in joint families was not the factor for the individuals to stay in villages, perhaps an absence of such strong economic motivation among them might be the main reason. Gupta (1988) observes that the large size of family could be the cause of poverty which, in turn, compels the members to leave the village to seek better employment (Pathare et. al 1972 and Wiest 1970).

Contrary to the above statement, Parameshwarappa (1981) observes that a majority of migrants are from nuclear families. Upton (1967) in his study of six Nigerian villages opines that the size of family is positively correlated to migration.

**Occupation**

Bradfield (1973) notices selectivity in rural - urban migration in case of the Huaylas in Peru, where he found that a considerable percentage of migrants were agriculturists. Arora and Kumar (1980), Upreti (1981) and Chatterjee (1983) have found that the majority of migrants hailed from agriculture and agro based works.
However, Dhekney (1959) finds that in Hubli city, a majority of the migrants are not from the agricultural sector.

Hamsaleelavathy (1970) states that, skilled and technical workers are more migratory than the non-skilled and non-technical. Contrary to the above statements Sen (1960) observes that, in Calcutta, most of the immigrants are unskilled. Garkovich (1983) observes that skilled and technically skilled persons are less migratory than non-skilled and non-technical persons.

**Land ownership**

It is generally assumed that out-migration from villages is caused by unequal distribution and scarcity of land. Also, that the poorest, the landless and those holding the lowest position in the social hierarchy of villages have the greatest tendency to migrate. Studies by Scudder and Anderson (1954), Hill (1972), Schimid (1967), Gupta (1988) and Sharma (1982) have revealed that there exists a certain relationship between the extent of land the individual/family holdings and their propensity to migrate.

Ryan (1968) finds that, the high rate of mobility of Toarpic migrants is related to non-availability of large tracts of land suitable for cash cropping. Goddard (1973) has noticed, in villages near Kano in Nigeria, that shortage of agricultural land is an important factor for migration of labourers.

Studies by Walsh and Trilin (1973) and Rochin (1972) have shown a positive relationship between high man-land ratio and propensity to migrate. It is apparent that inadequate extent of land for generating income and consequent poverty may have stimulated migration.
1.3.2 Determinants of migration

The influencing factors of migration are not only numerous but are also very complex, and vary from place to place and from time to time. According to Kingsley Davis (1964) the causes of human migration have never been systematically understood. When people speak of them, they often have in mind either the motives that migrants have or the conditions they face. It is not always realized that both causes are relevant and mutually interdependent. Except, when forced to do so (as in slavery), no one migrates without an objective in view. At the same time, however, the effect of an objective with respect to migration cannot be known until the local conditions are understood. The same objective may be satisfied at one time by one kind of behaviour and, at another, time by an opposite kind, depending on the situation.

Various scholars have presented their opinions on the factors which are responsible for migration. Some of them have laid importance on economic factors (Thomas 1954 and Gugler 1969). Garneir (1978) has observed that migration is generally based on the incentives provided by dissatisfaction with one's economic lot. Chapin and Shirley (1962) emphasises the role of desire for personal advancement as a factor of migration. Srivastav and Ali (1981) have noticed, in a study of Kols in India, that the prime cause of migration is absolute poverty.

Kuroda (1972) states that in an uneven distribution of economic activity, the level among regions and regional reproductive differentials of population tend to reinforce each other to accelerate migratory movements. Dhesi and Gumbar (1982) have opined that economic factors like small holding, low income, unemployment and better prospectus have made people migrate to other regions. Gulliver (1955) and Nair (1986) express that, in human migration economic necessity is almost always the real cause.
Studies in Africa by various scholars like Gulliver (1955), Cohen (1969), Richard (1954), Hutton (1966), Hart (1975), Prothero (1966) and Skinner (1963) have found that economic factors are more important than others.

Stouffer (1940) has opined that the spatial distance does not hinder the mobility of people from one place to another, provided better job opportunities are available at the place of destination. Stone (1973) finds that in Britain, the migrants from South Africa immigrated for better employment facilities. Similar observations have also been made by Dhekney (1959), Chauhan (1966), Sandhu (1969), Stockel (1972), Grewal and Sidhu (1979), Arora and Kumar (1980), Russel and Strachan (1980), Kaur (1971) and Musgrove (1963). These scholars hold the view that migration is an answer to personal predicament, often frustration in work and absence of opportunities for advancement. Lee (1975) emphasises the factors associated with the area of origin and destination, intervening obstacles between the place of origin and the place of destination and personal factors. Hertzeler (1956) opines that the advantages or disadvantages of the two places act as attractive, or repulsive factors in migration.

