WORKING PAPER

Working Paper No. 33

Process of Migration - An Analysis Sample Migrants in Madras Urban Agglomeration

by

S. Majumdar and K. Nagaraj

MADRAS INSTITUTE OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES
79, SECOND MAIN ROAD, GANDHINAGAR, ADYAR
MADRAS 600 020

Working Paper No. 33

Process of Migration - An Analysis of Sample Migrants in Madras Urban Agglomeration

by

S. Majumdar and K. Nagaraj

MADRAS INSTITUTE OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

79, Second Main Road, Gandhinagar,

Adyar, Madras 600 020

June, 1983

Process of Migration - An Analysis of Sample Migrants in Madras Urban Agglomeration

S. Majumdar and K. Nagaraj

I

1.1. The Main objective of this paper is to capture the process of migration among those who migrated into and within Madras Urban Agglomeration.

A study of migration, it seeks to examine two issues: one relates to the question as to what are the socio-economic factors that lead to migration. The other relates as to how migration takes place, i.e., whether the migrants move in one step or several steps; if there are several steps, what are the nature of places they have stepped into before reaching the place of enumeration. While the first question has been the subject matter of large number of studies, a few recent studies have noted the importance of the second question also [see, Connell et. al (1976), Ghosh (1961), Rao et. al (1977), J.R.T. (1980), Roxborough (1979), Simmons et. al (1977), Majumdar and Nagaraj (1982) etc.]7.

1.2. Factors Behind Migration

A stylised model attempting to explain the socio-economic factors behind migration has been formulated by Todaro (1976). According to Todaro rural-urban migration takes place whenever the expected income from urban employment exceeds the expected income from rural employment and the cost of migration. The probability of expected income from urban employment is derived from the possibility of a migrant being employed in the modern sector (the industrial sector). In other words, industrialisation will draw labour force from the rural areas. But it is pointed out that the

rural labour force to be mobile requires the disintegration of the rural society to be well-advanced /Rula (1976) p.227.

Todaro's model is oversimplistic. It does not distinguish between the migrants of different socio-economic characteristic having different reasons for migration. The model treats all migrants as having the same decision process, as it were. A number of studies have shown that there are much wider socio-economic processes which induce different groups of migrants to move for different reasons. In general terms, all these studies (cited below) in one way or another, indicate the process of disintegration underway at outmigrating ends.

The reason for the peasants or marginally landed populations outmigrate was found to be dispossession of their land (Rao et. al : 1977). But with regard to this group of migrants the dispossession process is not always the case. Arizpe (1982) found that the increased population of the poor peasant households in Mexico led some of the household members to outmigrate to the cities, seeking industrial employment. Similar phenomenon is observed in Maharashtra and in Northern India also /Salvi and Bhoite (1969), J.R.T.7. Those who are tied to the land, migrate in order to supplement their income whenever income prospects from the land is poor /Yeshwant (1962), Connell et. al. pp. 8-97. This relates to the productivity of the cultivable land.

A different process of outmigration has been observed in the case of rural artisans. Yeshwant (1962) has showed that in four villages of Ramanathapuram the adoption of pumpset for irrigation purposes had led to a decline in the demand for cobblers' services who were making leather bags for carrying water to the field. This led the cobblers to outmigrate to the cities. Thus technological change which shrunk the market for artisanal service has set in the process of outmigration of the artisans. Shrinkage of market has also

led to the outmigration of other artisanal groups, like goldsmiths.

Dasgupta and Laishley (1975) found that members of both rich agriculturist households and agricultural labour households outmigrate from the villages. This led them to hypothesise that while the agricultural labourers migrate in order to earn a higher income the agriculturist households, surviving on the surplus created by agricultural labourers, sent out their members to the cities for education or white collar jobs. This hypothesis is indicative of how the class structure in the country side provides different reasons for different socio-economic groups to outmigrate.

Thus different studies show how wider processes are at work at the outmigrating end which results in the outmigration of different socio-economic groups for different reasons. It is not merely the low expected income at the rural end that induces outmigration as Todaro has observed.

