



International Journal of Control Theory and Applications

ISSN : 0974-5572

© International Science Press

Volume 10 • Number 17 • 2017

A Study of Rural Urban Migration of Young Agricultural Labourers

K.S. Meenakshisundaram^a

^aDirector, School of Management Studies, VELS University, Chennai.

E-mail : director.sms@velsuniv.ac.in

Abstract : Development of any country depends on the Agricultural development. India is an agrarian economy since majority of population depends on agriculture. The GDP in India for Agriculture in the third quarter of 2016 decreased to 3095.38 IND Billion. from 3743.90 IND Billion in the second quarter of 2016. In general growth in any other sector depends on the growth of agriculture only. India's agriculture sector is expected to expand 6 % in the financial year 2016-17 in the case of normal monsoon during the month of June and September according to the National Institute of Transforming India Aayog. The 12th Five-Year Plan estimates the food grains storage capacity to expand to 35 MT. Agricultural labourers are an important part in producing the yields for which they toil themselves in hot sun and heavy rains to make this happen. Now due to fast growth in transport, the labourers from villages move out to nearby towns to owing to very many facts and practically it is observed who is going to do the cultivation in future since majority of young aged in villages are not in a position to take up agriculture as their main occupation owing to the fact it becomes unsteady. In this paper an attempt has been made to know the reasons why the young and to suggest suitable strategies to overcome this situation. A research was conducted in the Sriperumbudur taluk of Kancheepuram district in Tamilnadu and 128 samples were studied using a well structured questionnaire. The collected were tabulated and analysed with appropriate statistical tools. The results indicate that the causes of migration based on the previous agricultural operations significantly differ with respect to non availability of labour, lack of skilled labours, hard manual work, huge wages, attracted by special other facilities, poor soil status, high cost to soil test recommendations, fragmented land holdings, non availability of quality seeds, pesticides, farm yard manure, farm implements, power cuts and power supply.

Keywords : Migration, Agricultural Labourers, Young labourers, Rural Urban Migration.

1. INTRODUCTION

Agriculture is the back bone of our Indian Economy and it is the movement of people from one locality to another for the purpose of economic, political and educational reasons. Increasing population, decline in land area for cultivation purpose monsoon failure, shortage of employment, increased awareness about job availabilities, aspiration, nearness to city and infrastructure facilities are the factors which influence migration (Sharma and jaswal, 2006). Human migration is physical movement by humans from one area to another and it is closely related to economic and social factors as well as economic development. Recent growth of

economic development has made a decline in agriculture sector due to the phenomenal growth of industrial sector owing to Globalisation and Liberalisation Migration. Recently in rural areas there is a huge demand for agricultural labour owing to growing industrialisation, rapid urbanization and due to implementation of NREGA programme by Government of India with the primary objective of providing wage employment for 100 days with guarantee for village development. Agricultural labourers migrate to nearby towns and cities for better education, high paid employment and to enjoy the facilities of urban areas which are absent in rural areas. Rapid industrialisation, attractive wages, easy work schedule, other benefits paid by the urban companies made the agricultural labourers to migrate to urban area. Many young agriculture labourers migrate to the towns and cities for higher wages and better standard of living. The farmers often migrate to urban areas for better wage and even work in non-agricultural jobs (Anamica, 2010). It is a well known phenomenon that those who are in farming are only aged and it is really painful to note that younger generations do not want to do farming. Migration is the permanent movement of an individual or group of people from one place to another. The individuals take the decision to move based on certain deprivations, constraints, stress, motivation and aspirations at their place of origin. The movement happens in group since the deprivations are felt collectively. The Individual takes the step to move to another place when their basic needs are not met in the existing community and place (Haq, 1974). The day is not far off that no food will be available even though money is available. But the very fact remains that the entire World population have to depend only on the rural population who only feeds all.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Swaminathan (2006) in his speech on viable farm and non-farm livelihood options, felt that the rural youth preferred to migrate to cities in the lookout for jobs as the villages no longer attracted them with ample livelihood earning opportunities. This problem could best be addressed by developing the rural areas as real-times work centers offering farm and non-farm entrepreneurial opportunities.

As reported by Deshingkar (2009), income is one drive within the people who want to migrate in search of salary. The Migrants are pushed to move because of poor access to income, debt, declining common property resources and commodity crashes. The researcher further reported that agricultural stresses and rural employment drives migration. The migration is driven because of scarcity in cultivable land, less agricultural productivity, Inequitable distribution of land and land degradation.

Anamica(2010) stated that Majority of the respondents (75.00%) were identified as temporary migrants and remaining (25.00%) as commuters and nearly half the respondents (47.78%) were seasonal migrants one-fourth (27.78%) of the respondents were identified as forced migrants and the remaining 22.22 per cent and 2.22 per cent were skilled and return migrants respectively. While observing the decision making pattern, it was found out that nearly half of the respondents (54.44%) were found to take independent decisions. The remaining 30.00 per cent reported to have consulted with their family followed by 5.00 per cent of respondents who consulted with friends and neighbours in the decision to migrate. Only 3.00 per cent of the respondent's family members are engaged in some job occupation in the migrant's destination. The left 97.00 per cent look after the family chores or involve them in some occupation in the home place. Majority have migrated through the network of relations (37.78%) followed by neighbours (33.33%), friends (16.67%) and agencies (12.22%). Three-fourth of the respondents (73.00%) stay in their work place i.e. in the migration destination and the remaining 27.00 per cent of the respondents are commuters who stay in their home place. One-fourth (25.00%) of the respondents visit their home daily and the remaining 75.00 per cent visit at intervals of weeks or months or a year and more.

Soumya Mohanty (2012) MGNREGA (earlier known as NREGA) gives an alternative source of livelihood which has an impact on the reduction of migration, alleviating poverty, restricting child labour and making villages self-sustained through productive assets creation such as cleaning water tanks, road construction, water and soil conservation work etc. which has been considered as the largest anti-poverty programme. The success of this Act depends upon the implementation of the project.

