ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

Economics

KEY WORDS: Migration, Labour, Ship Breaking

DETERMINANTS OF MIGRATION AT HOUSEHOLD LEVEL: A CASE OF ALANG SHIP BREAKING YARD

Dr. Hrudanand Misra

Director-Technical Campus The Mandvi Education Society Institute of Business Management & Computer Studies, Mandvi, Dist: Surat, Gujarat

ABSTRACT

Migration is as old as human history. The massive movement of population of the modern times has wider social, economic, political, demographic and ecological implications. Migration process has been analysed by a number of ways. Generally it means the settlement or shifting of an individual or a group of individuals from one area i.e. origin to another area i.e. destination. A large proportion of the labour employed at Alang ship breaking yard are migrants from other states. They are largely from backward states of U.P, Bihar, Orissa and Jharkhand. Only a small fraction around 5-10 percent originates from Gujarat state. The large influx of migrants can be explained through the push-pull factors put forward by sociologists, economists and geographers. It is observed that the migrants originate from the most backward districts of these states.

Introduction

The determinants of migration at household level provide a better understanding as to why some families participate in the process of migration while others do not. It is found that the number of migrants from educated households is higher than the uneducated household. In other words, the propensity of out-migration was remarkably higher for the household whose member(s) have some education.

Landholding of household plays an important role in determining rural out-migration in an agrarian economy where the people are mostly dependent on land for their livelihood. Several studies found that out-migration from rural areas are closely associated with unequal distribution of resources, particularly land (Sovani, 1961 and Samsuddin, 1981). However, some studies conducted in developing countries on the relationship between landholding and propensity to move, have shown dissimilar result. For example, (Hill, 1972) mentioned that poorer and landless people have a higher propensity to migrate than richer and big landowners. On the other hand, Sekhar found that out-migration is higher for the small and medium land owning families and lower for either landless or big landowners (Sekhar, 1993: 191-202). The present study supports the proposition that out-migration is significantly higher for the landless households. The data revealed that 41 percent of the respondents are from the landless households (Table 1).

Most of the respondents are landless or marginal farmers with less than 2 acres of land. A higher rate of out-migration from the landless households may be due to the fact that person from such household mainly migrate to get employment as local opportunities are few. In the present study 41 percent of respondents are landless and 32 percent of respondents are having 0.5-2 acres of land. These two groups constitute 73 percent of the respondents. The number of respondent holding 2-5 and 5-10 acres of land is relatively low which is 13.4 and 11.3 percent respectively. Migration rate is very high for the landless migrants than the medium and large landholding migrants. The majority of respondents are landless. Further, persons from the landless household are found to be migrating mainly for their survival because a work/job may not be available in the rural areas and thus are capable to fulfill their livelihood needs during all seasons.

Landless laborers do not have much productive assets in rural areas and when employment opportunities are lacking in a region, there arise the need to look for better opportunities hence need for migration. In rural areas agriculture land is the main productive asset, which has the capacity to generate a flow of income. Individuals having low amount of agriculture land keep falling in and out of poverty depending upon vulgarities of nature. Hence these two group viz, landless labourers and marginal farmers are the most vulnerable groups in rural areas. The situation is much worse in drought prone regions of the country.

Table 1 Distribution of respondents by Land Ownership at their Native Place

State	U.P	Bihar	Jharkhand	Orissa	Gujarat	Total
Landless	32.74 (37)	41.94 (13)	34.72 (25)	56.76 (42)	60.00(6)	41.00 (123)
0.5-2	38.94 (44)	35.48 (11)	34.72 (25)	18.92 (14)	20.00(2)	32.00 (96)
2-4	16.82 (19)	19.35 (6)	12.50 (9)	6.76 (5)	10.00(1)	13.34 (40)
5-10	10.62 (12)	--	13.88 (10)	14.86 (11)	10.00(1)	11.33 (34)
11+	0.88 (1)	3.23 (1)	4.17 (3)	2.70 (2)	--	2.33 (7)
Total	100.00(113)	100.00(31)	100.00(72)	100.00(74)	100.00(10)	100.00(300)

Source: Field Survey, 2014.
Note: Figures in bracket are number of the respondents.

