

**MIGRATION : A CASE OF GUJARAT**

**T.K. Moulik  
Swati Mehta**

**WP898**



WP  
1990  
(898)

**W P No. 898**

**SEPTEMBER 1990**

**The main objective of the working paper series of the IIMA is to help faculty members to test out their research findings at the pre-publication stage.**

**INDIAN INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT  
AHMEDABAD - 380 056  
INDIA**

**PURCHASED**

**APPROVAL**

**GRANTS/EXCHANGE**

**FEES**

**ACC NO.**

**VEERAM SARASWATI LIBRARY**

**L. L. M., AHMEDABAD**

## ABSTRACT

Despite massive investments in rural development programmes during the last ten years, the problem of unemployment has assumed alarming proportions causing migration of the rural population. Although there are several factors responsible, lack of employment opportunities in the rural sector and the 'urban pull' factor caused by relatively greater employment opportunities are equally important. Over the years, economic factors have eclipsed other factors like environment, socio-cultural, political etc. Besides, alongwith selective permanent migration, temporal, spatial and seasonal migration has also become common. This is due to the greater absorption capacity of the rural labour force in commercial agriculture, new industrial activities, dam construction and field channels of irrigation etc.

Experience has also shown that migration was of higher magnitude and in greater frequency in the underdeveloped regions and in tribal regions. Although it is difficult to assess the qualitative and quantitative impact of rural migration in the underdeveloped regions, two effects can be pointed out, 1) due to the migration there would be a decline in the qualitative aspect of human resources which are so vital in devising need based developmental plans for rural development, 2) once the migrants come under the influence of the urban environmental factors, the 'rural pull' factor may not be so attractive any longer.

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

The problem of rural migration in Gujarat and other states has been the subject matter of many research studies. Researchers have extensively discussed issues related to rural-urban migration. cost effectiveness of rural unskilled migrants over urban labour force, pattern of rural migration etc. In fact, on seasonal migration, pioneering work was undertaken as early as in 1969, on the problems faced by the Gujarat patidars of South Gujarat in the recruitment of tribals from the neighbouring state for commercial agriculture. There have also been micro level studies, based on census data, on the pattern of migration in respect of specific caste groups.

Thus, the present study examines various aspects of rural migration and intends to focus on problems of rural migration in a tribal area which generally had altogether different dimensions both in nature and content.

### **1.1 OBJECTIVES**

1. To assess the employment opportunities and the extent of migration alongwith socio-economic characteristics of migrants such as social status, seasonality and duration of migration, factors responsible for the migration, institutional arrangements if any, for the migrants (like middlemen, contractors etc.) type of work for the migrants and income accrued.

## 1.2 METHODOLOGY

Primary data collection was undertaken from selected households, comprising of both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries under IRDP, through structured questionnaires to understand the process of migration, reasons of migration and benefits accrued to them in the process of migration.

Panchmahal district in Gujarat, is one of the poorest districts and largely inhabited by tribals. Due to lack of various infrastructural facilities the district was drought prone. Thus, there were lack of employment opportunities and resulted in large scale migration. Three, talukas where there was large scale migration were selected ie. Dahod, Limkheda and Santrampur. The following criteria were taken into consideration while selecting the sample households.

- different ethnic communities and cultural specifications.
- small, marginal, landless and women workers.
- various types of households in terms of migration characteristics eg. short duration of migration, migration of whole families or few members towards different geographical locations.

A total number of 300 sample households spread over 15 villages of Dahod, Santrampur and Limkheda were selected as sample.

All the sample households were grouped into two categories :  
1) beneficiaries, ii) non-beneficiaries. Beneficiaries were classified as those who were assisted by the government sponsored development programmes. The distribution of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries among sample households according to various land sizes is shown in Table 1.

**Table 4 : Distribution of Sample Households according to  
land ownership pattern and classification of  
Beneficiaries and Non-Beneficiaries  
in Selected Talukas.**

Land ownership (Acres)	Selected Talukas			
	Dahod	Santrampur	Limkheda	Total
<b>Landless</b>				
Beneficiaries (B)	12	11	7	30
Non-Beneficiaries (NB)	8	9	13	30
Sub-Total	20	20	20	60
<b>Marginal Farmers (Below 2.50)</b>				
Beneficiaries (B)	13	18	13	44
Non-Beneficiaries (NB)	17	12	17	46
Sub-Total	30	30	30	90
<b>Small Farmers (2.51 - 5.00)</b>				
Beneficiaries (B)	14	13	8	35
Non-Beneficiaries (NB)	6	7	12	25
Sub-Total	20	20	20	60
<b>Big Farmers (5.01 &amp; above)</b>				
Beneficiaries (B)	19	16	12	47
Non-Beneficiaries (NB)	11	14	18	43
Sub-Total	30	30	30	90
<b>Overall</b>				
Beneficiaries (B)	58	58	40	156
Non-Beneficiaries (NB)	42	42	60	144
Total	100	100	100	300

As migration was perpetual in nature, it was thought desirable to assess any changes in the socio-economic conditions of the migrant families at various destinations. Therefore, Ahmedabad and Nadiad being major urban centres were selected. A migrant family which belonged to Panchmahal district was selected both in Ahmedabad and Nadiad to elicit information. At each centre, 50 households spread over five or six localities were selected.

## 2.0 RESOURCES

### 2.1 Land Resources

VIKRAM SARABHAI LIBRARY  
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT  
VASTRAPUR, AHMEDABAD-380015

2.1.1 It was found that a large proportion of farmers own a very small proportion of land. On an average, per farm area owned by the sample farmers was 2.27 acres in Santrampur taluka, 2.49 acres in Dahod taluka and 4.09 acres in Limkheda taluka (Table 2). Among the three categories of farmers marginal, small and big - the marginal farmers were in the most disadvantageous position. In Santrampur taluka, it was as low as 0.21 acres per household. Relatively farmers in Dahod and Limkheda talukas had higher land per household of 1.52 acres and 1.41 acres respectively. Fragmentation of land holdings was a common phenomenon in the rural settings. It was observed that per plot, total land resource was higher in Limkheda taluka i.e. 1.69 acres per plot, as compared to Dahod 0.89 acres and Santrampur taluka 0.54 acres. There were no significant variations among beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries and also among different farm sizes.

2.1.2 Another aspect of land resources which deserves examination is the availability of cultivable land. All land in possession of the household was not cultivable. In Limkheda

Table 2 : Characteristics of Land Ownership among Sample Households in Selected regions.