MGNREGA mitigates seasonal/distress migration and has been a significant source of income and employment for a large proportion of rural population. There are two types of risks associated, the first is that the wages are paid on piece rate basis depending on his/her work performance; a worker may lesser than the minimum prevailing market wage rate. Secondly, as per the provisions of the scheme, a household must get minimum 100 days of employment, but, it fails to provide 100 days of employment to the job seekers. Such limited and irregular supply of works restricts the job-seekers from working under MGNREGA. Regular employment opportunities also motivate many of them to migrate to other states like Gujarat, Maharashtra, Nagpur, Raipur and Tata.

Age

Hossain (2001) reported that the rate of migration in Bangladesh was found significantly higher in age groups 20–24 and 25–29 years followed by age group (30–34) years (13 % and 6.8 % respectively). It was lesser for the age group 0–14 years and the rate was about 2% among the age group of 40 years and above.

Samal (2006) conducted a study in Andhra Pradesh and revealed that many migrants were in the (25–35) years age group (60 %) and followed by 35–45 years (17%).

Dugbazah (2008) conducted a survey among 343 migrants in the Abutia area of Ghana. The 20–30 age bracket was the most dominating age group among the migrants. There were totally 195 young adults who had migrated from this age group. This suggests that migration is more densely in the 20–29 age groups. The proportion of people who migrated decreased with an increase in the age group. 148 people migrated from 31–40) age bracket and this has reduced to 64 people who have migrated from the 41–50 age group from the survey of households.

Education

Hossain (2001) studied the way the migrants are distributed. The migrants were distributed according to their educational qualification in Bangladesh. More than 50% of migrants qualified secondary and higher-secondary education, whereas about 12 per cent qualified graduation. The illiterate and educated migrants were about 13 per cent and 23.00 per cent respectively.

Siddiqui (2004) conducted a study in Lahore district of Pakistan and reported that in the case of farm households the migrants who were literate were higher in proportion (70.3 %) relative to illiterate (29.7%). The proportion of literates and illiterates in the non-farm households the migrants were 32.7 per cent and 67.3 per cent respectively. Thus education contributed to migration and the migrants was affected positively by the education level in case of both farm and non-farm households.

Samal (2006) revealed that most of the migrants of Andhra Pradesh where in both the rural to rural and rural to urban streams. The unskilled and illiterate were 64% followed by 25% of those with very little education up to primary level.

Dugbazah (2008) reported that out of the 479 people from Abutia of Ghana, the have migrated from the households surveyed, 100 primary school educations, and 210 migrants had secondary level education, 119 had some level of tertiary education and 50 migrants were illiterates. The survey results further showed that 96.00 per cent of male migrants were educated compared to 57.00 per cent of female migrants. It was evident from this result that the rate of migration increases with a higher level of education.

Anamica, (2010), has reported that majority of the respondents were found to have had primary (30.00%) to middle school (36.67%) level education

Occupation Status

Hossain (2001) reported that about 24.00 per cent were unemployed before migration in Bangladesh. Further, 17.00 per cent of the migrants were engaged in agriculture (landowner) and 8.60 per cent were labourer, mostly in agricultural sector. However, the rate of migration was observed to be the highest (about 21%) among population who were unemployed and lowest (0.7%) who were engaged in household work/others (including unable to work).

Ramasubramanian (2003) revealed that among non-agricultural operations, match industries (63.38%), textile mills (50.71%), building construction (46.48%) and painting (39.44%) were preferred by the migrants of Arupukottai block. About one-third of migrants (33.81%) preferred to work as labourers in business premises.

Samal (2006) reported that in Andhra Pradesh 80.00 per cent of the migrants were involved mainly in the building/construction sector, canal and dam work, road-laying cable-laying work as wage labourers. The self-employment category mostly consisted of skilled workers and artisans who constituted around 10.00 per cent of migrants. Most self-employed skilled workers were found in building construction activities as masons, statue makers, stone grinders, mechanics, drivers, rickshaw pullers and other activities, mostly in urban centers and big cities. In contract employment, most migrants were found working as watchmen in apartments in towns and cities, bell-boys in hotels and lodges, servants in houses and petty-jobs in business establishments and offices.

Dugbazah (2008) observed that although agriculture constitutes the primary source of livelihood in Abutia of Ghana, the occupation of only 30.00 per cent of migrants were farmers prior to migration. The research findings further showed that 87.00 per cent of migrants were employed at their destination; 7.00 percent are students at various levels of education; whilst a minor 7.00 percent are unemployed. It was also observed from the study that informal sector, petty trading, artisan work, domestic worker are some of the occupations of most of the migrants.

Anamica, (2010), has reported that nearly half (50.00%) of the respondents were found doing farming as well as engaging themselves as agricultural labourers and for the remaining were engaged in farming as well as business (33.44%) or services (16.66%).

Statement of the Research Problem

Agricultural labour is the most important production component in agriculture. Major share of the cost of cultivation is met for the labour work in agriculture. This is a clear evidence to state the importance and the major role played by agricultural labourers in production of crops. Agricultural labourers are mostly illiterates and basically poor in status. They have been trained in cultivation by their elders experience and by the trainings offered under other schemes. Presently agricultural labourers started to migrate for other works since the cultivation has become a gamble due to failure of monsoon and due to attack of pests and diseases. More over the rapid industrialisation has made the agricultural labourers to migrate to other areas for non agricultural works since the transport facilities offered and less labour work at factories made them to migrate at the cost of agriculture. Further huge demand of labour is only at the time of agricultural season and this facilitated them easily to migrate. Adding fuel to the fire the NREGA schemes operated by Governments also forced them to take the work since it was found easy, convenient and continuous when compared to regular agricultural labour work. In this context it becomes necessary to understand how to make the agricultural profession remunerative, easier, continuous and interesting so as to minimise rural migration so that the younger generations of farm families could be attracted for farm work in order to do continuous cultivation for sustained production of grains.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- a) To study the demographic profile of the young migrated agricultural labourers.
- b) To analyse the causes for migration to urban areas by the young agricultural labourers.
- c) To estimate the expectations of young agricultural labourers to continue in agriculture profession.
- d) To suggest suitable strategies to minimise rural urban migration of young agricultural labourers.

Hypothesis

H_1 : There is a significant difference in the opinion of respondents about the causes for migration based on their previous status of agricultural operations.