It is found from the table 2 that the average land holding of the all respondents at their native place is 3.52 acres of land. The respondents from Orissa have more are of land at their native place as compared to other respondents i.e. 4.53 acres. These respondents own large are of land as compared to other respondents from different states but are migrating to Alang ship breaking yard. The reason is that the districts from which the migrants come are frequently proved to drought and floods. Kalahandi, Ganjam and Bolangir districts of Orissa are known for drought and natural calamities. Therefore, in these districts agriculture is not highly productive, hence this cause migration of labours. The average land holding pattern of other states viz, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Jharkhand and Gujarat are 2.79, 2.47, 3.70 and 4.13 respectively. The respondents from Uttar Pradesh have lower land holding at their native place as compared to other states. The table 1 also shows that majority of the respondents own less than 5 acres of land and hence considered as marginal farmers.

Table 2 Land holding of the respondents at their native place

State	Average land holding (in Acres)	Minimum (in Acres)	Maximum (in Acres)
Uttar Pradesh	2.79	0.5	15.0
Bihar	2.47	0.5	15.0
Orissa	4.53	1.0	13.0
Jharkhand	3.70	0.5	20.0
Gujarat	4.13	0.5	10.0

Source: Field Survey 2014.
***Respondents who have reported some land holdings.**

Another important factor in the process of migration is the family size of migrant. Several studies argued that migration is positively related with family size (Connell et al, 1976 and Upton, 1967). In other words, people migrate mostly from large households because it is easy to spare some members to go outside for work. The present study showed a similar result. The average family size of the respondents from the five states was found to be 7.60 members. Table 3 shows that average family size of the respondents from U.P was found to be highest at 8.64 members and for other states ranges from 4.8 to 8.27. The average family size of the respondents from Gujarat is 4.8 persons.

Table 3 Average Family Size of the respondents

Family Size	U.P	Bihar	Jharkhand	Orissa	Gujarat	Total
0-2	1.67(3)	--	--	2.00(1)	2.00(1)	1.80(5)
2-4	3.67(3)	4.00(4)	3.71(16)	3.69(11)	4.00(2)	3.75(36)
5-10	7.12(80)	7.20(19)	6.73(45)	6.96(57)	5.44(7)	6.94(208)
11+	14.48(27)	12.95(8)	12.81(11)	14.00(4)	--	11.59(51)
Total	8.64(113)	8.27(31)	6.98(72)	6.69(74)	4.8(10)	7.60(300)

Source: Field Survey, May 2004.
Note: *Figures in bracket are number of migrants.

Nevertheless, the number of adult male in the household better describes the outcome of an event (out-migration) than the family size. The study on migrants from different states shows that the average number of adult male was found to be more than 2. The inference is clear that the higher number of the male migrants in the family higher is the rate of migration. It is found from the table 4that household having more than 2 adult male members are more migratory than household having less than 2 adult male members. This is due to the fact that migrants have some property in their native place and to take care of property some members have to stay in the native place. Thus it also supports the proposition that more male members in a family more will be the propensity for some to migrate.

Table 4 Average male members in the respondent's family

Male Member	U.P	Bihar	Jharkhand	Orissa	Gujarat	Total
0-2	1.04(55)	1.48(19)	1.44(46)	1.48(36)	1.11(10)	1.23(166)
2-4	3.57(43)	3.13(6)	3.32(24)	3.27(32)	--	3.40(105)
5-10	6.10(15)	6.00(6)	5.50(2)	5.00(5)	--	5.84(28)
11+	--	--	--	12.00(1)	--	12.00(1)
Total	2.67(113)	2.67(31)	2.18(72)	2.63(74)	1.11(10)	2.46(300)

Source: Field Survey, May 2004.
Note: Figures in bracket are number of migrants.

Family or Father's Occupation and Income of the Respondents

Family occupation or father's occupation also influences the migrant's decision to migrate. If family occupation is related to non-agricultural sector then the propensity to migrate is higher. If families are engaged in agriculture sector then the propensity to migrate will be lower. Several studies found that the families engaged in non-agricultural work are more migratory than those engaged in agriculture work (R.R.Paul, 1989: 79-85). Table 4a shows the family occupation of the migrants at their place of origin.

Most of the respondent's families or father's are belonged to partially unemployed group i.e. 62.3 percent. Therefore, it is indicated from the table that the parents of the respondents are employed but there is not sufficient work available to employ round the years at their native place. The distribution reveals that most of the respondents were the sole earner in the family and their parents were particularly unemployed at their place of origin. Thus, the decision to migrate is influenced by their family occupation at their native place.

Table 4a. Percentage distribution of respondents by their father's occupation at the place of origin.