Land Ownership	Dahod Taluka			Santrampur Taluka			Likheda Taluka						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
	Available area per piece (acre)	Cultivated area (acre)	Percentage of net area (per cent)	Available area per piece (acre)	Cultivated area (acre)	Percentage of net area (per cent)	Available area per piece (acre)	Cultivated area (acre)	Percentage of net area (per cent)	Available area per piece (acre)	Cultivated area (acre)	Percentage of net area (per cent)	Available area per piece (acre)
Landless													
B	0.67	0.29	100.0	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.82	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MB	1.00	0.25	100.0	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.92	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Sub-Total	0.75	0.27	100.0	0.00	0.00	0.85	0.86	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Marginal Farmers													
B	0.77	1.60	94.0	1.65	0.42	0.38	0.38	65.25	1.59	1.05	1.43	100.0	2.17
MB	0.78	1.41	96.0	1.17	0.41	0.14	0.14	69.75	1.76	1.09	1.38	100.0	3.19
Sub-Total	0.77	1.52	95.2	1.45	0.41	0.21	0.21	67.51	1.64	1.07	1.41	100.0	2.68



Table 2 : Contd.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
<b>Small Farmers</b>													
B	0.94	0.94	2.65	73.0	4.11	0.85	2.13	78.10	6.90	1.99	3.67	82.69	4.88
NB	1.17	1.17	2.56	84.0	6.12	0.83	2.76	82.20	4.12	1.50	2.71	87.19	6.67
Sub-Total	1.02	1.02	2.61	77.0	4.92	0.84	2.45	80.16	5.53	1.70	3.20	84.94	5.70
<b>Big Farmers</b>													
B	1.36	1.36	5.85	86.0	9.18	1.25	5.19	85.17	8.25	2.39	7.37	88.12	7.13
NB	2.00	2.00	5.12	83.0	10.12	1.10	5.82	87.39	6.12	2.19	7.89	89.36	8.16
Sub-Total	1.50	1.50	5.49	84.6	9.69	1.09	5.52	86.28	7.27	2.29	7.63	88.74	7.65
<b>Overall</b>													
B	0.87	0.87	2.60	88.25	4.98	0.55	2.13	76.17	5.51	1.81	4.16	90.27	4.73
NB	0.93	0.93	2.34	90.75	5.80	0.54	2.41	79.78	4.02	1.59	3.99	92.18	6.01
Total	0.89	0.89	2.49	89.47	5.36	0.54	2.27	77.98	4.81	1.69	4.09	91.23	5.34

taluka, of the total land available with the household, 91.23% was cultivable as against 89.47% in Dahod taluka and 77.98% in Santrampur taluka. Among different farm sizes it appears that marginal farmers tended to have highest proportion of cultivable land resources. Big farmers were in a disadvantageous position as they had larger uncultivable area as compared to marginal farmers. The above situation also prevailed among the sample households of Dahod and Limkheda talukas. However, in Santrampur the big farmers had larger cultivable land than the small and marginal farmers.

2.1.3 The constraints of irrigation resources for agricultural purposes among different farm sizes was quite obvious. Among the marginal and small farmers the proportion of irrigable area was less than 6% whereas in case of big farmers it was between 7.27% and 9.69% in the three selected regions. Among the group of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries inter regional variations were observed. In Dahod and Limkheda the proportion of irrigable area to cultivable area was higher among non-beneficiaries than beneficiaries. The situation was reverse in Santrampur taluka.

## 2.2 Livestock Resources

Livestock rearing was traditionally undertaken in the rural areas as a subsidiary occupation to augment family income. Experience has shown that under unfavorable soil and climate conditions livestock rearing became a primary occupation in certain parts of the rural areas.

The livestock resources of the sample households revealed that on an average the per household ownership of animals was 4.21 in

Limkheda. 3.54 in Dahod taluka and 3.06 in Santrampur taluka (Table 3). In Santrampur and Limkheda talukas beneficiaries had greater herd sizes as compared to non-beneficiaries. Only among the sample households of Dahod taluka the herd size was larger among non-beneficiaries. Among the different types of animals, regional preferences were evident. Sample households had preference for animals like sheep and goats. Among different land sizes animal herd size was lowest among the landless and steadily increased with the increase in the size of land holding in all talukas. Thus, it may be said that there was positive relationship between land ownership and herd size.

### **3.0 OUT-MIGRATION**

The following aspects of rural out-migration and urban in-migration are focussed here.

- Magnitude and/or extent of out-migration
- Causative factors of out-migration
- Nature of permanent or temporal out-migration
- Availability of wage employment opportunities for the urban in-migrants
- Income level of urban in migrants

Further in order to understand the perpetual nature of out-migration.

#### **3.1 Incidence**

While estimating the out migration of family members it was observed that in 1986-87, on an average 1.72 members per sample household from Limkheda taluka migrated to other places as

Table 3 : Per Household Number of Different Animals owned by the Sample Households According to land ownership

pattern and Beneficiaries and Non-beneficiaries

Land Ownership	Dahod Taluka			Santraampur Taluka			Lankheda Taluka								
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
	Drought Animal	Milch Animal	Young Stock	Other Stock	Total	Drought Animal	Milch Animal	Young Stock	Other Stock	Total	Drought Animal	Milch Animal	Young Stock	Other Stock	Total
	0.29	-	-	2.00	2.29	0.34	-	-	1.0	1.34	0.39	0.80	-	1.07	2.26
B	0.50	-	-	0.50	1.00	0.30	0.60	0.70	1.80	2.40	0.40	0.70	-	1.37	2.47
MB	0.36	-	-	1.45	1.81	0.32	0.05	0.15	1.35	1.87	0.39	0.60	-	1.09	2.08
Overall															
	0.79	0.36	0.15	0.46	2.76	1.12	0.18	0.24	0.71	2.25	1.06	0.82	0.14	2.18	4.20
B	1.24	0.10	0.55	0.93	2.82	0.33	0.16	0.12	0.26	0.87	0.70	1.07	0.27	1.16	3.20
MB	0.99	0.25	0.32	1.24	2.80	0.55	0.17	0.15	0.38	1.25	0.70	0.90	0.17	1.05	2.90
Overall															

Landless

Marginal Farmers

Table 3 : Contd.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
<b>Small Farmers</b>																
B	1.50	0.40	-	-	3.40	5.30	0.50	0.75	0.50	0.50	2.25	1.22	0.85	0.19	2.21	4.47
NB	2.38	-	0.50	2.13	5.01	0.75	0.75	0.50	0.75	2.75	2.00	2.00	0.92	0.37	2.81	6.10
Overall	1.89	0.22	0.22	2.83	5.10	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.63	2.52	1.75	1.75	0.86	0.19	2.30	5.10
<b>Big Farmers</b>																
B	1.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	4.50	2.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	6.00	2.43	1.43	0.14	4.00	8.00
NB	2.00	-	-	-	40.00	42.00	1.00	1.00	0.50	2.50	5.00	2.18	1.30	0.20	4.17	7.85
Overall	1.67	0.67	0.67	14.00	17.01	1.33	1.33	1.00	0.67	2.33	5.33	2.20	1.35	0.16	4.05	7.76
<b>Total</b>																
B	0.88	0.34	0.14	1.84	3.20	0.99	0.99	0.48	0.58	1.05	3.10	1.28	0.98	0.16	2.36	4.79
NB	1.40	0.07	0.48	2.05	4.00	0.60	0.60	0.57	0.52	1.33	3.02	0.70	1.00	0.28	1.65	3.63
Overall	1.10	0.23	0.28	1.93	3.54	0.83	0.83	0.53	0.55	1.15	3.06	0.99	0.99	0.22	2.01	4.21