H_2 : There is a significant difference between gender on the causes for migration.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Selection of District

Kancheepuram, district in Tamilnadu will be selected for the study since these districts are heavily populated district next to Chennai as per 2011 census. Further, these districts have a phenomenal growth of industries and equally populated with agricultural and allied activities.

Selection of Blocks

Kancheepuram district has eight taluks and thirteen blocks. Sriperumbudur taluk has been selected for the study since lot of industries has come up in this taluk.

Selection of Respondents

Respondents for this study will be selected based on the total number of agricultural labourer's population and based on the agricultural activity taking place in the district. From each selected block three villages were selected by simple random technique.

Research Strategy

Table 1

<i>Research Design</i>	<i>Descriptive Research</i>
Study Population	Agricultural Labourers of Kancheepuram
Population Source	Census 2001.
Study Area	Kancheepuram district.
Sample Frame	Respondents those who were involved in Agricultural activities and who are now involved in other activities.
Sampling Unit	Agricultural Labourers (occupied previously as agricultural labourers and also now employed as agricultural labourers).
Sampling Method	Multi Stage Sampling.
Sample Size	Total = 128
Nature of Data	Both Primary and Secondary
Sources of Primary Data	Survey method through Personal Interview
Sources of Secondary Data	Journals, Books, Previous Research Reports.

Statistical Tools : Percentage, correlation, Regression.

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The collected data were analysed and the results are presented below.

Table 2
Age Composition of the Respondents

<i>Age Composition</i>	<i>Number of the Respondents</i>	<i>Percentage to Total</i>
18–21	28	21.9
22–25	69	53.9
26–28	31	24.2
Total	128	100.0

Table 2 describes the age composition of respondents selected for the study. 21.9 percent of respondents are in the age group of 18 to 21, 53.9 percent of respondents are in the age category of 22 to 25 and 24.2 percent are in the age composition of 26 to 29. The major age groups of migrated agricultural youngsters belong to the age category of 22 to 25. 4.2.

Table 3
Gender Background of the Respondents

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent Valid</i>	<i>Cumulative Percent</i>
Male	93	72.7	72.7
Female	35	27.3	100
Total	128	100	100

Source : Computed Data

Table 3 highlights the gender background of respondents. 72.7 percent of respondents are male and 27.3 percent are female. It is evident that male compositions are higher than female among the migrated young agricultural fraternity

Table 4
Educational Qualification of the Respondents

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>	<i>Cumulative Percent</i>
Less than metric	7	5.5	5.5	5.5
Metric	12	9.4	9.4	14.8
Less than hsc	13	10.2	10.2	25.0
HSC	36	28.1	28.1	53.1
Degree	23	18.0	18.0	71.1
PG	19	14.8	14.8	85.9
Others	18	14.1	14.1	100.0
Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Table 4 shows the educational category of respondents. 5.5 percent of them have less than metric qualification, 9.4 percent are metric, 10.2 percent are less than Higher Secondary, 28.1 percent are Higher Secondary qualified, 18 percent are qualified with degrees, 19 percent have Post gradational background and 14.1 percent have other backgrounds like diploma, agricultural courses and so on. The migration is among the youngsters who possess Higher Secondary, degree and Post gradational background while compare to metric and below qualified.

Table 5
Occupation of the Respondents

		<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>	<i>Cumulative Percent</i>
Valid	Government	24	18.8	18.8	18.8
	Private	23	18.0	18.0	36.7
	Business	17	13.3	13.3	50.0
	Others	64	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Table 5 outlines the present occupational sources of respondents. 18.8 percent are in government services, 18 percent in private jobs, 13.3 percent are in business and 50 percent are in other categories like trade, micro credit, abroad and so on.

Table 6
Family Type of the Respondents

		<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>	<i>Cumulative Percent</i>
	Joint	65	50.8	50.8	50.8
	Nuclear	30	23.4	23.4	74.2
	Extended	33	25.8	25.8	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Table 6 shows family type of respondents. 50.8 percent are in joint family after their migration, 23.4 percent in nuclear family and 25.8 percent in extended family.

Table 7
Family size of the Respondents

		<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>	<i>Cumulative Percent</i>
	Upto 3	29	22.7	22.7	22.7
	3-5	65	50.8	50.8	73.4
	Above 5	34	26.6	26.6	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Table 7 outlines family size respondents. 22.7 percent have up to 3 members in their family. 50.8 percent have 3 to 5 members and 26.6 percent have more than five members in their family.

Table 8
Marital Status of the Respondents

		<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>	<i>Cumulative Percent</i>
	Married	97	75.8	75.8	75.8
	Unmarried	31	24.2	24.2	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Table 8 infers the marital status of respondents. 75.8 percent of them are married and 24.2 percent are unmarried.

Table 9
Resident type of Respondents

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>	<i>Cumulative Percent</i>
Own	110	85.9	85.9	85.9
Rental	18	14.1	14.1	100.0
Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Table 9 outlines the resident types of respondents selected for the study. 85.9 percent of the respondents live in own houses, 14.1 percent are in rental houses.

Table 10
Present Location of the Respondents

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>	<i>Cumulative Percent</i>
Urban	97	75.8	75.8	75.8
Rural	31	24.2	24.2	100.0
Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Table 10 describes the present location of the respondents after their migration from the source of agriculture. 75.8 percent have been migrated to urban locations, 24.2 percent are in rural places nearer to their native.

Table 11
Farming Experience of the Respondents

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>	<i>Cumulative Percent</i>
less than 5	15	11.7	11.7	11.7
6–10	9	7.0	7.0	18.8
more than 10	104	81.3	81.3	100.0
Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Table 11 infers the farming experience of the respondents. 11.7 percent have less than 5 years of farming experience. 7 percent have 6 to 10 years of experience and 81.3 percent have more than 10 years of experiences in farming and agriculture.

Table 12
Monthly Income of the Respondents

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>	<i>Cumulative Percent</i>
Less than 20000	13	10.2	10.2	10.2
20001–25000	107	83.6	83.6	93.8
More than 25000	8	6.3	6.3	100.0
Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Table 12 highlights the monthly income of respondents. 10.2 percent obtain less than 20000 of monthly income. 83.6 percent between 20001–25000 and 6.3 percent more than 25000.