It is also not true that all migrants at (urban) inmigrating end share the benefit of industrialisation equally as against Todaro's model. Mitra et. al (1980) found that urban-urban migration is positively correlated with capital investment in urban organised sector where industrial sector assumes a major role. This implies that rural-urban migrants are often pushed to the urban unorganised sector. Also the rising capital intensity of the industrial sector over time, may improve the probability of the skilled migrants to be employed therein, whereas for the unskilled migrants the probability may never improve and remain forever in the unorganised sector.[1] Further, Deshpande (1979) has shown that the migrants who are relatively rich (at the outmigrating end) have greater access to the organised sector employment than the poorer ones.

---

1. It has been hypothesised that with capital intensities increasing in the industries the unorganised sector tends to be bloated, see Bharadwaj (1972) p.327.

Another important factor which induces migration is urban contacts from migrants which generate chain migration. It has been amply noted that some migrants come to a place with the help of family members, relatives, or friends who migrated to the place earlier (J.R.T., Rao et. al., Connell et. al). It is noted by Connell et. al. that the flow of information from previous migrants and preference of living together with kith and kin generate such a process. The contacts at inmigrating end may help migration by helping to cut the cost of migration, even if the probability of getting the job is low. This indicates that unlike Todaro's formulation migration is a complex process.

In addition to the above mentioned factors other social factors may also generate migration processes. Family feuds (Rao et. al., Connell et. al) and racial discrimination (Simmons et. al) are some such factors.

Several factors cited above show that migration is not a simple process initiated by expected income differential between the places of out- and inmigration. Differential income prospect is only a symptom generated by deep rooted socio-economic processes which need to be studied in its specifics.

In an earlier paper we attempted to capture the process of migration into and within Madras Urban Agglomeration with the help of census data.

Following the limitations of census data we could not capture the specific processes relevant to different socio-economic groups of migrants. The paper showed the following broad processes:

A : There was heavy inflow of migrants into Madras city during 1931-41 and 1941-51. This could only be explained in terms of general phenomenon of the time like the great

depression during 1930's[2] and industrial boom during the World War II and thereafter.

B : After 1951 the rate of inmigration to Madras city declined sharply. This was the period when there was a shift of industrial investment to the satellite towns around Madras. Though there is no time series data on migration into the satellite towns, it is possible that after 1951 with of the growth of manufacturing activity migrants started flowing into the satellite towns suggesting a positive relationship between migration and industrialisation.

C : An analysis of the census data [Nagaraj and Majumdar (1982)] shows that between 1961 and 1971 while Madras city grew in 'manufacturing' and 'tertiary' activities, the satellite towns grew predominantly in 'manufacturing' activity. Since the development in Madras is somewhat different from that in the satellite towns, it may be hypothesised that the stream of migrants in these places differ in their characteristics.

D : However, the growth of manufacturing activity as a pulling agent may be a partial truth. There may partly be a process of suburbanisation around Madras city as well. The 1971 census data on migration shows that 50 per cent of the total migrants in the satellite towns are from Madras city. This is suggestive of the process of suburbanisation where partly the population of Madras city and partly the migrants who earlier stepped into Madras city have been pushed out to the satellite towns.

---

2. It is noted that during the great depression there were notable changes in the countryside like the break down of debtor-creditor relation [Baker (1976) pp. 180-1] and the system of attached labour [Baker (1981) pp. 581-2] in Madras Presidency which generated outmigration.

The above observations were very broad and tentative and hence failed to explain the specific processes of migration into Madras Urban Agglomeration related to different socio-economic groups of migrants. This limitation arises from the very nature of the Census data. Hence we need elaborate field data to study the process of migration in detail. Data based on a sample seek to answer the following questions:

1. What are the socio-economic characteristics of the migrants in Madras city and in the satellite towns? Are there differences in the characteristics of the migrants in the two places?

2. What are the various socio-economic processes, at both outmigrating and the inmigrating ends, that have led various socio-economic groups to migrate into Madras Urban Agglomeration? Does the process of migration within Madras Urban Agglomeration show a process of suburbanisation?

These questions have been dealt with in sections III to V.

1.3. How migration takes place

Migration is not always a smooth one step process. Step migration occurs depending on the cost of migration relating to the distance of migration and the lack of precise information regarding the place of inmigration (Connell et. al p.82). Connell et. al noted that the rural migrants go to a smaller or nearby towns to earn and gather finance for a further move to distant or bigger cities. But a different process is observed in the case of migrants in Calcutta(Ghosh) and Vizag cities (Rao et. al). Those who moved to a smaller town for seeking employment had to move later to a bigger city, like Vizag, in order to find employment for the dependents when the family grew larger. In the

context of political economy such steps are seen as a process of assimilation of the rural migrant workers with the urban proletariat (Roxborough, p. 85).