\* Sheep owned by two sample household alone were 180.

compared to 1.54 members from Dahod taluka and 0.99 from Santrampur. Among the sample households the number of family members indicating migration were lowest from Santrampur taluka. However, migration steadily increased from 1982-83 onwards in all three talukas. In Limkheda per household migration was 0.78 in 1982-83 but increased to 1.72 in 1986-87 as seen in Table 4. Among different categories of households, it was expected that those having no land resources or marginal land owners will have greater migration than small or big farmers. However, when seen according to land ownership pattern in 1986-87 there were a few variations. Among different farm sizes, the highest per household migration was from Limkheda which was 2.43 followed by Santrampur 2.33 among big land owners. Contrary to this from Dahod the highest migration was among small land owners 1.61 as compared to landless 1.55 and marginal land owners 1.54. It was also observed that the range of household members migrating was between one to four members. However, in 1986-87, households showing migration of upto two members constituted 95.8% in Santrampur followed by 88% from Limkheda and 86% from Dahod taluka.

### **3.2 Composition of family members of out - migrants**

In 1986-87, Dahod taluka showed the highest proportion of out migration 27.75% as compared to Limkheda taluka 26.30% and Santrampur 20.52%. During the period 1982-83 to 1986-87 there was a steady increase in the proportion of migration of family members. In Dahod this proportion increased from 15.31% in 1982-83 to 27.75% in 1986-87. In Santrampur it went up from 12.01% in 1982-83 to 20.52% in 1986-87 and in Limkheda from 11.93% to

**Table 4 Per Household Out-Migration of Members of the Family in the Selected Talukas According to the Land Ownership Pattern : 1982-83 to 1986-87**

Land Ownership	Year	Dahod Taluka	Santrampur Taluka	Limkheda Taluka
Landless	1986-87	1.55	0.42	1.37
	1985-86	1.64	0.46	1.21
	1984-85	1.36	1.21	1.10
	1983-84	1.36	1.08	0.89
	1982-83	1.18	1.08	0.78
Marginal	1986-87	1.54	1.30	1.46
	1985-86	1.53	1.08	1.72
	1984-85	1.32	0.90	1.60
	1983-84	1.02	0.57	1.25
	1982-83	0.84	0.40	0.60
Small	1986-87	1.61	1.13	2.14
	1985-86	1.67	1.12	2.29
	1984-85	1.11	0.88	2.07
	1983-84	1.11	0.38	1.79
	1982-83	0.83	0.38	1.25
Big	1986-87	1.00	2.33	2.43
	1985-86	0.00	2.33	2.29
	1984-85	0.67	0.67	2.00
	1983-84	0.00	0.67	2.29
	1982-83	0.00	0.67	0.57
Overall	1986-87	1.54	0.99	1.72
	1985-86	1.52	0.97	1.92
	1984-85	1.27	0.97	1.76
	1983-84	1.04	0.68	1.47
	1982-83	0.85	0.58	0.78

26.30% ( Table 5) .

According to the land ownership pattern in 1986-87 the proportion of out migration of family members to the total was highest among big land owners both from Limkheda (34.69%) and Santrampur (22.58%)

### 3.3 Causative Factors

Lack of cultivable land, poor qualitative standards of land in terms of productivity, lack of irrigation facilities, and shortage of fodder for the animals and large families to support were the various reasons cited for out migration.

It was observed that 100 heads of sample households in Dahod taluka had given 142 opinions only on the non availability of resources as a major factor for migration (Table 6). The responses of the heads of households on account of constraints of resources was as high 200 in Santrampur and 277 in Limkheda. The implications of the above responses are that due to poor quality and lack of land and other income generating resources there was a need for an alternative source of livelihood. The responses of the households on the persistent drought conditions was another reason for out migration. These reasons were quite valid in the sense that within the village it was not possible to find employment opportunities in the agricultural sector due to continuing drought conditions. The above view is again corroborated from the opinion indicated as lack of employment opportunity as another reason for migration.

The responses on i) repayment of debt and ii) to meet the family consumption requirements were very poor and restricted only to Dahod . It therefore appears that persist-



**Table 5 : Proportion of Male and Female Migrants to the total numbers of Male and Female Population in the Sample Households Migrating for Work between 1982-83 and 1986-87 in the Three Selected Talukas**

Land Ownership:	Dahod Taluka			Santraampur Taluka			Linkheda Taluka		
	Proportion of Migrant to total Males	Proportion of Migrant to total Females	Proportion of Migrant to total	Proportion of Migrant to total Males	Proportion of Migrant to total Females	Proportion of Migrant to total	Proportion of Migrant to total Males	Proportion of Migrant to total Females	Proportion of Migrant to total
<b>Landless</b>									
1986-87	35.90	10.34	27.42	13.04	8.33	10.64	28.14	7.32	15.09
1985-86	38.45	10.34	29.03	15.22	8.33	11.70	27.37	7.08	11.07
1984-85	33.33	6.90	24.19	34.78	27.08	30.85	24.82	6.92	10.72
1983-84	33.33	6.90	24.19	30.44	25.00	27.66	23.91	6.20	10.17
1982-83	36.33	3.45	20.97	30.43	25.00	27.65	18.77	5.86	9.82
<b>Marginal</b>									
1986-87	39.20	20.69	30.00	39.24	4.65	21.94	36.36	11.56	23.93
1985-86	39.77	19.54	29.71	36.07	6.20	20.97	43.43	13.07	28.21
1984-85	34.09	17.24	29.71	29.11	6.20	17.42	40.40	12.06	26.20
1983-84	27.27	12.07	19.71	16.46	6.20	10.97	28.79	12.06	20.40
1982-83	24.43	8.05	16.29	10.76	5.43	7.74	14.14	5.53	9.82
<b>Small</b>									
1986-87	38.10	9.09	24.58	34.62	----	16.98	43.92	12.87	28.85
1985-86	38.09	10.91	25.42	34.62	----	16.98	44.86	15.84	30.77
1984-85	25.40	7.27	16.95	26.92	----	13.21	39.25	15.94	27.98
1983-84	25.40	7.27	16.95	11.54	----	5.66	35.51	11.88	24.04
1982-83	20.63	3.64	12.71	11.54	----	5.66	25.23	7.92	16.93
<b>Big</b>									
1986-87	21.43	0.00	12.00	41.18	----	22.58	42.31	26.09	24.69
1985-86	----	----	----	41.18	----	22.58	24.62	30.43	32.65
1984-85	14.29	----	8.00	11.76	----	6.45	26.92	30.43	28.57
1983-84	----	----	----	11.77	----	6.44	34.62	30.43	32.65
1982-83	----	----	----	11.78	----	6.43	7.69	8.69	8.16
<b>Overall</b>									
1986-87	39.46	16.36	27.75	34.15	4.72	20.52	39.27	13.00	26.90
1985-86	38.11	15.98	27.39	32.52	5.66	20.09	43.20	15.17	29.66
1984-85	31.82	13.38	22.88	29.96	9.91	20.09	38.97	14.55	26.90
1983-84	26.92	10.04	18.74	18.29	9.43	14.19	31.42	13.31	22.48
1982-83	23.78	6.32	15.31	14.63	8.96	12.01	17.22	6.90	11.93

