



ISSN (E): 2277- 7695

ISSN (P): 2349-8242

NAAS Rating: 5.23

TPI 2022; SP-11(3): 07-09

© 2022 TPI

[www.thepharmajournal.com](http://www.thepharmajournal.com)

Received: 07-01-2022

Accepted: 10-02-2022

**SA Wagale,**

Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Agricultural Economics, Dr. B. S. Konkan Krishi Vidyapeeth, Dapoli, Maharashtra, India

**SS Wadkar,**

Head and Professor Department of Agricultural Economics Dr. B. S. Konkan Krishi Vidyapeeth, Dapoli, Maharashtra, India

**VA Thorat,**

Associate Professor Department of Agricultural Economics Dr. B. S. Konkan Krishi Vidyapeeth, Dapoli, Maharashtra, India

**PJ Kshirsagar,**

Associate Professor Department of Agricultural Economics Dr. B. S. Konkan Krishi Vidyapeeth, Dapoli, Maharashtra, India

**SS Manerikar**

Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Agricultural Economics, Dr. B. S. Konkan Krishi Vidyapeeth, Dapoli, Maharashtra, India

**SA Diwate**

Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Agricultural Economics, Dr. B. S. Konkan Krishi Vidyapeeth, Dapoli, Maharashtra, India

**Corresponding Author**

**SA Wagale,**

Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Agricultural Economics, Dr. B. S. Konkan Krishi Vidyapeeth, Dapoli, Maharashtra, India

## The socio-economic profile of migrant and non-migrant family and the factors responsible for the migration in South Konkan region of Maharashtra state

**SA Wagale, SS Wadkar, VA Thorat, PJ Kshirsagar, SS Manerikar and SA Diwate**

### Abstract

Migration has greater impact on economic, social, cultural, political and psychological life of people. Migration may be international or intra-national but it is one of the magnitudes of assessment of changing socio-economic and political condition at national and international level. The size of family was large (8.53) in migrant. Among the family members at native place numbers of earner members were more (3.17) in case of non-migrant sample respondents as compared to migrants (1.45). The number of non-earner members at native were maximum (3.38) in migrant households than non-migrants (2.99). The education score of migrant and non-migrant households at native varied from 9.22 to 10.32, with an average of 9.77. The educational score of migrant members was relatively high (10.95). The total income of non-migrant sample respondents was Rs.255299 while in case of migrant sample respondents the total income was Rs.41894. The major factors responsible for migration were Unavailability of employment opportunities in the village (87.25 per cent) followed by Job opportunities by friends & relatives at migrated place (Siblings) at place of migration (75.75 per cent), Inability to meet basic needs with existing income (71.25 per cent), Attraction of the rural youths towards urban area (69.00 per cent) Small and fragmented land holding (63.50 per cent), No higher education facilities in village or nearby village (55.75 per cent), Health issues and any other reason (14.00 per cent) and (10.25 per cent) respectively.

**Keywords:** Migrant, non-migrant, average, frequency, Konkan region, Sindhudurg, Ratnagiri remittance

### Introduction

Migration occurs under two different compelling circumstances, either the “growth pull” (demand pull) effects or “crowding out” (supply push) effects. When the destination serves higher level of growth because of increased public and private investment or influx of new technology as growth influencing factors, the “growth pull” effect is seen. On the other hand, when there is an abundance of labour force without having sufficient economic opportunities in the local region for the maintenance of livelihood, the “crowding out” effect of migration occurs (Narayan moorthy *et al.*, 1999) <sup>[1]</sup>. Migration has greater impact on economic, social, cultural, political and psychological life of people. Migration may be international or intra-national but it is one of the magnitudes of assessment of changing socio-economic and political condition at national and international level (Kalian and Berry, 1980) <sup>[2]</sup>. The internal migration may take several forms such as rural to urban, urban to urban, urban to rural and rural to rural (Rao, 1981) <sup>[3]</sup>.

Previously, various efforts have been made to justify the reasons for migration from rural areas. These studies suggested that, the availability of social infrastructural facilities, employment opportunities and the sources of income generation in rural areas are lesser than in the urban areas. Hence, the trend of migration from rural to urban areas, principally to larger cities, is frequently experienced.