However, rural to small town to the bigger cities is not the only direction of step migration. A large number of migrants in Kanpur city are from even bigger cities like Bombay and Calcutta (J.R.T.). But how this process was generated is not clearly known. Connell et. al. mentioned that sometimes the poorer migrants attempt to move to distant or bigger cities in their first move in order to economise on the cost of migration, but later move out to the smaller towns (p.82). A similar movement of population from a bigger city like Madras to the smaller satellite towns and a possible existence of step migration in that movement have been noted earlier (see subsection 1.2). That some migrants came to Madras first and then got pushed out to the satellite towns remained merely a hypothesis based on the Census data of 1971. But the existence of step migration among those who came from outside to Madras Urban Agglomeration is clearly suggested by the Census data (Majumdar and Nagaraj, Section IV).

Thus the existing literature indicates the presence of step migration and varied patterns of step migration in terms of nature of places these migrants had stepped in. But we do not know from the census data about the nature of places the migrants stepped on before arriving at Madras Urban Agglomeration, or if they moved straight into Madras Urban Agglomeration in their first step and moved within it in the subsequent steps. Since the census data are inadequate, they merely indicate the possible existence of step migration, but do not describe the processes underlying it. We propose to analyse the nature and pattern of step migration into and within Madras Urban Agglomeration and the underlying processes with the help of survey data. Specific questions, in this

context, that will be examined are:

1. Where did the migrants in Madras Urban Agglomeration come from - nature of origin?

2. How did the migrants move into and within Madras Urban Agglomeration - in one or several steps? In the case of step migration what are the nature of places they stepped in several moves? Did they move to the towns outside the agglomeration before coming to our study area? Or, did they come to the agglomeration first, but later moved within it?

3. What are the underlying factors behind the patterns of movement to be examined in question 2.

These questions relating to step migration are dealt with in Section IV.

II

Sample of Migrants

2.1. Our sample includes only the active migrants, i.e., only those who decided to migrate on their own, or those who had the knowledge as to why they had to migrate with their family members. This way of choosing the migrants avoids the analytical problems faced while dealing with the migrants by place of birth concept.[3] Analysis of migration based on the place of birth concept often fails to capture the responses

---

3. Kingsley Davis noted, "A person's place of birth may be accidental. Hindu wives, for example, return to their parent's home for their first confinement; if this happens to be a few miles across a provincial or district boundary the child then becomes an 'inmigrant' at the next census....." See Census of India, 1961, Special Migration Tables, Madras City, Vol.IX, PartX-(II) p III.

of migrants to the changes in the socio-economic factor at out- and in-migrating ends. In our sample we have included only those who migrated in 1961 or later.

Respondents of our sample were mainly the heads of households. Wherever the heads of households were not migrants, we included any one member of the households if the member was a migrant according to the above criteria.

2.2. Our analysis of migration is based on those who have migrated into Madras Urban Agglomeration (henceforward MUA) from outside, as well as those moved within MUA. MUA consists of the satellite towns (hereafter STs) around Madras City (hereafter MC). Those who moved within MUA are those, (i) who moved within MC alone, (ii) who moved within STs alone and (iii) who moved between MC and the STs. In this context the migrants are those who crossed the administrative or census boundaries. Those who came from outside to MUA one clearly from other districts of Tamil Nadu and also from other states. Those who moved between MC and the STs and within the STs, along with those from other districts and the states are the migrants crossing the administrative boundaries. Those who moved only within MC, they, in fact, moved across the census divisions of the city, and have been included as migrants within MC.

2.3. A sample of 500 migrants was drawn from the whole of MUA - on the basis of a given cost. Of these a sample of 300 migrants was allocated to MC and 200 to the STs on the basis of the total number of estimated migrants in the two places (MC and the STs).