Note: (----) indicates no migration

**Table 6 Causative Factors for Out-Migration**

Reasons for Migration	Number of Responses in		
	Dahod Taluka	Santrampur Taluka	Limkheda Taluka
<b>A. Resource Based</b>			
i) Lack of Land	62	80	87
ii) Poor Agriculture Productivity	8	61	85
iii) Lack of Irrigation Facilities	70	58	73
iv) Shortage of Fodder	2	-	-
v) Large Family size	-	1	32
Sub-total	142	200	277
<b>B. Persistent Drought Conditions</b>	64	68	74
<b>C. Lack of Employment Opportunities</b>	84	79	85
<b>D. To repay Debts</b>	2	-	-
<b>E. To meet family Consumption requirements</b>	7	-	-
<b>F. No response</b>	9	3	-
<b>G. Total Score</b>	308	350	436

ent drought condititons prevailing in the region must have an adverse effect on the liquidity position of the majority of the sample households because the available resources structure and its utilization were not able to provide sufficient income to the sample households.

### 3.4 Period of Migration

It was expected that the period of migration should have some relationship with the cropping activity in the Kharif season (June -September) and there would be no out migration during this season.

Migration in the sample households was through out the year except in September. Majority of the members migrated during the Rabi season ( October-March ). Among these talukas out migration was highest in Limkheda during Rabi season (78.58%) followed by Santrampur (72.63%) and Dahod (53.94%). Contrary to the above the lowest proportion of migration was in the summer crops season (April-May). However, there were inter regional differences in migration pattern in the summer season. It was highest from Santrampur (16.85%) followed by Dahod (10.86%). The out migration from Limkheda was lowest (Table 7 ).

Lack of irrigational facilities being primarily responsible for virtually no cropping activity in the Rabi season, the high incidence of out migration during that period was quite expected. However, the migration during Kharif season to the extent of 35.20% from Dahod taluka, 20.71% from Limkheda and 10.52% from Santrampur clearly demonstrates the constraints of not only land resources but also unremunerative returns from agriculture.

**Table 7** Period of Out-Migration Among Sample Households in the Three Selected Talukas

Months	Proportion of Migrants indicating month of their out-Migration in		
	Dahod Taluka	Santrampur Taluka	Limkheda Taluka
<u>Rabi Crop Season</u>			
January	1.12	2.11	1.43
February	0.37	0.00	1.43
March	3.75	3.16	22.86
<u>Summer Crop Season</u>			
April	3.37	10.53	0.00
May	7.49	6.32	0.71
<u>Kharif Crop Season</u>			
June	16.10	9.47	0.71
July	18.48	1.05	0.71
August	5.62	0.00	19.29
September	0.00	0.00	0.00
<u>Rabi Crop Season</u>			
October	16.85	35.79	30.00
November	22.10	29.46	12.86
December	9.75	2.11	10.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

### 3.5 Directional Aspects

It was reported that those who had migrated had no particular preference for any place. The distribution of various places of migration indicated by the sample households suggest that their family members migrated to the metropolitan city of Ahmedabad and big cities like Surat, Baroda and Rajkot. Migration was also reported to urban industrial centres like Bharuch, Bajwa, Padra, Anand, Halol, Vapi, Valsad etc. Similarly migration was reported to the urban centres of Dahod, Godhra, Nadiad, Cambay and Santrampur. Migration was reported to rural segments of Sojitra, Borsad, Umreth, Limdi and Mangrol. Thus, the migration was restricted to Gujarat only.

Migration to the big cities was maximum constituting 41-46% from Dahod, 33-45% from Santrampur, 32-36% from Limkheda during the period 1982-83 to 1986-87 (Table 8). A shift was however observed in the above proportion only during 1984-85 from Limkheda where out migration to urban industrial areas was highest. Out migration from Dahod was 20-30% , from Santrampur 17-28% and from Limkheda 23-32% . Ahmedabad had attracted 10-13% migrants from Dahod and for Santrampur and Limkheda talukas it was in the range of 2-25% and 2-13% respectively. In terms of migration to urban centres the proportion of family members migrating showed substantial annual variation. However, relatively Limkheda had indicated higher out migration to the urban centres than Dahod and Santrampur talukas. The out migration to rural areas was quite substantial from Limkheda as compared to Dahod and Santrampur. In case of Dahod and Santrampur talukas out migration to rural areas had shown wide variations particularly from San-

**Destinationwise Outmigration by the Members  
of the Sample Households in the Selected  
Region: 1982-83 to 1986-87**

(Figures in Percentages)

Name of Taluka	Year	Proportion of family members showing out-migration to					Total
		Metro-politan City	Big Cities	Urban Industrial Centres	Urban Centres	Rural Areas	
<b>DAHOD</b>							
	1986-87	10.38	42.86	22.08	12.34	12.34	100.0
	1985-86	12.50	43.39	20.39	7.24	12.48	100.0
	1984-85	11.81	44.88	22.05	11.02	10.24	100.0
	1983-84	11.54	41.35	29.81	7.69	9.61	100.0
	1982-83	12.94	45.88	23.53	9.41	8.24	100.0
<b>SANTRA-MPUR</b>							
	1986-87	13.04	33.70	26.09	9.78	17.39	100.0
	1985-86	2.02	45.45	28.28	15.15	9.10	100.0
	1984-85	21.60	36.80	16.80	13.60	11.20	100.0
	1983-84	16.10	33.30	20.40	8.60	21.60	100.0
	1982-83	24.60	35.50	16.90	12.60	10.40	100.0
<b>LIMKHEDA</b>							
	1986-87	2.40	36.10	28.40	22.50	10.60	100.0
	1985-86	11.70	33.60	28.80	14.60	11.30	100.0
	1984-85	7.20	21.10	31.70	25.00	15.00	100.0
	1983-84	10.27	30.14	26.71	13.02	19.86	100.0
	1982-83	13.16	31.58	23.68	17.11	14.47	100.0

trampur taluka.