The more an individual is poor, landless and socio-economically deprived, the greater are the chances of his migration from rural to urban areas. Ranga Rao et al (1977), Mukherjee (1979) and Vasudev Rao (1981) opine that most of the capable earners move out of their native places in pursuit of economically active occupations. Bora (1987) has found in his study that 77% of workers migrated in search of jobs.

Sorokin (1932) observes that a city attracts both special talents and abilities and also a great number of unambitious pleasure seeking persons. According to Pal (1974) the relatively better conditions of living and better prospects, in a city, are significant motivating factors. Parameshwarappa (1981) has found that the decline in home industries, uneven distribution of resources and periodic droughts were the main cause of migration. While Ralph Thompison (1965) opines that the factors influencing migration are complex and intertwined.
General observations about causes of migration

Ganguli (1947) states, that wider economic, political and cultural factors are remarkable causes of migration. Bogue (1959) finds that, not only economic factors, but also social, political, medical and psychological factors can cause migration. Gupta (1972) opines that the improvement of transport and communication and increase in educational level have been responsible for increase in migration in recent years in India. According to Addo (1974), both internal and international migrations are economic, demographic, environmental, political and, to some extent, religious in character.

Harvey (1972) and Amin (1975) have observed, that internal migration seems to be from areas of low level of development to relatively more advanced regions. Gosal (1961) has indicated, that the present tempo of internal migration is bound to increase in future as a result of a growing diversification of economic activity, as increasing degree of commercialization, urbanisation, industrialisation. Improvements in transport facilities and spread of modern education are also likely to increase the mobility of the Indian population.

Scholars, like Kamath (1914), D'Souza (1966), Suprunovich (1971), Mujumdar and Mujumdar (1978), Wattal (1934), Chandrashekhar (1950) and Davis (1951), have also focused on the social forces of population and mobility, beside stressing economic factors, caste systems, regional and communal aspects, early marriages, family ties, diversity in language and culture, low level of education etc.. as factors influencing migration.

The influence of social contact on migration has an important role. Landis (1948) has noted, that the presence of relatives and friends is an attractive force, in deciding choice of destination, for a large majority of migrant families and further, that this type of migratory movement helps immediate social adjustment of the migrants. According to
Rao (1986) the social network (ties of kin, caste, village & language) is the most effective channel of communication which favours decision making in migration. Very rarely do people move without prior information and a linkage of some kind or the other. Illsley (1970), in his study in Scotland, found that the presence of friends and relatives already living there has influenced migration. Nicholson (1980) has noticed, that distance does not affect migration when migrants have friends and relatives in the place of destination. The role of social contact in migration has been upheld by the scholars like Russell and Strachan (1980), Dhesi and Gumbar (1982) and Williams and Mcmillion (1983).

Uhlenberg (1973) states, that people having more community affiliation and kinship ties are comparatively less mobile than otherwise. Davis (1951) has stated, that homesickness itself is not a cause, but is a by product, of the interplay of various socio-economic factors and forces which retard migration.

Wyon and Gordan (1971) have noted that, in some regions, the social custom may either control migration or promote it. Among the farmers of Punjab, the elder sons were kept away from schools so that they might remain on the family farm, while the younger sons were provided some schooling as a preparation for migration.


Militancy in recent years has caused many people to migrate from one place to another. An article in a monthly journal called Frontline (Dec 1990) has described, that due to militants activities, about 15,000 families have migrated from Punjab State to Delhi during the period 1986 to 1990.
Hilda (1965) states, that political factors are also one of the determinants of migration. He has found that in West Africa, during the pre-colonial era, the migration rate was low, but during the colonial period the rate of migration had increased due to several political policies for developing transport and communication. One of the largest mass migrations in history, essentially due to religious - political causes, took place in 1947 when the Indian sub-continent was divided into India and Pakistan (Philips and Wain Wright -1970).

