expenses on marriage, illness or religious ceremonies. Another 1.56 per cent of households mainly utilized the remittance received for clearing their old debts. Only 3.13 per cent of the households used the money for developmental expenditure like, the construction of a house or improve agriculture. Generally in the study area the remittance is used for consumption expenditure only.

In zone II, out of 238 households receiving remittance, 93.64 per cent of families spent the money for consumption purpose only which stood first rank. About 4.04 percent of the families used the remittance for the construction of house and other agricultural expenditures. About 1.16 percent of households used the remittance for the expenses towards marriage, illness and festivals. Another 1.6 percent of households utilized the remittance to clear the debts.

6.4 SUMMARY
The overall analysis on rural households contact with migrants shows that the commonest means of contact was through personal visit by the migrants. A considerable percentage of migrants keep their families in their native places. The probability analysis shows that the land holdings, marital status, age and education of the migrants and place of migration had significant influence on aggregate probability. The same trend also was observed in the analysis on determination of amount of remittance, except in a few variables.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

7.1 INTRODUCTION

Migration is an inevitable process associated with economic development. Globally, this process of population distribution does have profound effect on both the areas from which migrants have come and the areas in which they finally settle. Depending on the origin and destination of a migrant the migration is divided in four major streams namely rural-rural, rural-urban, urban-rural and urban-urban migration. Each of these streams has their own set of push and pull factors which compel a migrant to take the decision to move. In the migration
literatures, several socio-economic, cultural and political factors have been identified to explain the causes and determinants of migration.

One of the major determinants that is said to have had an impact on migration flows is the difference in expected income between urban and rural areas. But studies there after have revealed the fact that the expected income gap hypothesis explains only portion of the migration causes. There area quite few instances in evidence where migration flow is low despite the existence of a fair expected income gap. In this case the quality of standard of living comes into play to be a major determinant. Studies have shown that people choose to stay at their respective native place rather than moving to a place away from their friends and relatives. In these cases family ties play a pivotal role in explaining the extent of migration other than the expected income gap. Among the other determinants that are found to have considerable impact on rural urban population mobility are urbanization, basic amenities in the destination towns, ethnic factors cost of migration, easy accessibility to jobs, state of agricultural performance, urban informal labour market lesser employment in rural sector, literacy rate urban poverty, rural poverty, family decision. Under this backdrop,
the present study attempts to analyse socio-economic conditions, push and pull factors and consequences in Madurai city.

For the purpose of study both primary and secondary data have been used. Total of 300 sample migrant households were randomly and proportionately selected from zone I (old 28 wards) and zone II (new 72 wards) in Madurai city. A personal interview method was adopted to collect primary data. The survey pertains to the year 2012-13.

In the foregoing chapters, socio-economic characteristics of sample migrants both personal and general and comparison of migrant households in different zones, job search occupation and earnings of the migrants, migrants with their family relationship and their remittances have been discussed. The present chapter summarizes the major findings along with conclusions and suggestions.

7.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
Major findings of the study are summarised and certain policy implications on the basis of the findings have also been presented in the following paragraphs.

While analysing the socio economic characteristics of the total sample size of 300 households it was found that 70.33 per cent households were headed by males and the remaining 29.67 per cent by females. It is, therefore, inferred that migration of males from the households increases the decision-making freedom of females. It was found that there were all in the migrant household heads were educated in both zone I and zone II.

An analysis of the occupations of the sample households shows that primary occupation of the majority of household heads was agriculture and related activities (46.00 per cent). Agricultural labourers accounted for 26.33 per cent, compared to a less percentage of household heads employed in the formal sector. The other important fact leading to migration was that nearly 80 per cent of the labourers were involved in agriculture and related activities and they did not have any secondary sources of employment.
Composition of the family is an important factor lying at the root of migration. Among migrant households more than 69 per cent in both zones were nuclear families. This could be due to the size of the family which facilitated easy movement and decision-making.

The number of earning members in sample households is an important factor causing migration. It was found that number of earning members in migrant households was less in both zones in Madurai city.

While considering land holding of sample households, zone I households possessed 3.78 acres on average whereas in zone II households had only 2.77 acres. It was observed that the majority of migrant households (38 to 51 per cent) did not have any cultivable land who were landless. This supports the view that the landlessness or less possession of land causes migration in the study area.

The income level analysis of the households indicates that 50.62 per cent migrant households in zone I were below Rs.50,000 income level as compared to 41.58 per cent in zone II. The average incomes for a zone I and zone II household
were Rs.59876.54 and Rs.201084.47 respectively. This proves that low income level induces household members to migrate from their places of origin. Another factor connected with economic status is savings. On analysis the following results were found. The monthly average savings in zone I and zone II household heads were `2500 and `3125 respectively. Debt, another economic factor, among the households was analysed and it was found that a zone I household and zone II household, on an average, had debts of Rs.54102.77 and Rs.22094.77 respectively. This is due to the fact that the migrant households had no good reason to take loans, since most of them were not owning lands.