The destination wise out migration among the members of the sample households was indicative of the following features. First, members of the sample households in general, were attracted to the big cities in large numbers. Second, Ahmedabad also attracted substantial proportion of migrants from the selected regions. About 50% of the total migrants among the sample households had urban biases. Third, urban industrial centres had another major attraction for the migrants from Limkheda and Dahod talukas. Regional preferences seem to be quite prominent. Fourth, in view of the out migration among the sample household to rural segment, it appears that some of the out migrants may not have any choices and migrated wherever opportunities were available to them.

#### **4.0 IN - MIGRATION**

In this study, in-migrants are only those persons who have their place of origin in the selected talukas. Selected in migrants in Ahmedabad and Nadiad were classified according to land ownership pattern. The analysis refers to 300 sample households in the selected talukas and 100 households in Ahmedabad and Nadiad originally from Panchmahal district.

#### **4.1 Involvement of Intermediaries**

Since lack of employment opportunities was a primary reason for the out migration, it was expected that various intermediaries dealing in the employment business will play an important role. However, in providing employment opportunities, labour contractors had a very low profile. This was evident from the fact that

only 4% of the total in-migrants had availed the services of IABRUP contractors to seek employment. Most of the in-migrants had moved out from the place of their origin at their own initiative or through the help of their relatives.

#### 4.2 Employment among In-Migrants

In 1986-87, on an average, each migrant in the sample from Dahod taluka had employment for 194 days as against 180 days for the migrants from Santrampur and only 108 days for migrants from Limkheda. Thus, the in-migrants from Dahod were engaged in gainful employment for a longer duration. During the period 1982-83 to 1986-87 also, the in-migrants from Dahod had higher number of days of employment than those from Santrampur and Limkheda. In fact, during the above period, on an average, each migrant from Dahod had employment to the extent of 206 days in a year as against 170 days for in-migrants from Santrampur and 160 days for in-migrants from Limkheda taluka. (Table 9).

Among the different farm sizes also in-migrants from Dahod had an advantage over in-migrants from Santrampur and Limkheda talukas. It was observed that, in general, in-migrants in the category of landless and marginal land owners were employed for longer duration as compared to small and big land owners. For example, in 1986-87 itself, in-migrants from Dahod had employment for 210 days and 202 days among landless and marginal category of in-migrants respectively, as compared to 161 days and 187 days for landless and marginal category of in-migrants respectively from Santrampur. Similarly, in-migrants from Limkheda were employed for 127 days and 111 days among landless and marginal categories



Table 9 Average Number of Employment Days per Male and Female in-Migrants

Land Ownership	Average No. of days worked by In-Migrants								
	Dahod Taluka			Santraampur Taluka			Limkheda Taluka		
	Males	Females	Average	Males	Females	Average	Males	Females	Average
<b>Landless</b>									
1986-87	224	195	210	150	172	161	138	115	127
1985-86	194	195	194	156	184	170	180	135	158
1984-85	216	195	206	191	114	152	170	155	163
1983-84	218	195	207	222	208	215	225	190	208
1982-83	205	180	200	178	166	172	201	165	187
<b>Marginal</b>									
1986-87	216	189	202	180	195	187	117	105	111
1985-86	183	204	194	169	180	174	185	180	183
1984-85	198	188	192	190	137	163	196	150	173
1983-84	200	204	202	170	180	175	175	118	147
1982-83	207	212	209	180	140	160	140	120	130
<b>Small</b>									
1986-87	174	180	175	200	142	171	88	105	99
1985-86	180	175	175	167	105	136	170	110	140
1984-85	200	180	197	185	140	162	173	137	155
1983-84	203	180	198	180	120	150	145	135	140
1982-83	224	-	224	180	120	150	175	120	148
<b>Big</b>									
1986-87	150	-	50	225	180	202	88	95	92
1985-86	-	-	-	225	165	195	185	135	160
1984-85	90	-	90	120	115	117	190	135	163
1983-84	-	-	-	160	122	141	205	145	175
1982-83	-	-	-	195	123	159	190	155	180
<b>Overall</b>									
1986-87	196	191	194	188	172	180	109	105	108
1985-86	185	197	191	180	158	169	180	140	160
1984-85	190	189	190	171	126	148	183	144	164
1983-84	210	196	203	183	157	170	188	148	168
1982-83	212	199	206	184	137	160	179	144	162

respectively. However, in case of small and big category of in-migrants, on an average, the employment was for 175 days and 50 days respectively from Dahod and 99 days and 92 days respectively from Limkheda taluka. However, there was a deviation from the above trend in case of small and big category of in-migrants from Santrampur where these category of in-migrants had higher number of days of employment than the landless and marginal categories.

#### **4.3 Employment among Male In-Migrants**

In employment, the superiority of males over females was quite obvious among the in-migrants. For example in 1986-87 male in-migrants from Dahod had on an average 196 days of employment as compared to 191 days for females. The similar situation was among male in-migrants from Santrampur where they had employment for 188 days as against 172 days among the female in-migrants. Although the above trend was also for in-migrants from Limkheda the difference between the male and female in-migrants was very marginal during the entire period of 1982-83 to 1986-87.

#### **4.4 Employment among Female In-Migrants**

The female in-migrants had employment for lesser number of days than male in-migrants. However, once again female in-migrants from Dahod taluka had higher number of days of employment than those from Santrampur and Limkheda talukas. It was observed that in 1986-87, female in-migrants from Dahod taluka had on an average 195 days of employment as compared with 172 days for Santrampur and 115 days for Limkheda taluka. The above trend continued also between the period 1982-83 and 1986-87.

Thus, it may be construed that as compared to male in-migrants, female in-migrants with exception of those from Dahod had lesser number of days of employment than the male in-migrants.

#### 4.5 Nature of Employment Among Male and Female In-Migrants

In view of active participation of female in-migrants in the employment, it would be desirable to ascertain the nature of jobs both male and female in-migrants were engaged in.

The distribution of in-migrants both in male and females indicated that labour was the important occupation irrespective of land ownership pattern. Both male and female in-migrants were engaged in building construction activity and the nature of employment has not changed during the five years. Apart from working in building construction, two other vocations among in-migrants were agricultural labour and temporary employment in semi-government bodies. It was indeed surprising that some of the skilled male labourers had also migrated from the rural areas of Dahod and Limkheda talukas.

Although both male and female in-migrants from Dahod had very low proportion of employment as agricultural labourers, the proportion for the in-migrants from Santrampur and Limkheda talukas were quite substantial. Particularly among the in-migrants from Limkheda it was observed that in 1986-87, 40.8% of the male in-migrants and 33.3% of female in-migrants were engaged as agricultural labourers. The same was true of in-migrants from Santrampur.