1.3.3 The problem of immigrant adjustment in new socio-economic milieu

Rao (1986) has stated, that the immigration of agricultural labourers, either seasonal or permanent, in other rural area gives rise to different sets of problems related to their condition of work, nature of their exploitation by middle men and farmers, their relationship with the locals and the impact on their origin. Arora and Kumar (1980), Russell and Strachan (1980) and Rank and Voss (1982) have stated, that the migrant farm workers experience adjustment problems in the new social ecosystem due to their socio-cultural stereotypes. They have a low level of social participation, face non-co-operation and cool behavioural treatment from the locals and experience feelings of relative deprivation. According to Richard (1976) and Gupta (1988), this type of attitude can lead to conflict at the place of destination. Weinberg (1973) believes that the adjustment of migrants to the new environment is related to the level of exploitation. He opines that many people who migrate against their will, sabotage themselves unconsciously. That is why most of the migrant communities have to face certain problems of social adjustment. According to Aurora (1967) social adjustment is a two way process because it involves the attitude of migrants as well as that of the host community.

Belvin (1971) opines that the feeling of relative deprivation among the migrants may lead to expansion in power structure, either by immigrants or by locals. Ducocestella
(1970) states that the hostile attitude of locals causes relative deprivation among the migrants.

Zacharaiah (1968) opines, that the problems of adjustment depend upon the duration of the stay of immigrants at any place. Punekar (1974) and Raju (1989) observe that knowing one another's language can bring people together and promote an understanding between locals and immigrants. Fitzpatric (1975) believes that relatives and friends who migrated earlier play an important role in the process of adjustment and integration. Sharma (1982) and Bora (1987) have noticed that the problem of accommodation at the destination hinders the immigrant's proper adjustment in a new location.

According to Reddy (1971), as the duration of stay extends, and migrants adopt new cultural values to integrate with the new social setting, they find it difficult to retain relations with their native community. Levine (1973) and Vidhyasagar (1986) observe that the native ties weaken the duration of stay of immigrants. However, Gugler (1969) opines that Africans immigrants, by virtue of their dual living system, are loyal both to place of destination and origin. Scholars like Bhakoo (1978), Gupta (1988) Joshi (1989) and Raju (1988) have noticed, that the migrants undergo some changes in a new social setting such as food, habit, dress and language etc. in the process of adjustment with the host community.

1.3.4 The method of recruitment and wages of immigrants

According to Arora and Kumar (1980), labourers in Punjab were recruited from Bihar by local agents and traders and they were supplied to the farmers after charging a commission of Rs.300/- to 400/-. As a result, the farmers did not see the need to pay the first two months salary to the labourers. In this way, a big chunk of the potential earnings of migrants was taken away by these agents and traders. Scholars like Gupta
(1988), Rao (1986) and Patel (1987) observe that immigrant labourers, to some extent, were exploited by middlemen during recruitment.

The movements of people from one place to another has been for both economic and non-economic reasons. The migrants have to face many problems in the new social setting such as, housing, nature of work, working conditions and wages, method of recruitment and the non adjustment with the locals, the diversity of language, culture and relative deprivations etc. However, the adjustability of the migrants in the new area increases with the duration of stay in the destination due to the interaction with new values and norms etc. in course of time, and to some extent, the problem of adjustment also arises with the place of origin.
### Table 1.1 Internal Migration in India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Year</th>
<th>Percent of persons enumerated in a state or province different from the locality in which they were born to total population.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kingsly Devis (1951), Ashish Bose (1978) and Census of India 1971.

### Table 1.2 Percentage of total migration by streams in India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Of Migration</th>
<th>1961 % Distribution of migration streams in total migration</th>
<th>1971 % Distribution of migration streams in total migration</th>
<th>1981 % Distribution of migration streams in total migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Male Female</td>
<td>Total Male Female</td>
<td>Total Male Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural - Rural</td>
<td>73.7 56.7 81.3</td>
<td>71.3 53.5 78.8</td>
<td>65.2 45.7 73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban - Rural</td>
<td>3.6 4.6 3.2</td>
<td>4.9 6.1 4.4</td>
<td>6.0 7.0 5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural - Urban</td>
<td>14.6 25.7 9.7</td>
<td>15.0 26.1 10.3</td>
<td>17.7 30.0 12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban - Urban</td>
<td>8.1 13.0 5.8</td>
<td>8.8 14.3 6.5</td>
<td>11.1 17.3 8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00 100.00 100.00</td>
<td>100.00 100.00 100.00</td>
<td>100.00 100.00 100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Census of India 1971 Series - 1 India, Part II special. All India Census Table (Estimated) on one percent sampling data Delhi P.137-64. The Figures are provisional. Census of India 1981 Series - 1 India Part - V A & B Migration Tables.