Family Occupation	U.P.	Bihar	Jharkhand	Orissa	Gujarat	Total
Farmer	37.17 (42)	35.48 (11)	23.62 (17)	28.38 (21)	--	30.33 (91)
Labour Work	5.31 (6)	--	1.77 (2)	4.05 (3)	--	3.67 (11)
Service	4.42 (5)	9.68 (3)	--	4.05 (3)	--	3.67 (11)
Partially Unemployed	53.20 (60)	54.84 (17)	73.61 (53)	63.52 (47)	100.00(10)	62.33 (187)
Total	100.00(113)	100.00(31)	100.00(72)	100.00(74)	100.00(10)	100.00(300)

Source: Field Survey, 2004.
Note: Figures in bracket are number of the respondents.

Another push factor, which influences the people to migrate, is the family income. If the family income is low and the number of dependent members is high, the propensity to migrate is high (Hossain, 2001: 11-13). The dependency ratio is based on the fact that every member of the society is a consumer while some are producers. A country with large proposition of producer is economically better off than a country with smaller proposition of producers. It is found that the ratio of persons of relatively non-productive ages is high in India. A high rate of dependency means that large proposition of population is less than 15 years or above 60 years.

It is found that dependent members in respondent's family are more than 5 members. Table 4b shows that average dependent members in the respondent's families is 5.11, which shows that respondents are from the large family size with higher number of dependent members. Table also reveals that number of dependents is higher in Bihar state, which is 6.27 persons. The table reveals that for every migrant there are many dependents. When the dependents are more per working member, the worker looks for higher and steady income. In agriculture the income are seasonal and unsteady. Table 4b Average Dependent Member in respondents Family

Dependent Member	U.P.	Bihar	Jharkhand	Orissa	Gujarat	Total
0-2	1.17(12)	--	2.00(11)	1.47(15)	1.00(1)	1.52(39)
2-4	3.50(28)	3.49(9)	3.56(21)	3.53(27)	3.83(7)	3.55(92)
5-10	6.49(69)	6.70(20)	6.38(38)	6.54(32)	6.00(2)	6.49(161)
11+	12.25(4)	14.50(2)	11.50(2)	--	--	12.63(8)
Total	5.39(113)	6.27(31)	5.03(72)	4.41(74)	3.98(10)	5.11(300)

Source: Field Survey, May 2004.
Note: Figures in bracket are number of the respondents

One of the major factors in the process of migration is the earning members in respondent's family, which will affect the migration process. More members in a family are earning then less number of

dependent members in the family. It is found from the table 5 that 151 respondents are the sole earners in the family and 84 respondents have two earning members in the family and remaining respondents have 3 or more than 3 earning members in a family. It is found from the analysis that 50 percent of the respondents are the only earning member in the family. Therefore, it can be said with the increase in earning members in a family reduce the dependent members.

Table 5 Family Size and Earning Member in respondents Family

Family Size	Earning Members in a Family						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
1-2	3.31 (5)	-	-	-	-	-	1.67 (5)
2-4	21.10 (32)	3.57 (3)	-	-	-	-	11.67 (35)
5-10	72.19 (109)	76.19(64)	69.57 (32)	38.46 (5)	-	-	70.00 (210)
11+	3.31 (5)	20.24(17)	30.43 (14)	61.54 (8)	100.00(3)	100.00(3)	16.66 (50)
Total	100.00(151)	100.0(84)	100.00(46)	100.00(13)	100.0 (3)	100.00(3)	100.00(300)

Source: Field Survey, May 2004.
Note: Figures in bracket are number of the respondents.

Table 6a and 6b shows that the average family income of the respondents before and after migration. The average family income of the respondents before migration is Rs. 1871.22 and after migration is Rs 5387.23, which is three to four times higher than the pre-migration family income. The average family income of respondents from different states before migration is Rs 2637.17, Rs 1940.32, Rs 2255.56, Rs 2095.74 and Rs 900 whereas after migration family income of the respondents is Rs 5058.30, Rs 3990.65, Rs 4086.77, Rs 4626.20 and Rs 2810.99. It is found from the analysis that after migration family income of respondents increase three or four times and most of the family income before migration ranges between 500-2000. However, it is found that lower family income with higher number of dependents increase the propensity to migrate, which is also found to be valid among workers at Alang ship-breaking yard.