The classification of male and female in-migrants according to land ownership pattern did not show any marked variations. It

implies that irrespective of the land ownership pattern and sex distribution of the in-migrants, labour work in building construction and agriculture continued to be the primary occupation.

#### 4.6 Earnings from Employment Among Male and Female In-Migrants

To assess the impact of in-migration, income accrued to the in-migrants is presumably one of the most important considerations. This study has tried to estimate income per male and female in-migrant from the selected talukas of Panchmahal district.

On an average, each migrant from Santrampur had earned Rs. 1563 as against Rs. 1453 for Dahod and Rs. 1370 for Limkheda in 1986-87. A redeeming feature of the income accrued to the migrants was that during the period 1982-83 to 1986-87, there were improvements in the earnings for the migrants from all the selected talukas. In 1982-83 on an average in-migrants from Dahod taluka had earned Rs. 1196 from employment and it increased to Rs. 1453 in 1986-87. Similarly the in-migrants from Santrampur had shown improvement from an average of Rs. 1295 in 1982-83 to Rs. 1563 in 1986-87. Although there was improvement in the income level of in-migrants from Limkheda from Rs. 1217 in 1982-83 to Rs. 1370 in 1986-87, the improvement was not at par with the migrants from Dahod and Santrampur talukas.

The income level according to the land ownership pattern for the in-migrants from the selected talukas however did not show any relationship with the land ownership pattern and revealed marginal variations. Also, among different category of households there was no such indicating rise in the income level with the

passage of time particularly for the in-migrants from Santrampur and Limkheda talukas. However, the steady increase with the marginal ups and downs in the intervening period for the in-migrants from Dahod taluka revealed that for them stability has been maintained in the accrual of the income.

#### 4.6.1 Income Level Among In-Migrants

It was indeed surprising that in the accrual of the income no parity was observed among male and female in-migrants. This was in case of all in-migrants from the selected three talukas and continued over a period of time from 1982-83 to 1986-87. This necessitated a look into the details of the ranges of the income accrued to the in-migrant males and females separately. The ranges of income accrued to both male and female in-migrants revealed that it varied between Rs. 1000 and Rs. 7000. In respect of male in-migrants, it was observed that large proportion of them had an income range of Rs. 1000- Rs. 2500. The regional variations among the in-migrations from the different talukas in the above income range was quite distinguishing. It was observed that 71.8% of the total male in-migrants from Dahod had income between Rs. 1000-Rs. 2500 as against 52.6% from Limkheda taluka and 49.9% from Santrampur taluka (Table 10.1, 10.2, 10.3). If we consider accrual of income upto Rs. 1000 it was observed that 23.6% of the male in-migrants from Dahod taluka had accrued income in this range as against 36.6% from Limkheda taluka and more 1.4% from Santrampur. The implications are that only male in-migrants from Santrampur taluka had higher accrual of income of about Rs. 2500 and such male in-migrants constituted 48.7% of

Table 10.1 : Average Income of Male and Female in-Migrants and their Distribution among

Different Ranges of Income According to Land Ownership for Migrants from

DAHOD TALUKA : 1982-83 - 1986-87

LAND OWNERSHIP	Proportion of Male Migrants in the Income group of:					Proportion of Female Migrants in the Income group of:					Average Income (Rs.)					
	Up to Rs.1000	1001 to 1500	1501 to 2000	2001 to 2500	2501 to 3000 above	Up to Rs.1000	1001 to 1500	1501 to 2000	2001 to 2500	2501 to 3000 above	Males Average (Rs.)	Females Average (Rs.)				
YEAR	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1984-87	14.3	35.7	7.1	42.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1752	1375	1564
1985-86	20.0	33.3	6.7	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1717	1238	1477
1984-85	15.4	23.1	15.4	46.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1598	500	1049
1983-84	23.1	30.7	30.8	15.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1468	600	1034
1982-83	16.7	25.0	50.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	6.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1494	600	1297
<b>MARGINAL FARMERS :</b>																
1986-87	20.3	23.2	30.4	18.8	4.5	2.8	1.4	36.1	27.8	33.3	2.8	0.0	0.0	2123	1415	1769
1985-86	21.4	28.6	25.7	17.2	5.7	1.4	1.4	41.2	29.4	26.5	2.9	0.0	0.0	1583	1224	1404
1984-85	20.0	31.7	35.0	8.3	3.3	1.7	1.7	53.3	20.0	26.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	1581	1150	1366
1983-84	27.1	27.0	37.5	4.2	2.1	2.1	2.1	52.4	23.8	23.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	1387	1047	1217
1982-83	39.6	27.9	25.6	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	71.4	21.4	7.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	1524	1063	1294

Table 10.1 : Contd.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
<b>SMALL FARMERS :</b>																
1986-87	29.2	16.7	33.3	20.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1612	920	1517
1985-86	25.0	33.3	33.3	8.4	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1428	1000	1353
1984-85	12.5	37.5	43.7	6.3	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1899	1025	1713
1983-84	12.5	37.5	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1764	1050	1687
1982-83	23.1	30.8	38.5	0.0	7.6	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1617	900	1258
<b>616 FARMERS :</b>																
1986-87	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1425	1000	1425
1985-86	37.5	62.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1500	1200	1350
1984-85	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1500	1075	1287
1983-84	63.6	27.3	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1800	1500	1640
1982-83	44.5	55.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1450	925	1187
<b>OVERALL :</b>																
1986-87	23.6	22.7	27.3	21.8	2.8	1.8	45.6	26.1	26.1	26.1	2.2	0.0	0.0	1728	1178	1453
1985-86	23.1	32.5	23.1	17.1	3.4	0.8	46.9	32.6	18.4	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1556	1166	1361
1984-85	19.8	30.8	33.0	13.2	2.2	1.0	57.9	21.0	21.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1644	938	1291
1983-84	28.4	29.5	34.1	5.7	1.1	1.2	60.0	25.7	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1605	1049	1327
1982-83	33.8	31.2	28.6	2.6	2.5	1.3	81.8	13.6	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1521	872	1196

Table 10-2 : Average Income of Male and Female in-Migrants and their Distribution among