Table 13
Skill set of the Respondents

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>	<i>Cumulative Percent</i>
Carpentry	8	6.3	6.3	6.3
Road Laying	23	18.0	18.0	24.2
Mason	14	10.9	10.9	35.2
Electrician	8	6.3	6.3	41.4
Only Agriculture or No Other Kind of Skills	75	58.6	58.6	100.0
Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Table 13 shows the skill sets possessed by respondents away from their present occupation and core source of agriculture. 6.3 percent have the skill set of carpentry, 18 percent in road laying, 10.9 percent in mason, 6.3 percent as electrician and 58.6 have no other skill sets except agriculture.

Table 14
Gender of the Respondents * Farming Experience of the Respondents Cross tabulation

		<i>Farming Experience of the Respondents</i>			<i>Total</i>	
		<i>Less than 5</i>	<i>6–10</i>	<i>More than 10</i>		
<i>Gender of the Respondents</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Count</i>	12	3	78	93
		<i>% of Total</i>	9.4%	2.3%	60.9%	72.7%
	<i>Female</i>	<i>Count</i>	3	6	26	35
		<i>% of Total</i>	2.3%	4.7%	20.3%	27.3%
<i>Total</i>	<i>Count</i>	15	9	104	128	
	<i>% of Total</i>	11.7%	7.0%	81.3%	100.0%	

Table 14 describes the farming experience of the young migrated agricultural workers based on their gender. 9.4 percent of male workers have less than 5 years of experience, it is 2.3 percent among female. 2.3 percent of male workers have 6 to 10 years of experience and 4.7 percent of female workers have the same. 60.9 percent of male workers have more than 10 years of experience and 20.3 percent have more than 10 years of experience. Both male and female categories the maximum experience is more than 10 years and where male is having more experience than female.

Table 15
Gender of the Respondents * Monthly Income of the Respondents Crosstabulation

		<i>Monthly Income of the Respondents</i>			<i>Total</i>	
		<i>Less than 20000</i>	<i>20001–25000</i>	<i>More than 25000</i>		
<i>Gender of the Respondents</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Count</i>	10	76	7	93
		<i>% of Total</i>	7.8%	59.4%	5.5%	72.7%
	<i>Female</i>	<i>Count</i>	3	31	1	35
		<i>% of Total</i>	2.3%	24.2%	.8%	27.3%
<i>Total</i>	<i>Count</i>	13	107	8	128	
	<i>% of Total</i>	10.2%	83.6%	6.3%	100.0%	

Table 15 highlights the monthly income of the respondents based on their gender. 7.8 percent of male receive the monthly income less than 20000 and it is 2.3 percent among female. 59.4 percent of male and 24.2 percent of female receive the income between 20001–25000, 5.5 percent of male and 0.8 percent of female receive the monthly income more than 25000.

Table 16
Educational Qualification of the Respondents * Skill set of the Respondents Cross tabulation

			<i>Skill set of the Respondents</i>					
			<i>Carpentry</i>	<i>Road Laying</i>	<i>Mason</i>	<i>Electrician</i>	<i>Only Agriculture or No Other Kind of Skills</i>	<i>Total</i>
Educational Qualification of the Respondents	Lessthen metric	Count	1	2	0	0	4	7
		% of Total	.8%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	3.1%	5.5%
	Metric	Count	0	2	2	1	7	12
		% of Total	0%	1.6%	.6%	.8%	5.5%	9.4%
	Less than HSC	Count	0	3	0	0	10	13
		% of Total	.0%	2.3%	.0%	.0%	7.8%	10.2%
	HSC	Count	1	10	0	5	20	36
		% of Total	8%	7.8%	0%	3.9%	15.6%	28.1%
	Degree	Count	2	1	12	0	8	23
		% of Total	1.6%	8%	.4%	.0%	6.3%	8.0%
	PG	Count	2	2	0	1	14	19
		% of Total	1.6%	1.6%	0%	.8%	10.9%	14.8%
	Others	Count	2	3	0	1	12	18
		% of Total	1.6%	2.3%	.0%	.8%	9.4%	14.1%
Total	Count	8	23	14	8	75	128	
	% of Total	6.3%	18.0%	0.9%	6.3%	58.6%	100.0%	

Table 16 shows the skills sets possessed by young migrated agricultural workers based on their educational background. 1.6 percent of degree holders, Post graduates, other qualified have carpentry skill sets, 7.8 percent of Higher secondary qualified have the previous experience and skill of road construction and laying. 9.4 percent of degree holders have skills on mason related works, 3.9 percent of Higher secondary qualified have electrical related work skills and total 58.6 percent have only agricultural related work skills among them 15.6 percent are higher secondary qualified.

Table 17
Monthly Income of the Respondents * Marital Status of the Respondents Crosstabulation

			<i>Marital Status of the Respondents</i>		<i>Total</i>
			<i>Married</i>	<i>Unmarried</i>	
Monthly Income of the Respondents	Less than 20000	Count	0	13	13
		% of Total	.0%	10.2%	10.2%
	20001–25000	Count	92	15	107
		% of Total	71.9%	11.7%	83.6%
	More than 25000	Count	5	3	8
		% of Total	3.9%	2.3%	6.3%
Total	Count	97	31	128	
	% of Total	75.8%	24.2%	100.0%	

Table 17 describes the monthly income of the young migrated agricultural workers based on their marital status. The workers who received less than 20,000 are unmarried. Among the category of 20001 to 25000 are 71.9 percent are married and 11.7 percent are unmarried. The respondents who receive more than 25000 are 3.9 percent are married and 2.3 percent are unmarried.

Table 18
Occupation of the Respondents * Previous Status of Agricultural Operation Crosstabulation

			<i>Previous Status of Agricultural Operation</i>			<i>Total</i>
			<i>Landlord</i>	<i>Marginal Farmers</i>	<i>Labourers</i>	
Occupation of the Respondents	Government	Count	7	15	2	24
		% of Total	5.5%	11.7%	1.6%	18.8%
	Private	Count	4	4	15	23
		% of Total	3.1%	3.1%	11.7%	18.0%
	Business	Count	12	4	1	17
		% of Total	9.4%	3.1%	.8%	13.3%
	Others	Count	32	27	5	64
		% of Total	25.0%	21.1%	3.9%	50.0%
	Total	Count	55	50	23	128
		% of Total	43.0%	39.1%	18.0%	100.0%

Table 18 shows present occupation of the respondents based on their previous status of agricultural background. 5.5 percent of landlord category are in government service at present, 3.1 in private, 9.4 percent in business and 25 percent in other backgrounds. In the category of marginal farmers, 11.7 percent are in government, 3.1 percent in private, 3.1 percent in business and 21.1 percent in others. In the category of agricultural labourers 1.6 percent in government, 11.7 percent in private, 0.8 percent in business and 3.9 percent in others.