Table 6a Average Family Income of the Respondents

Family Income	U.P.	Bihar	Jharkhand	Orissa	Gujarat	Total
500-1000	743.59(39)	980.77(13)	646.88(32)	663.79(29)	900.00(10)	671.55(123)
1001-2000	1657.14 (21)	1560.00 (10)	1738.46 (13)	1692.31 (13)		1666.67 (57)
2001-4000	2883.87 (31)	2760.00 (5)	2881.25 (16)	2773.91 (23)		2841.33 (75)
4001-6000	5000.00 (12)	5500.00 (2)	4800.00 (5)	5000.00 (6)		5000.00 (25)
6001-8000	7350.00 (8)	7000.00 (1)	7250.00 (4)	6666.67 (3)		7175.00 (16)
8001-10000	--	--	9000.00 (1)	--		9000.00 (1)
10001+	--	--	11000.00(1)	--		12333.33(3)
Total	2637.17 (113)	1940.32 (31)	2255.56 (72)	2095.74 (74)	900.00(10)	1871.22 (300)

Source: Field Survey, May 2004.

Note: Figures in bracket are number of respondents.

Table 4.16b Average Family Income of the Respondents (After Migration)

Family Income	U.P.	Bihar	Jharkhand	Orissa	Gujarat	Total
1000-2000	1950.00(3)	1950.00(4)	2000.00(2)	2000.00(1)	2000.00(1)	1980.00(11)
2001-4000	2975.70(44)	2976.72(15)	2756.81(33)	2964.64(33)	2901.11(9)	2379.00(134)
4001-6000	5174.55(41)	4754.18(7)	5148.24(24)	5208.11(27)	--	5017.27(99)
6001-8000	6962.50(12)	6566.67(3)	7458.33(7)	7024.44(9)	--	7003.00(31)
8001-10000	9283.33(8)	9140.00(2)	9250.00(2)	9666.67(4)	--	9335.00(16)
10000+	12966.67(5)	--	12516.67(4)	--	--	12741.67(9)
Total	5058.30(113)	3990.65(31)	4086.77(72)	4626.20(74)	2810.99(10)	5387.23(300)

Source: Field Survey, May 2004.

Note: Figures in bracket are number of respondents

Conclusion

The overall average family size is found to be of 7.30 members, constituting of higher family size. In case of migrants from U.P the average family size is high (8.64 persons) as compared to migrants from other states (7 persons). However, the dependent members in migrant's family are observed relatively higher. The overall average dependent member in migrant's family is 5 persons and high dependent members in migrant family are found to be from Bihar. About 41 percent of migrant households do not own any agricultural land. Further, about 71 percent of the cultivating migrant households owned less than 2 acres.

A study of the causes of migration is highly important in the process of migration. Among the causes of migration reported in the present study, it is observed that both 'push' and 'pull' factors have their influence on migration. Little more than 35 percent mentioned 'pull' factors are the main causes of their migration and 65 percent cited 'push' factors as the most important. So it is found that 'push' factors have been more important than 'pull' factors. As far as 'push' factors are concerned, it is observed that the leading cause of migration is unemployment in the rural areas, which are the principal causes of migration. The study brings out that 58 percent migrants moved out of the rural areas because of non-availability of work at the place of origin. Another important push factor is low fixed property (5.3 percent) of the migrant at their native place. Social and family disputes are yet another push factor. The most important cause of migration for 35 percent of respondents is 'pull' factors. From the data it is observed that the important 'pull' factors, which cause migration of rural labourers, is relatively good wages at Alang as compared to their native place.

REFERENCES

1. Connell. J, B. Das Gupta, R. Laishely and M. Lipton (1976) "Migration from Rural Areas: The Evidence from Village Studies", Oxford University Press, Delhi.
2. Hill. P. (1992) "Rural Hausa, A Village and Setting", Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
3. Hossian. M. Z (2001) "Rural-Urban Migration in Bangladesh: A Micro-Level Study", IUSSP conference, Brazil.
4. Paul. R. R. (1989) "Rural-Urban Migration in Punjab", Himalaya Publishing House, Delhi.
5. Sekhar. T. V. (1993) "Migration Selectivity from Rural Areas: Evidence from Kerala",Demography India.
6. Sovani. N. V. (1961) "Urban Social Situation in India", Arthvinjana, Vol. III (2).
7. Upton. M (1967) "Agriculture in South Western Nigeria", Department of Agricultural Economics, Development Studies No. 3, Migration, University of Reading.