Different Ranges of income According to Land Ownership for Migrants from

SANTRAMPUR TALUKA : 1982-83 - 1986-87

LAND OWNERSHIP	Proportion of Male Migrants in the Income group of:					Proportion of Female Migrants in the Income group of:					Average Income (Rs.)	
	Up to 1000 Rs.1000	1001 to 1500	1501 to 2000	2001 to 2500	2501 to 3000 above	Up to 1000 Rs.1000	1001 to 1500	1501 to 2000	2001 to 2500	2501 to 3000 above	Males Average (Rs.)	Females Average (Rs.)
1986-87	0.0	42.9	28.5	14.3	0.0	14.3	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	1086	1214
1985-86	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	16.7	16.7	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	1150	1218
1984-85	6.7	33.3	53.3	0.0	0.0	6.7	7.7	61.5	23.0	0.0	1271	1185
1983-84	14.3	35.7	42.8	0.0	0.0	7.2	8.3	50.0	33.3	0.0	1590	1432
1982-83	7.1	42.8	35.7	0.0	14.4	0.0	8.3	50.0	33.3	0.0	1202	1162
MARGINAL FARMERS :												
1986-87	1.8	16.7	16.6	14.8	33.3	16.7	21.4	0.0	35.7	42.9	1562	1481
1985-86	3.9	21.6	13.7	27.4	15.7	17.7	11.7	29.4	47.0	11.9	1635	1505
1984-85	2.2	11.1	40.1	35.6	8.9	2.1	0.0	12.5	50.0	37.5	1470	1285
1983-84	3.8	7.7	65.4	7.7	15.4	0.0	12.5	25.0	62.5	0.0	1900	1800
1982-83	5.8	41.2	35.3	17.7	0.0	0.0	14.3	42.8	42.9	0.0	1252	1159
LANDLESS:												
1986-87	0.0	42.9	28.5	14.3	0.0	14.3	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	1086	1342
1985-86	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	16.7	16.7	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	1150	1287
1984-85	6.7	33.3	53.3	0.0	0.0	6.7	7.7	61.5	23.0	0.0	1271	1100
1983-84	14.3	35.7	42.8	0.0	0.0	7.2	8.3	50.0	33.3	0.0	1590	1275
1982-83	7.1	42.8	35.7	0.0	14.4	0.0	8.3	50.0	33.3	0.0	1202	1122



Table 10-2 : Contd.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
<b>SMALL FARMERS :</b>																
1986-87	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	77.8	11.1	0.0	16.7	0.0	66.7	16.6	0.0	1977	1327	1652
1985-86	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	77.8	11.1	0.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	1800	1435	1617
1984-85	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	85.7	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	2100	1900	2000
1983-84	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.4	33.3	0.0	0.0	1310	1050	1180
1982-83	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	1297	1150	1223
<b>BIG FARMERS :</b>																
1986-87	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	28.6	42.8	0.0	28.6	28.5	0.0	42.9	0.0	2225	1582	1903
1985-86	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	28.6	42.8	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	1975	1760	1867
1984-85	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	2100	2000	2050
1983-84	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	1800	1470	1635
1982-83	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1670	1600	1635
<b>OVERALL :</b>																
1986-87	1.4	18.5	18.6	12.8	24.3	24.4	24.4	10.0	13.3	30.0	33.3	13.4	0.0	1712	1413	1563
1985-86	4.1	17.8	15.0	19.2	24.5	19.3	19.3	5.7	20.0	48.6	14.3	5.7	5.6	1708	1539	1623
1984-85	2.9	14.5	37.7	23.2	17.3	4.4	4.4	4.3	39.1	30.4	13.0	8.7	4.5	1735	1594	1664
1983-84	6.7	17.8	55.6	8.9	8.9	2.2	2.2	8.0	36.0	40.0	12.0	0.0	4.0	1650	1374	1512
1982-83	5.6	38.9	36.1	8.3	11.1	0.0	0.0	8.3	41.7	37.5	8.3	4.2	0.0	1355	1235	1295

Table No. 3 : Average Income of Male and Female in-Migrants and their Distribution among

Different Ranges of income According to Land Ownership for Migrants from

LIMKHEDA TALUKA : 1982-83 - 1986-87

LAND OWNERSHIP	Proportion of Male Migrants in the Income group of:					Proportion of Female Migrants in the Income group of:					Average Income (Rs.)	
	Up to Rs.1000	1001 to 1500	1501 to 2000	2001 to 2500	2501 to 3000 above	Up to Rs.1000	1001 to 1500	1501 to 2000	2001 to 2500	2501 to 3000 above	Males Average (Rs.)	Females Average (Rs.)
1986-87	20.0	26.7	40.0	13.3	0.0	10.0	20.0	40.0	20.0	10.0	1700	1400
1985-86	52.5	6.2	21.3	6.2	10.0	62.5	12.5	17.5	0.0	7.5	1786	970
1984-85	50.0	20.0	15.0	5.0	10.0	36.4	27.3	18.2	9.1	9.0	1100	930
1983-84	62.2	6.7	8.9	4.4	0.0	57.1	9.5	19.1	0.0	0.0	870	680
1982-83	33.3	33.4	25.0	8.3	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1470	900
MARGINAL FARMERS :												
1986-87	43.1	33.3	8.3	2.8	0.0	73.2	15.3	7.7	3.8	0.0	977	860
1985-86	58.1	9.3	15.1	8.1	2.3	80.8	3.8	15.4	0.0	0.0	1810	1100
1984-85	66.2	7.5	8.8	7.5	5.0	29.2	29.1	16.7	25.0	0.0	1430	1115
1983-84	60.0	8.7	8.8	5.2	5.3	58.3	12.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	1450	883
1982-83	50.0	7.1	25.0	7.2	3.6	63.6	0.0	36.4	0.0	0.0	953	753

LANDLESS:

1986-87	20.0	26.7	40.0	13.3	0.0	10.0	20.0	40.0	20.0	10.0	1700	1400
1985-86	52.5	6.2	21.3	6.2	10.0	62.5	12.5	17.5	0.0	7.5	1786	970
1984-85	50.0	20.0	15.0	5.0	10.0	36.4	27.3	18.2	9.1	9.0	1100	930
1983-84	62.2	6.7	8.9	4.4	0.0	57.1	9.5	19.1	0.0	0.0	870	680
1982-83	33.3	33.4	25.0	8.3	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1470	900

Table 10.3 : Contd.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
<b>SMALL FARMERS :</b>																
1986-87	27.6	17.0	34.0	6.3	10.6	4.5	41.2	23.5	17.6	5.9	11.8	0.0	0.0	1630	1340	1485
1985-86	27.1	6.2	37.5	6.3	14.6	8.3	50.0	6.2	31.3	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	1713	1035	1374
1984-85	33.3	21.2	27.3	0.0	18.3	0.0	37.5	6.2	31.3	12.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	1490	1128	1309
1983-84	55.3	5.2	18.4	7.9	0.0	13.2	33.3	16.7	25.0	8.3	0.0	16.7	1200	945	1073	960
1982-83	25.9	22.2	11.1	7.4	7.4	26.0	25.0	0.0	12.5	37.5	0.0	25.0	1201	720		
<b>BIG FARMERS :</b>																
1986-87	54.5	36.4	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	11.1	44.4	0.0	44.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1730	1325	1578
1985-86	44.5	0.0	33.3	11.1	0.0	11.1	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	57.1	14.3	14.3	1800	1400	1600
1984-85	42.9	14.3	0.0	14.2	0.0	28.6	14.3	0.0	28.6	28.6	0.0	28.5	1753	1125	1439	
1983-84	66.7	0.0	11.1	22.2	0.0	0.0	28.6	42.9	0.0	14.2	0.0	14.3	1300	1210	1255	
1982-83	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	1970	1830	1900
<b>OVERALL :</b>																
1986-87	36.6	27.6	19.3	5.5	3.4	7.6	50.0	21.4	16.0	7.1	5.5	0.0	0.0	1509	1230	1370
1985-86	48.9	7.2	22.9	7.2	7.6	6.2	62.9	7.9	18.0	0.0	10.1	1.1	1.1	1777	1126	1451
1984-85	55.4	12.9	13.7	5.0	8.6	4.4	31.0	19.0	22.4	19.0	5.2	3.4	3.4	1443	1075	1259
1983-84	59.7	6.7	11.4	6.7	2.0	13.5	50.0	15.6	15.6	3.1	0.0	15.7	1205	930	1067	
1982-83	36.2	17.4	20.3	8.7	4.3	13.1	51.7	6.9	17.2	13.8	3.5	6.9	6.9	1384	1051	1217