In order to find the average socio-economic status of migrant zone I and zone II households, the socio-economic scale was used. The average socio-economic status was found more or less to be equal for both zone I and zone II households and for the whole sample means showed that there was a significant difference between them since the calculated ‘Z’ value of 3.498 was greater than the table value of ‘Z’ 1.96 at 5 per cent level of significance. Hence, there is a relationship between the socio-economic status of the non-migrants and migrant
households. Hence, it can be said that socio-economic status is one among the reasons influencing migration in the study area.

For analysing the factors influencing the incomes of the migrants, in zone I and zone II and total sample households semi-log regression was used. The results showed that caste did not influence income significantly in all the three estimated equations. The age variable had a positive influence on migrants and on the total sample households. The variable ‘education’ positively influenced the income of the households in all the three categories of in zone I and zone II and total sample households. The primary occupation of agriculture negatively influenced the income for zone I households. For migrant households, it was a positive influence on income. Presence of secondary occupation had positive influence on income for all the three categories and it was not significant. The total number of household members had the positive influence on income for all the three categories of households. The number of earning members in the household had positive and significant influence on household income for all the three categories of households. The number of female earning members had negative influence on income for all the three categories. Land holding and income from agricultural sector had positive influence on household income for all three categories. The
land holding for migrant households significantly influenced the household income, whereas it was not so for the landholding of non-migrant households.

The analysis of age at the time of migration shows that 88.45 per cent of total migrants migrated at an age below 35 years. The model age group was 26 to 30 years. The average age of migrants at the time of migration was 26 years.

Regarding the educational status of the migrants in zone I. 57.33 per cent of the migrants were literates. The proportion of primary educated persons was higher among the educated.

Employment pattern at the time of migration shows that majority of them were employed in the agricultural sector (52 per cent). But the proportion got reduced when the level of education increased. Educational level and the pattern of employment reveal that the persons employed in the agricultural sector, especially the educated unemployed, were prone to migration.
The analysis of ‘occupation-wise earning’ shows that the average earning of a cultivator was `444.79 per month, for agricultural labourers it was `301.44 per month, and the self-employed migrants earned `1072.22. The variations in earning were high among the self-employed compared to other sectors. This induced the people to migrate to the non-agricultural sector.

The analysis of ‘causes of migration’ expressed that employment motive was the most predominant factor for bringing about migration in the rural area. Landlessness, and unemployment were the other two important factors for rural outmigration.

The analysis of contact between the migrant and his family members shows that 97.33 per cent of the migrants visited regularly their native places and 88 per cent of the total migrants’ purpose of visit was to see parents and relatives. The highest number of migrants left wife and children in their native places due to insecurity of jobs and because they wanted to save more.
The analysis of frequency of money received shows that 45.33 per cent received money regularly every month. A study of the amount of remittances shows that modal class of amount of remittance was upto Rs.2000 per year. It accounted for 44 per cent of the total migrants and 55.62 per cent of the households receiving remittances. The amount of remittance on average which a rural out migrant household received was Rs.2202.89 per year. On an average a rural to rural migrants were sending less money than rural to urban migrants.

For the analysis of determinants of remittance, a simple multiple regression is used. All the households which received remittance from the migrants were included in this analysis. The dependent variable was the natural logarithm of annual remittance received by a household. The estimated equation shows that among the demand side demographic variables, ‘relation with migrant’ (RHRH and RHRS) had positive and significant influence. The number of rural household members (HMEM) had the expected negative influence on amount of remittance but the calculated co-efficient was not statistically significant. The calculated co-efficient for relation ‘husband’ (RHRH) shows that ceteris paribus, it determined the amount of remittance by 165.21 per cent, the relation ‘son’ (RHRS) determined the remittance by 45.41 per cent. Among the supply
side demographic variables, ‘present age’ and ‘age square’ (MPAGE and MPASQ) had the expected positive and negative influences on the amount of remittance by migrants but the calculated co-efficient was not statistically significant. The variables’ marital status’ and ‘years of schoolings’ (MSMIG and EDUM) of the migrant had positive and significant influence on the amount of remittance. The demand side economic variables (HINC, PLAND, PIND and PSAV) have positive influence on the amount of remittance. Among the supply side variables (MIGE, MIGESQ, FORE and SELF) except ‘migrant employment in formal sector’ all other variables had significant influence on the amount of remittance. The general pattern of rural outmigration variables (PLMG and OSMIG) had positive influence on the amount of remittance.

The probability analysis shows that landholding, marital status, age of the migrants, education of the migrants and place of migration had significant influence on the aggregate probability. The same trend also was observed in the analysis of determination of the amount of remittance, except in a few variables.