The estimates of migrants in MC and the STs were obtained as the excess of actual population in 1971 over the projected population of 1971. The projected population in 1971 was estimated by applying the annual compound rate of growth of population of the entire state of Tamil Nadu (2.2 per cent approx.) between 1961-71 to the population of 1961 in the

STs as well as in MC. The sample was allocated to MC and the STs proportional to the total estimated migrants thus obtained. The ratio of the estimated migrants in MC to the STs was 3:2. This distribution, however, differs from the actual ratio of migrants in MC to the STs as revealed by the unpublished 1971 census data, made available to us later. The actual distribution, according to 1971 census, is 7:3 between MC and the STs respectively. However, since 1971 census data on migrants were not available to us at the time of survey we resorted to the above method.

2.4. The sample of 300 migrants in MC was allocated to 30 census divisions of the city, out of 120 divisions in 1971, chosen on the basis of the highest population density of the divisions. The sample was then allocated to the 30 divisions in proportion to their population. We resorted to this method of choosing the divisions by their population densities instead of estimated migrants, because of the change in area of the divisions between 1961 and 1971. Between the two years the number of divisions in MC changed from 100 to 120 on a total constant area of the city. As a result the area of the divisions changed. Hence it was difficult to understand if the population change in the divisions between 1961 and 1971 was due to area change or due t growth/decline in the population. However, due to the change in the area we resorted to some standardisation of the population of the divisions, and chose density as a basis of selection of the divisions. We assumed, while selecting the top 30 densest divisions, that higher density was due to higher rate of inmigration to the divisions.

2.5. The distribution of the sample of 200 migrants in the 20 towns out of all the STs was proportionate to the estimated number of migrants in all the towns. However we left out those towns where the area changed between 1961 and 1971 censuses. The method of estimation of the migrants

in these towns was same as explained before. Another town, Tambaram was selected on a purposive basis which has shown a good degree of urbanisation. Thus 21 towns form our sample area of the STs were chosen.

2.6. The size of sample allocated to each selected division of MC and to the towns of the STs is presented in Table II.1. The migrant households were selected on random basis from the electoral lists of the divisions of MC and of the towns of agglomeration. Migrant households were identified by applying the criteria explained above (see subsection 2.1.).

2.7. Our objectives in this paper is to capture the nature and process of migration along with the characteristics of the migrants. Accordingly, we obtained particulars of the individual migrants' family (age, sex, asset characteristics, etc.) occupation of the migrants, mode of migration, job prospects in MUA, reasons for migration, and the nature of origin,[4] etc. Our data were collected in the month of March, 1981.

2.8. Limitations

1. Our sample of 500 migrants is in no way a proper representative of the total number of migrants in MUA. We noted how our allocation of the sample between MC and the STs differed from that indicated by the census 1971. Also, 500 migrants in 1981, as compared to 11.6 lakhs even in the census of 1971, indicates the inadequacy in terms of size. Yet the size is moderately large compared to many other migration studies. However, the analysis of the sample data should be treated as a preliminary one.

---

4. Origin refers to the places of outmigration where from the migrants started moving out on their own decision (see sub-section 2.1)

Table II.1: Size of the Sample in Madras Urban Agglomeration

Divisions of Madras City		Towns in the Agglomeration but outside Madras city	
Name of the division	Size of the sample	Name of the town	Size of the sample
1. Kosapet	9	1. Avadi	48
2. Perumalpet	9	2. Ambattur	24
3. Choolai	8	3. Villivakkam	10
4. Pulianthope	10	4. Tiruvanmiyur	8
5. Besant Nagar	10	5. Nazarethpet	2
6. Pattalam	10	6. Erukkancheri	2
7. Balasubramaniyam Nagar	10	7. Koyambedu	2
8. Chintadripet	9	8. Alandur	30
9. Nehru Nagar	9	9. Chitlapakkam	2
10. Mottai Garden	9	10. Perungudi	2
11. Narayanappa Naicken Garden	10	11. Polichalur	2
12. Singara Garden	10	12. Sadayankuppam	2
13. Seven wells (North)	10	13. Kodungaiyur	2
14. Amman Koil (North)	9	14. Tambaram	4
15. Muthialpet	9	15. Pallavaram	24
16. Mannady	8	16. Saligram	4
17. Amman Koil (South)	9	17. Peerkangaranai	2
18. Seven wells (South)	9	18. Kodambakkam	8
19. Anbazhagan Nagar	9	19. Perungalattur	2
20. Zambazaar	10	20. Thiruvorriyur	28
21. Triplicane	9	21. Velachery	2
22. Bharathi Nagar	10		
23. Umarupulavar Nagar	10		
24. Korukkupet	12		
25. Kumaraswamy Nagar	10		
26. Dr.Vijayaraghava Nagar	13		
27. Kondithope	10		
28. Peddunaickenpet	10		
29. Perumalkoil Garden	10		
30. Anjugam Ammaiyar Nagar	10		

2. The sample data relate to those who moved into and within MUA in 1961 or later. This, however, leaves out the migrants moving in before 1961. As a result we shall miss an important aspect of the process of migration which might have been generated by the process of industrialisation in MC during 1941-51.