Table 19
Skill set of the Respondents * Gender of the Respondents Crosstabulation

		<i>Gender of the Respondents</i>			<i>Total</i>
		<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>		
Skill set of the Respondents	Carpentry	Count	3	5	8
		% of Total	2.3%	3.9%	6.3%
	Road Laying	Count	16	7	23
		% of Total	12.5%	5.5%	18.0%
	Mason	Count	11	3	14
		% of Total	8.6%	2.3%	10.9%
	Electrician	Count	2	6	8
		% of Total	1.6%	4.7%	6.3%
	Only Agriculture or No Other Kind of Skills	Count	61	14	75
		% of Total	47.7%	10.9%	58.6%
Total	Count	93	35	128	
	% of Total	72.7%	27.3%	100.0%	

Table 19 shows possession of other skills sets by the young migrated agricultural workers based on their gender background. In the category of male 2.3 percent have carpentry background, 12.5 percent have the background skill of road laying, 8.6 percent in mason, 1.6 percent in electrical and 47.7 do not have others skills. In the category of female 3.9 percent have carpentry base, 5.5 percent in road laying, 2.3 percent in mason, 4.7 percent in electrical and 10.9 have only the skill background in agricultural alone.

Table 20
Respondents Opinion about the Causes for Migration based on their Previous Status of Agricultural Operation

		<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Non availability of Labour	Between Groups	8.410	2	4.205	74.463	.000
	Within Groups	7.059	125	.056		
	Total	15.469	127			
Lack of Skilled Labourers	Between Groups	33.217	2	16.608	97.581	.000
	Within Groups	21.275	125	.170		
	Total	54.492	127			
Non availability of Committed Labour	Between Groups	.000	2	.000	.000	1.000
	Within Groups	18.000	125	.144		
	Total	18.000	127			
Hard Manual Field Work	Between Groups	8.410	2	4.205	40.250	.000
	Within Groups	13.059	125	.104		
	Total	21.469	127			

A Study of Rural Urban Migration of Young Agricultural Labourers

		<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Highe wages	Between Groups	78.986	2	39.493	89.937	.000
	Within Groups	54.889	125	.439		
	Total	133.875	127			
Attracted by special other facilities	Between Groups	9.056	2	4.528	66.596	.000
	Within Groups	8.499	125	.068		
	Total	17.555	127			
Poor Soil Status	Between Groups	8.856	2	4.428	69.026	.000
	Within Groups	8.019	125	.064		
	Total	16.875	127			
High cost to soil test recommendations	Between Groups	1.159	2	.579	15.882	.000
	Within Groups	4.560	125	.036		
	Total	5.719	127			
Fragmented land holdings	Between Groups	9.948	2	4.974	59.678	.000
	Within Groups	10.419	125	.083		
	Total	20.367	127			
Unable to reach the fields	Between Groups	.290	2	.145	2.096	.127
	Within Groups	8.640	125	.069		
	Total	8.930	127			
Nonavailability of Quality Seeds	Between Groups	8.343	2	4.172	106.446	.000
	Within Groups	4.899	125	.039		
	Total	13.242	127			
Nonavailability of Fertilisers	Between Groups	.000	2	.000	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	125	.000		
	Total	.000	127			
Nonavailability of Pesticides	Between Groups	4.635	2	2.318	23.667	.000
	Within Groups	12.240	125	.098		
	Total	16.875	127			
Non availability of farm yard manure	Between Groups	2.607	2	1.304	28.290	.000
	Within Groups	5.760	125	.046		
	Total	8.367	127			
Non availability of Farm Implements	Between Groups	2.607	2	1.304	28.290	.000
	Within Groups	5.760	125	.046		
	Total	8.367	127			

		<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Frequent Power Cuts	Between Groups	4.635	2	2.318	15.882	.000
	Within Groups	18.240	125	.146		
	Total	22.875	127			
Improper power supply at odd times	Between Groups	17.433	2	8.717	43.481	.000
	Within Groups	25.059	125	.200		
	Total	42.492	127			

Table 20 attempts to test the significant difference exist in the opinion of respondents about the causes for migration based on their previous agricultural status of occupation. In order to test the significance, ANOVA has been employed by taking the causes related factors as dependent variables and previous agricultural status of occupation of respondents as independent factor. The level of significance has been fixed as 5 percent. Through the analysis, it is observed that there are significant difference exist in the opinion of respondents about non availability of labour, lack of skilled labourers, hard manual works, higher wages, attracted by special facilities, occurrence of cyclones, floods, droughts, poor soil status, high cost to soil recommendations, fragmented land holdings, non availability of quality seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, farm yard manure, farm implements, cost of inputs, marketing, storage, high payment of labourers, payment and shortage of power. Since all the obtained values of the above said factors are found to be less than 0.05. The insignificant exist only about the aspects of non availability of committed labours, seasonal fluctuations and non reachable aspects hence H1 is accepted.