The chance to get remittance for a rural outmigrant on the demand side was estimated with OLS, Probit and Logit methods. On the basis of the estimated
equation the aggregate probability to get remittance from the migrants by the rural outmigrant households was 0.82121 in Probit estimate and 0.8391 in Logit estimate, when evaluated at the mean level of independent variables. It is inferred that the probability for not getting remittance was 0.17879 in Probit estimate and 0.16094 in Logit estimate. Among the demographic demand side variables (HMEM, RHRH, LAND, RHRS), relationship with the migrants had the expected positive relation and with household members the expected negative relation. In the supply side, all the four demographic variables (MPAGE, MPASQ, MSMIG AND EDUM), that is, ‘age of the migrant’, age square’, marital status of the migrant’ and years of schooling’ were statistically significant. The marginal probability of the variable household members in rural area (HMEM) was -0.022 in Probit and -0.102 in Logit estimate. The marginal probability of the variable age of the migrant (MPAGE) was 0.03648 and marginal probability for ‘age square’ (MPASQ) was very negligible.

Among the demand side economic variables ‘rural household earnings’ and ‘presence of land’ (HINC and PLAND) had significant influence on aggregate probability. The co-efficient of presence of land (PLAND) has positive influence on aggregate probability and its co-efficient was statistically significant at one
percent level in all the three estimates. Among the supply side economic variables ‘migrants earning’ and ‘migrants earning sequences’ (MIGE and MEGESQ) had the expected positive and negative influences on aggregate probability respectively. The formal sector employment (FORE) of a migrant had the negative influence on aggregate probability. The negative influence of income square (MIGESQ) shows that the marginal propensity to receive was reduced when income of the migrant increased at certain level. The marginal probability of the variable migrant earnings (MIGE) was very negligible in the case of Probit estimate. The general factors, (IE) pattern of migration variables (PLMIG and OSMIG) has positive and significant influence on aggregate probability.

In the overall analysis on probability of getting remittance showed that those households which had the contact with the migrant through close blood relationship, through economic ties and having migrants in urban areas and other states, had higher probability than others. And those migrants well settled in urban areas, employed in the formal sector or self-employed had less chances to remit money to their native place.
7.3 CONCLUSIONS

Thus it may be concluded from the above analysis of findings that seeking better employment, better earnings and landlessness were the main factors for causing migration. Level of socio-economic status was also found as one of the causes of migration. Regarding the migrants socio-economic status, the urban migrant was found to be in better status than the rural migrant households. The source of information for migration showed that the urban-based contacts (friends and relatives) played a major role. Regarding remittances from migrants showed that rural to rural migrants were sending less money than rural to urban migrants.

7.4 SUGGESTIONS

Implementation of improvised and modern technology for enhancing agricultural production could be arranged and the authorities involved could educate the agricultural labourers, identified as potential migrants. This could
include technologies like unconventional power generation, maximum utilisation of power, effective use of resources like light, energy and water.

Making available to the potential migrants such facilities like mechanical tillers, tractors, threshers and farm equipments on hire or on rental basis could lead to effort minimisation and earning maximisation.

Through new schemes and their effective implementation landless agriculturist could be provided with a minimum quota of cultivable land, if possible within their locality or to other areas permissible. This could be properly schemed, monitored and carried out by the authorities without any friction.

If migration from a certain area is unavoidable, the Government could resort to training the migrants prior to migration in their respective rural areas by way of opening up IIT’s technical training centres, conducting training programme to make them skilled or semiskilled in various fields like fitting, turning, coil winding, small electrical maintenance and civil construction requirement. By doing so, the migrants will be relieved of the pressure of being novices when they
migrate to the new and demanding urban environment it would allow them to settle down smooth and fast.

Suitable local bodies or authorities in cooperation with non-government bodies could regulate and monitor the inflow of migrants at various points and help them settle down faster. This could include finding them suitable jobs with adequate income, positioning their family or arranging for easier remittance, acquiring essential registration for bank, gas, PDS and the like.

Effective implementation of minimum wages for agricultural operation and revision of the minimum wage for agricultural and other rural sector industries are required to avoid further migration to urban area.

Effective employment and industrialisation policy should be implemented for absorbing the migrant labourers in the formal sector. Enough precautions must be taken to avoid surplus labour in the urban labour market and especially in the urban informal sector by way of migration.
An effective policy should be followed in the distribution of income thus reducing the gap between urban and rural standards of living. For this, agricultural activities should be more commercialised and the Government should fix remunerative prices for agricultural produces on a par with industrial products.

Effective implementation of existing rural employment programmes should be made to give off-season employment to agricultural labourers. Rural industries should be made to absorb surplus agricultural labourers, since employment happens to be the primary motive for migration.

7.5 GUIDANCE FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The future study on migration may be conducted in other cities. A comparative study may be undertaken on migration among the cities in India. Further studies may be carried out regarding the migration aspects from urban to rural areas. Further, the study may be focused on the role of migrants political arena and social behaviour of their residence.
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