the total male in-migrants.

Among male in-migrants, according to the land ownership pattern it was observed that in 1986-87, 85.7% of the total male in-migrants among landless category from Dahod taluka had accrued income between Rs.1000-2500, as against 95.7% from Santrampur and 80% from Limkheda taluka. Among other category of in-migrant males in marginal and small-land holdings their proportion in the Rs. 1000-2500 income range group declined substantially and majority of them had higher earnings of more than Rs. 2500 among the male in-migrants from Santrampur and Limkheda talukas. However, among most male in-migrants from Dahod, marginal and small land owners they continued to have income accrued between Rs. 1000-2500. It was indeed surprising that over the period of five years the pattern had not changed particularly for the migrants from Dahod .

#### 4.6.2 Income Level Among Female In-Migrants

It is seen from above that female migrants were not having parity in the income accrual with their male counterparts. A detailed examination of the earnings among the female in-migrants indicated that during 1986-87, 66.7% female in-migrants from Dahod had accrued income upto Rs. 1500 and the proportion in Limkheda was 71.4%. However, in case of Santrampur 76.7% of the female in-migrants had earnings between Rs. 1500-3000 and the proportion of female in-migrants earning income upto Rs. 1500 were only 23.3% . Again over the years the pattern has not changed substantially. Among the different category of land ownership, female in-migrants earning income upto Rs. 1500 were 100% among the

landless category among in-migrants from Dahod taluka, as compared to 63.9% among the marginal category and once again 100% among small and big category. In case of the female in-migrants from Santrampur in different category of land ownership, the accrual of income upto Rs. 1500 were in smaller proportion to the total female in-migrants. In fact, they constituted 33.3% among the landless category, 21.4% in the marginal category, 16.7% in the small category and 28.6% in the big category. The income level among the female in-migrants from Santrampur indicated that most of them had higher accrual of income than those from Dahod taluka. High accrual of income among female in-migrants was Rs. 1500 and above among different category of land owners in Limkheda taluka.

Thus, in terms of accrual of income separately to both male and female in-migrants apart from regional variations there were unequal opportunities for earnings particularly for the female in-migrants from Dahod taluka. Added to the above, the total amount of income accrued to them was also on an average not more than Rs. 2000 during the period of their in-migration. The implications are that since male and female in-migrants were working in unison and belonged to the same family the total income accrued to them was in the range of about Rs. 3000-4000 which only attracted them towards out-migration from their places of origin.

#### **4.6.3 Living conditions at the Place of Migration**

In view of the nature of employment and involvement of both males and females, it became necessary to ascertain the views of the

in-migrants on their living conditions at the place of migration. It was reported that most in-migrants had no accommodation to stay and were forced to live in open spaces available to them at the various places of migration. This was both in the urban and rural areas of migration. The above sentiments were expressed by all category of land owners among male and female in-migrants.

## 5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.1 In Panchmahal district, the out-migration of population was of a high magnitude and perpetual in nature. On an average, 1.52 members of a family migrated. Although, it was expected that out-migration would be restricted to the members of those households having no land resource or marginal land owners, it was found that in certain regions, the migration was of very high magnitude and even members of households belonging to big land size migrated. Family members of beneficiary households had also migrated.

5.2 Among different category of land owners, the phenomenon of out-migration showed steady increase from 1982-83 to 1986-87. Among sample households, it was irrespective of the land ownership and beneficiary of the programmes.

5.3 The migration was not restricted to only one member of the family but in certain families it was upto four members. The distribution of the members of the family migrating suggested that migration of the family members upto two members constituted the highest proportion.

5.4 In terms of the total family resources, the migration among members was to the extent of 25%. Further, migration, particular-

ly in Limkheda for big farmers was highest as compared to the households of same land size in the two other talukas.

5.5 Another important aspect of migration was that it was in an identical proportion among both male and females. Particularly out-migration of females belonging to big farm sizes was quite characteristic. An in-depth study of males and females suggested that majority of those migrated belonged to the age group of 16-25 years. Thus, both males and females who migrated belonged to "young age group".

5.6 Among the causative factors of out-migration, lack of productive income-generating resources in the family was one of the most important reasons. Besides, repayment of debt and meeting the family consumption requirements were other two reasons for migration. The out-migration of sample households was spread throughout the year. However, a majority had migrated during the rabi cropping season when their own on-farm activities were limited.

5.7 It was reported that the sample households had no particular preference for destinations as such. The various destinations indicated four clusters. a) the metropolitan city of Ahmedabad b) big cities c) urban industrial centres d) rural areas. Further, out-migration to the big cities was maximum. Urban industrial centres was another major attraction. However, out-migration to rural areas also showed that availability of employment was the only criterion in some cases.

5.8 It was found that intermediaries dealing in employment business had no role in selecting the place of work. Among

different regions of the district, migrants from DAhod had higher number of days for employment than migrants from Santrampur and Limkheda talukas. Although the duration of employment varied from 30 to 300 days in a year, males had higher number of days of employment. The nature of employment among male and females suggested that they were mostly involved in all types of construction activities and the type of jobs have not changed.

5.9 It appears that rural out-migration was not very remunerative. From the income estimates it can be seen that during 1986-87, on an average, each migrant from Santrampur had earned Rs. 1563 as against Rs. 1453 from Dahod and Rs. 1370 from Limkheda. Also, over the period of five years there was no substantial increase in the wages of the migrants in real terms. In the accrual of income it was surprising to note that there was no parity between male and female wages. Also, a majority of migrants had earned income from wages between Rs. 1000-2500.

5.10 A deplorable state of affairs was observed in terms of living conditions of the migrants at the place of their work. It was reported that most of the migrants lived in open spaces at various destinations of migration.