Table 21
Strategies Adopted by the Respondents to Minimise Migration from Agriculture

<i>Level</i>	<i>Strategies</i>	<i>Total Score</i>	<i>Mean Score</i>
Personal	Family Support	3840	30
	Attitude of Involvement	6400	50
	Emotional Balance	8538.88	66.71
	Feel Pride to be Farmer	10138.88	79.21
	Encourage Family Members in same agricultural field	2839.04	22.18
Economical	Maximum Sources of Earning	3848.96	30.07
	Comprehensive Benefits	4149.76	32.42
	Raising minimum standard of Living	5561.6	43.45
	Free Flow of Finance	7974.4	62.30
	Minimum Guaranteed Wages	2437.12	19.04
	Motivational Packages	4524.8	35.35
Social	Multi income sources through irrigation and cultivation	5487.36	42.87
	Involving in Diversified agricultural business	4000	31.25
	Recognition for Business	7774.72	60.74
	Social support during the time of crisis	3174.4	24.80
Financial	Socio market acceptance	4949.76	38.67
	Corporate support	7848.96	61.32
	Subsidies and incentives	10142.12	79.29
	Comprehensive loans	7745.28	60.51
	Government supported micro credit	5400.32	42.19
	Minimum wages to farmers	1973.76	15.42

Table 21 shows the strategies adopted by the young agricultural workers to manage migration from the field at the levels of personal, economical, social and financial. The important aspects under each category according to the opinion of respondents based on their preference of ranking have been identified. For these identification, Garrett Ranking has been used. From the allotted ranks in each aspects obtained from the total and mean score, it is observed that at personal level self concept development of farmers has been used by them. Free flow of income and raising standard of living has been felt by the respondents to reduce migration at economical level. At social level, corporate support for continuous cultivation through different forms have been expected by them. The augmented subsidies and incentives provided by the government and agricultural governing bodies felt as the migration reducing strategies at financial level by the respondents.

Table 22

Expectations of Young Agricultural Labourers to continue in the profession

<i>Family</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Emotional Support	24	104	–	2.19	1
Financial Support	15	107	6	2.07	4
Involvement in the same profession by family members	6	18	104	1.23	5
Support from relatives	–	3	125	1.02	6
Need to support elders	21	104	3	2.14	2
Need of protecting family members	16	106	6	2.08	3
Income	–	24	104	1.19	6
Availability of Land	–	119	9	1.93	4
Acquiring Asset	–	9	119	1.07	7
Continuous Cultivation	107	21	–	2.84	1
Recognition for Labourism	15	107	6	2.07	2
Job security	–	125	3	1.98	3
Support of Technology	6	18	104	1.23	5
Acceptance	–	104	24	1.81	2
Social wealth	6	107	15	1.93	1
Good selling price	107	15	6	2.79	2
Margin	6	18	104	1.23	6
Product acceptance	6	18	104	1.23	6
Low cost of delivery	–	122	6	1.95	5
Protect competition	6	3	119	1.12	8
Marketing forum by government	15	113	–	2.12	3
Training	–	18	110	1.14	8
Compensation on transit loss	6	119	3	2.02	4
Market identification	119	3	6	2.88	1
Storage facility	9	15	104	1.26	2

<i>Family</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Crop maintenance	–	113	15	1.88	5
Free supply of raw materials	–	15	113	1.12	7
Advanced technologies at subsidised rates	–	6	122	1.05	8
Common procuring facility of raw materials	–	110	18	1.86	6
Common inventory at clusters	104	18	6	2.77	1
Market – field channels	15	104	9	2.00	4
Consultancy for processing	6	118	4	2.02	3
Subsidies / Incentives	3	6	119	1.09	12
Quick disposal of insurance claim	15	107	6	2.07	5
Extra care to protect crop	–	9	119	1.07	
Standardised benefits during natural damages	105	15	9	2.77	2
Special incentives for growing less demanded products	–	15	113	1.12	11
Government support for marketing consortium	3	104	21	1.86	7
Identification of supply of advanced machines at low price by government	6	18	104	1.23	8
Fully supported credit guarantee scheme by government	104	21	3	2.79	1
Special care by government officials for getting loan	–	113	15	1.88	6
Special housing schemes for agricultural labourers	3	15	110	1.16	9
Multi loaning facilities away from bankers.	21	107	–	2.16	4
Free education to the children of agriculture labour	–	21	107	1.16	9
Free medical facilities	104	3	21	2.65	3
Training on computer literacy	–	128	–	2.0	2
Knowledge of online selling	3	110	15	1.9	3
Current updation of market knowledge	15	–	113	1.2	4
Familiarizing of E–Governance	6	18	104	1.2	4
Cluster based counselling through online	107	–	21	2.7	1
Loan syndication	128	–	–	3.0	1
Government protected micro credit	18	–	110	1.3	7
Interest free working capital	–	128	–	2.0	4

<i>Family</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Overdraft facilities	10	100	18	1.9	5
Non- hypothecated loans	6	15	107	1.2	8
Less procedure to sanction agricultural loans	104	3	21	2.6	2
Multi loan to same family	9	119	–	2.1	3
Crop insurance	–	18	110	1.1	9
Medial combined personal insurance policy with low premium	6	107	15	1.9	5

Source: Computed Data

Table 22 identifies the expectation of young migrated agricultural workers in various aspects at the intervals of high, medium and low. In order to compute their level of expectations the identified parameters have been computed with simple weighted average method by assuming the weights of 3,2 and 1 for high, medium and low intervals. The expectations of young migrated respondents have measured in various categories like personal, family, social, economical, government, information & technology, operations, market and labour. The important aspects under category have been computed through weighted average method and subsequent ranking has been given. Under the category of family the important expectations are emotional and elders support. As the labours, they expect the supports of continuous job and recognition for occupation. The acquaintance of social wealth is also felt important by them. In market related aspects market identification and fair selling price are identified as their expected aspects. For their agricultural effective operations they expect common storage facilities and cluster based inventory. From the government, they expect credit guarantee and standardised benefits during natural damages. Cluster based on line professional counselling and basic computer literacy are the expected aspects from the background of information and technologies. In terms of finance based expectations lies with loan syndication and simple process for sanctioning loans related to agriculture. If proper care should be given on the identified aspects, the level of migration can be curbed among the young agricultural workers.