### Objectives

1. To study the socio – economic profile of migrant and non-migrant family
2. To identify the factors responsible for the migration.

## Methodology

### Study area

The study was conducted purposively in Ratnagiri and Sindhudurg district of Konkan region in Maharashtra state as extent of migration is more in this district. Five tahsil each, from the two districts and five villages from each selected tahsils was selected randomly. From Ratnagiri district five tahsils i.e. Rajapur, Lanja, Ratnagiri, Chiplun and Dapoli and from Sindhudurg district kudal, Kankavali, Vaibhavwadi, Malvan and Sawantwadi were selected randomly. From each selected village four migrant families and four non migrant families were selected thus from each tehsil 20 migrant respondent and 20 non migrant respondents were selected. Thus final sample from Ratnagiri and Sindhudurg district consist of 200 migrant and 200 non migrant respondents.

### Collection of data

A schedule was designed for data collection keeping in view the objectives of study. The data were collected through personal interview method. The required data were collected through well designed and pretested schedules.

### Analysis of data

The tabular analysis was followed. The averages and percentages required to fulfil the objectives was estimated.

## Result and Discussion

### The socio-economic profile of migrant and non-migrant family

The composition and size of family of sample households is presented in Table 1. It is revealed from the table that the size of family was large (8.53) in migrant. In case of migrant families most of the families were joint families and therefore

size of family was larger than non-migrant sample households. Among the family members at native place numbers of earner members were more (3.17) in case of non-migrant sample respondents as compared to migrants (1.45). The number of non earner members at native were maximum (3.38) in migrant households than non-migrants (2.99).

The migrant member constitutes 1.52 males and 0.64 females. Among migrant members the average earner members were 1.45 and non-earner members were 0.67. The number of earner members was more because migrated female also work in private sector. The non-earners are children's either young age or they were in education.

The age of migrant family members was 42.41 and 24.07 years in migrant family members which were staying at native and migrated members respectively. The average age of non-migrant sample household was 39.05 years. This indicated that migrated member includes young stock. The average age of non-migrant sample households was less than family members of migrants at native place. This may be because of the fact that the composition of non-migrant sample households includes more number of children as compared to migrant families. At overall level average age of sample households at native and migrated place ranged between 40.73 to 24.07 years.

The education score of migrant and non-migrant households at native varied between 9.22 to 10.32, with an average of 9.77. The educational score of migrant members was relatively high (10.95).

The average size of land holding of migrant households was relatively more (1.53 ha) as compared to non-migrant households (1.43 ha) with an average size of holding of 1.48 hectare.

**Table 1:** General information of sample respondents.

Sr. No.	Particulars	Category of respondents		Overall
		Migrant (n = 200)	Non-migrant (n = 200)	
I.	<b>Composition of family</b>			
	1) Size of family (No.)			
	<b>a) Family members at native place</b>			
	i) Male	3.22	3.35	3.29
	ii) Female	3.15	2.76	2.96
	iii) Earners	2.96	3.17	3.06
	iv) Non earners	3.38	2.99	3.19
	<b>b) Migrant members</b>			
	i) Male	1.52	-	1.52
	ii) Female	0.64	-	0.64
	iii) Earners	1.45	-	1.45
	iv) Non earners	0.67	-	0.67
II.	Age (years)			
	a) Family members at native place	42.41	39.05	40.73
	b) Migrant members	24.07	-	24.07
III.	Education (Score)			
	a) Family members at native place	9.22	10.32	9.77
	b) Migrant members	10.95	-	10.95
Iv.	Size of holding (ha)	1.53	1.43	1.48

The source wise average income of non-migrant and migrant sample respondents is given in Table 2. It was observed from the table that the total income of non-migrant sample respondents was Rs.255299 out of which 47.77% was from agriculture followed by 25.03% from other sources, 17.48% and 9.72% from livestock and wages respectively.

In case of migrant sample respondents, the total income was Rs.418943 out of which 47.38% from agriculture followed by 26.68% from remittance received from migrant family member. It was further observed that the income from livestock, other sources and wages was 11%, 8.65% and 6.29% respectively.