Table 23
Respondents Opinion about the causes for Migration based on their Gender

<i>Causes for migration</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.(2-tailed)</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i>	<i>Std.Error Difference</i>
Credit Debt	2.529	.114	.772	126	.441	.028	.036
			1.749	106.000	.083	.028	.016
Lack of support from the government deaprtment	4.271	.041	.633	126	.528	.055	.087
			.911	48.791	.367	.055	.061
No information on the government subsidies	468.125	.000	-6.491	126	.000	-.286	.044
			-2.828	20.000	.010	-.286	.101
Lack of facilities to market produces	45.609	.000	-3.304	126	.001	-.663	.201
			-2.126	21.938	.045	-.663	.312

<i>Causes for migration</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.(2-tailed)</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i>	<i>Std.Error Difference</i>
No Storage facilities	81.724	.000	5.499	126	.000	.314	.057
			3.068	21.018	.006	.314	.102
Advance payments given	339	.562	-1.188	126	.851	-.035	.187
			-.233	36.784	.817	-.035	.151
Heavy Distribution Cost	40.304	.000	-3.245	126	.002	-.432	.133
			-2.100	21.983	.047	-.432	.206
Heavy Grading/ Segregation Cost	81.724	.000	-5.499	126	.000	-.314	.057
			-3.068	21.018	.006	-.314	.102
Frequent Visits to Urban Areas	11.301	.001	4.092	126	.000	.369	.090
			3.022	23.196	.006	.369	.122
Frequent Visits of relatives and friends	3.064	.082	-1.327	126	.187	-.146	.110
			-1.281	27.528	.211	-.146	.114
Reference groups	13.367	.000	-2.139	126	.034	-.377	.176
			-1.705	24.121	.101	-.377	.221
Impact of Opinion leaders	7.367	.008	4.163	126	.000	.397	.095
			3.231	23.775	.004	.397	.123
Exposure to Radio	.222	.638	-0.752	126	.453	-.119	.159
			-.826	31.317	.415	-.119	.144
Exposure to TV	74.079	.000	-3.871	126	.000	-.460	.119
			-2.256	21.265	.035	-.460	.204
Exposure to News Papers	7.542	.007	3.443	126	.001	.341	.099
			2.762	24.204	.011	.341	.123
Exposure to Traditional Ads	9.275	.003	1.340	126	.183	.111	.083
			1.873	45.753	.067	.111	.059
Exposure to ICT	14.564	.000	-2.321	126	.022	-.405	.174
			-1.834	24.006	.079	-.405	.221
To avail good schooling and educational facilities	14.564	.000	2.321	126	.022	.202	.087
			1.834	24.006	.079	.202	.110
Good Recreational facilities	9.275	.003	1.340	126	.183	.223	.166
			1.873	45.753	.067	.223	.119

<i>Causes for migration</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.(2-tailed)</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i>	<i>Std.Error Difference</i>
Material Wealth	4.271	.041	-0.633	126	.528	-0.055	.087
			-0.911	48.791	.367	-0.055	.061
To get popularity in terms of economic viability	13.367	.000	-2.139	126	.034	-0.377	.176
			-1.705	24.121	.101	-0.377	.221
Status symbol	7.470	.007	1.247	126	.215	.194	.156
			1.675	42.290	.101	.194	.116
To improve the family status	57.456	.000	-4.974	126	.000	-0.627	.126
			-2.884	21.237	.009	-0.627	.217
To settle the family members with employment in future	9.678	.002	-1.884	126	.062	-0.174	.093
			-1.568	24.736	.129	-0.174	.111

Source : Computed Data

The causes for migration by young agricultural workers based on their gender tested for its significance at 5% level of significance. In order to test the opinion of selected samples and generalized to population of young agricultural labourers who underwent for migration from agricultural sector independent sample t-test has been applied by considering dichotomous character of gender male and female. From the analysis it is observed the reason or causes for migration between male and female young agricultural workers those who migrated from the sector differ significantly with respect to the aspects of government subsidies, marketing facilities, storage facilities, distribution cost, grading cost, influence of reference groups, influence of TV, exposure to ICT, better schooling, recreation facilities, economic viability, family status and family development in future. Since the obtained significant values of the factors are less than 0.05. The insignificant is observed with respect to status symbol, material wealth, exposure to news papers, radio, impact of opinion leaders, frequent visit of friends & relatives, payments, lack of support from the government. Hence the study accepts H_2

6. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- It is found that majority of migration took place among the young agricultural workers in the age group of 22 to 25 (53.9 percent)
- 72.7 percentage of migrated respondents are male.
- It is found that 28.1 percent of migrated respondents have the educational qualification of higher secondary and 18 percent are graduates. It is also found that the migration level is less in the educational background of metric and below.
- Among the migrated young agricultural workers, 50 percent migrated to the occupation of abroad, trade and other categories. 18 percent of them dispersed to government and private.
- After migration 50.8 percent of respondents prefer to live in joint family for the reasons of family protection, availability of living space and so on.

- It is found the family size of respondents is around 3 to 5 members (50.8 percent) after migration.
- The marital status of respondents have due influence on the migration, it is proved that out of migrated young agricultural workers 75.8 percent are married.
- 85.9 percent of respondents live in own houses after migration.
- It is found that 75.8 percent of respondents are migrated to urban locations and 24.2 percent to rural where industrial establishments have been created.
- Regarding the farming experience possessed by the migrated respondents 81.3 percent have more than 10 years of farming experiences.
- It is found that 83.6 percent of migrated workers get monthly income between 20001 to 25000.
- 58.6 percent of respondents do not have skill sets in other occupations, 18 percent have other skill set of road construction and laying.
- It is found that 60.9 percent of male migrants have more than 10 years of experience and 20.3 percent of female have the same experience in farming.
- The income of male migrants is more than female migrants and very specifically male migrants are making major income above 25000.
- It is evident and found that under the educational qualification of less than metric 1.6 percent have the skill sets of road laying, 1.6 percent of metric qualified have road laying and mason, 2.3 percent of less than higher secondary qualified in road laying, 7.8 percent of higher secondary qualified in road laying, 9.4 percent in mason and whose qualification is degree, 1.6 percent of post graduation qualified with carpentry and road laying, 2.3 percent of other qualification with road laying skill sets away from agricultural background.
- It is found that 71.9 percent of married respondent do get income between 20001–25000 and 3.9 percent more than 25000.
- Regarding the present occupation of migrant workers 11.7 percent of marginal farmers in government sectors, 11.7 percent labourers in private sector, 9.4 percent of landlords in business and 25 percent of landlords in other categories like abroad, trade and so on.
- 12.5 percent of male migrants have road laying and construction skills away from agriculture and where as 5.5 percent of female do have the same skills.
- It is found that the respondents opinion about the causes of migration based on the previous agricultural operations significantly differ with respect to non availability of labour, lack of skilled labours, hard manual work, huge wages, attracted by special other facilities, poor soil status, high cost to soil test recommendations, fragmented land holdings, non availability of quality seeds, pesticides, farm yard manure, farm implements, power cuts and power supply.
- It is understood and found that feeling pride to be a farmer may be the personal strategy adopted by farmers to manage migration, under economical strategy free flow of funds, raising minimum standard of living, corporate support under social category and comprehensive loans under financial strategy can reduce migration among young agricultural workers.
- It is found the expectation of young migrant agricultural labourers in terms of family as emotional and elder supports. Continuous cultivation under labourism, social wealth under society, market identification under market, common inventory at clusters under operations, fully supported credit guarantee scheme by government under government, cluster based counseling through online under information & technology, loan syndication.
- It is found among the gender based opinion of respondents about the causes for migration relevance to external and environmental aspects, the opinion significantly differ with information on availability about government subsidies, lack of facilities to market produces, storage non availability, heavy

distribution cost, heavy grading/segregation cost, frequent visits to urban areas, reference groups, exposure to TV, ICT, avail good schooling and educational facilities, recreational facilities, popularity in terms of economic viability, family status, settlement of family members in employment.

7. SUGGESTIONS

- The existing young agricultural workers below the age of 25 may be encouraged through retention programme by creating due awareness about their presence on agricultural sector.
- The status of organized professional entity may be extended to agricultural sector and which attracts most male to stay back in the industry.
- The standardized income sources may be constituted to retain the educated youth to contribute in agricultural sector.
- The minimum guaranteed welfare measures may be made for agricultural workers at their respective locations.
- The yield based family insurance plans may be offered for married young agricultural labours to get social security.
- The comprehensive business centers comprising the zones of marketing, selling, production and quality management may be established through cluster wise process.
- The skill development programmes may be offered periodically through orientation and refreshment training programmes.
- The special retention schemes may be launched to retain female labourers in agricultural and its allied sectors.
- The consortium can be made available to promote the produce of agricultural on regional basis supported by government and corporate collaborations.
- The family counselling and orientation for family members may be frequently organized by government and training institutions.
- The comprehensive farming benefits may be given to farmers during the time of losses, damages and calamities.
- The socio interaction programmes and visits may be organized for the representatives of farmers especially the states like Punjab, Gujarat and Haryana.
- The augmentation of sources of income may be enriched for agricultural labourers through supporting and allied agricultural businesses.
- The grading level of produces towards market and product acceptance may be done.
- The closed protected markets can be made for produce cum distributing farmers.
- The periodic training especially psychological based may be offered to farmers.
- The modern cultivation and advanced technologies may be offered to farmers at subsidies prices.
- The comprehensive credit guarantee schemes may be launched for the farmers.
- Standardized benefits may be granted during the time of natural damages.
- The importance of web selling and marketing may be penetrated among the farmers to reach the fast track markets through better literacy of computer operations and processing.

8. CONCLUSION

In India, especially south India, the expansion of non-agricultural jobs for rural people has accelerated since the mid-1990s, inducing a large-scale migration of workforces from rural to urban areas. To investigate the nature of such rural-urban migration, the most striking finding was that the rural class structure in the study village still largely corresponded with the size of farmland ownership, in spite of the increased importance of non-agricultural employment today. The key to understanding this phenomenon is the high cost of education necessary to acquire white-collar jobs (or even some blue-collar jobs) and inter-class disparity in the access to credit (including relatives who have already obtained remunerable non-agricultural employment) for financing an expensive education. In other words, the high cost of higher education (especially in the college/university level) is reproducing (or even expanding) the traditional structure of economic disparity among households based on ownership of farmland. They are some basic expectations prevail among the migrant young agricultural workers in terms of family, social, technological, economical, financial aspects and subsequent actions will help to retain the people to stay back in the agricultural industry and that leads to a precautionary measure to protect agricultural industry to address the biogenic related issues of society in years to come.

9. SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

- A Focused study on Causes of Migration between male and female agriculturist and its impact on their socio-economic aspects may be studied.
- The present study may be extended to entire District and state levels.
- The study of post migration life aspects of agricultural workers may be studied.
- A Comparative studies before and after migration with special reference to economic, social and occupational level may be studied.
- The role of governing bodies and other institutions towards the migration and non migration may be studied.
- The influence of private jobs on the migration of agricultural labourers may be studied.
- The impact of globalization on agricultural economy with special reference to migration may be studied.

REFERENCES

- [1] Anamica, M. 2010. "Migration Behaviour of Dry Land Farmers—An Expost Facto Study" (UNPUBLISHED M.Sc.(Ag) Thesis—Department of Agricultural Extension & Rural Sociology, TNAU, Coimbatore)
- [2] Deshingkar, P. 2009. Circular Migration in India, World Development Report, Available at: www.odi.org.uk/resources/download/2506.pdf
- [3] Dugbazah, J.E. 2008. Gender, Migration and Rural livelihoods in Ghana: a case of the Ho district. Unpub. Ph.D. Thesis, The University of Birmingham, United Kingdom.
- [4] Haq, A., 1974. Theoretical consideration for studying socio-psychological factors in migration. *The Pakistan Rev.*, XIII: 353–60.
- [5] Hossain, M.Z. 2001. Rural-urban migration in Bangladesh: a micro-level study paper presented at 24th IUSSP General Conference. Salvador, Brazil, Available at: www.iussp.org/Brazil2001/s20/S28_P02_Hossain.pdf
- [6] Ramasubramanian, M. 2003. Developing strategies for sustainable dry farming. Unpub. Ph.D. Thesis, TNAU, Coimbatore.
- [7] Samal, C.K. 2006. Remittances and Sustainable Livelihoods in Semi-arid Areas. *Asia-Pacific Development Journal*, 13(2): 73–91.
- [8] Siddiqui, T. 2004. Migration as a livelihood strategy of the poor: the Bangladesh case, paper presented at the conference on migration, development and pro-poor policy choices in Asia. Dhaka, Bangladesh. Available at: www.livelihoods.org/hot_topics/docs/Dhaka_CP_5.pdf
- [9] Swaminathan, M.S.2006., "Swaminathan Wants Farming made Attractive," *The Hindu*, 129(131): 15.