**Table 2:** Source wise income

Sr. No.	Particulars	Non-Migrant	Migrant
		Income (Rs.)	Income (Rs.)
1	Agriculture	121960 (47.77)	198475 (47.38)
2	Live Stock	44625 (17.48)	46088 (11.00)
3	Wages	24805 (9.72)	26345 (6.29)
4	Remittance	-	111780 (26.68)
5	Other	63909 (25.03)	36255 (8.65)
Total		255299 (100.00)	418943 (100.00)

**Factors responsible for the migration.**

Factors responsible for the migration was given in table 3 It

**Table 3:** Factors responsible for migration.

Sr. No.	Reasons	Respondents (N=400)	
		Frequency	Percentage
1	Unavailability of employment opportunities in the village	351	87.75
2	'Inability to meet basic needs with existing income'	285	71.25
3	Small and fragmented land holding	254	63.50
4	'No higher education facilities in village or nearby village	223	55.75
5	Health issues	56	14.00
6	Attraction of the rural youths towards urban area	276	69
7	Job opportunities by friends& relatives at migrated place (Siblings) at place of migration	303	75.75
8	Any other	41	10.25

The study has also brought out that education and health problems as the another problems lending to migration. This again holds true in the areas like Konkan that lacks in proper infrastructure. Further, migration of some of the members of rural family has become routine in Konkan area because of the reasons stated above.

**Conclusions**

The size of family was large (8.53) in migrant. Among the family members at native place numbers of earner members were more (3.17) in case of non-migrant sample respondents as compared to migrants (1.45). The number of non-earner members at native were maximum (3.38) in migrant households than non- migrants (2.99). The education score of migrant and non-migrant households at native varied from 9.22 to 10.32, with an average of 9.77. The educational score of migrant members was relatively high (10.95). The total income of non –migrant sample respondents was Rs.255299 out of which 47.77% was from agriculture followed by 25.03% from other sources, 17.48% and 9.72% from livestock and wages respectively. In case of migrant sample respondents the total income was Rs.418943 out of which 47.38% from agriculture followed by 26.68% from remittance received from migrant family member. It was further observed that the income from livestock, other sources and wages was 11%, 8.65% and 6.29% respectively.

The major factors responsible for migration were Unavailability of employment opportunities in the village (87.25 per cent) followed by Job opportunities by friends& relatives at migrated place (Siblings) at place of migration (75.75 per cent), Inability to meet basic needs with existing income (71.25 per cent), Attraction of the rural youths towards urban area (69.00 per cent) Small and fragmented land holding (63.50 per cent), No higher education facilities

was found from Table 3 that nearly 351 (87.25 per cent) of respondent reported 'unavailability of employment opportunities in the village forces rural people to migrate 'as the major reason for migration. Along with that 303 (75.75 per cent) of respondent reported 'Job opportunities by friends& relatives at migrated place (Siblings) at place of migration' as one of the reasons leading to migration of rural population. About 285 (71.25 per cent) reported 'inability to meet basic needs with existing income as one of the reasons leading to migration of rural population.

Further attraction of the rural youths towards urban area' was the reason for migration as perceived by 69.00 per cent of the respondent. This was followed by 55.75 per cent of the 'No higher education facilities in village or nearby village, 14.00 per cent expressed health issues being the reason for migration and 10.25 per cent reported other reasons for migration of rural people.

in village or nearby village (55.75 per cent), Health issues and any other reason (14.00 per cent) and (10.25 per cent) respectively.

**References**

1. Narayanmoorthy A, Jyotishi A, Deshmukh RS. "Agricultural growth and migration" Search for new evidence. Indian journal of Agricultural Extension, 1999, 54(3).
2. Kalin R, Berry JW. "Geographic Mobility and Ethnic Tolerance". The Journal of Social Psychology. 1980;112(1-2):129-134.
3. Rao MSA. "Some Aspects of Sociology of Migration", Sociological Bulletin. 1981;30(1):21-38.
4. Bodrul Islam, Pradyut Guha. Factors affecting migrations of labourers from domestic agriculture and its impact on household crop income in Assam. Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics, 2020;75(4):458-467.
5. Shankar Kandhare S, Bharadi HH. Internal labour migration in India: Its trends and patterns. Journal of Economic & Social Development. 2019;XV(1):78-85