3. There is a serious methodological problem in choosing the census divisions of MC on the basis of density of population. The assumption that higher density is due to higher rate of inmigration to the divisions is questionable. In fact, it is shown later that the very densely populated divisions in 1961, had in fact a decline in the population during 1961-71.

4. Finally, the data on all the variables could not be obtained for all the migrants. We have finally, obtained 497 respondents out of 500. After rejecting those for whom rural or urban specification of the outmigrating end (or origin) was not available we have 470 respondents under study. Even out of these (470), total number of migrants varies from one table to another. For instance, we have the data on educational characteristics of 465 migrants, whereas data on the mode of migration could be obtained only for 431 migrants.

III

Nature and Pattern of Migration and the Socio-economic characteristics of the Migrants

In this section we shall attempt to analyse the nature and pattern of migratory movements and the socio-economic characteristics of the migrants in MC and the STs. Our purpose is to identify the differences, if any, in the characteristics of migrants in MC and the STs.

3.1.1. Nature and Patterns of Migration

In this sub-section we shall be concerned with the nature of the places of outmigration such as rural/urban areas, districts of Tamil Nadu, or other states.

3.1.2. Rural/Urban Origin

The distribution of the migrants in MC and the STs by their rural/urban origin is shown in Table III.1. The urban migrants in MC are numerically dominant over the rural migrants. However, the dominance is only marginal. In the STs, the number of migrants from rural areas is equal to that from urban areas. This suggests that the pattern of urbanisation in MUA has attracted the rural and urban migrants equally.

3.1.3. Districts and States of Outmigration

Table III.2 provides the distribution of the migrants in MC and the STs from the rural and urban areas of the districts of Tamil Nadu and from other states. Migrants from the distant districts of Tamil Nadu far outnumber those, from the adjacent districts - of Chinglepet, North and South Arcots, while migrants from other states are mainly from the contiguous states of Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Kerala. Dominant group of migrants in MUA is from within the state.

It can be seen from the Table that about 30 per cent of the rural migrants in MC as well as in the STs came from the adjacent districts. Of the migrants from the distant districts the majority came from Tirunelveli, Ramanathapuram and Thanjavur.[5] The first two of these districts being usually outmigrating ones /See Kurien and Haq (1980)/ their shares in the inmigrants to MC and the STs from the distant districts are very high.

Foot note 5 next page.

Table III.1 : Distribution of Migrants (all steps together) in MC and the STs by their Rural and Urban Origin

R/U Origin	MC	STs	Total in MUA
Rural	126 (43.60)	97 (46.63)	223 (44.87)
Urban	147 (50.87)	97 (46.63)	244 (49.09)
Unclassified	16 ((5.54)	14 (6.73)	30 (6.04)
Total	289 (100.00)	208 (100.00)	497 (100.00)

5. Percentage distribution of migrants from the rural areas of the distant districts in MC and the STs.

Distant districts	Migrants in MC	Migrants in the STs
Tirunelveli	25 (36.23)	17 (25.76)
Ramanathapuram	19 (27.54)	19 (28.79)
Thanjavur	10 (14.49)	11 (16.67)
Other distant districts	15 (21.74)	19 (28.79)
Total of distant districts	69 (100.00)	66 (100.00)

Table III.2 : Number of Migrants in MC and the STs from the Districts of Tamil Nadu and from Outside

Places of Inmigration	Rural/ urban origin	Chingle-pet	Madras city	North & South Arcot	Distant Districts of Tamil Nadu	Within state (T.N.) Total	States contiguous to Tamil Nadu	Noncontiguous states	Other states total	Total
Madras City (MC)	Rural	23	-	16	69	108	16	2	18	126
	Urban	10	35	12	64	121	18	7	25	146
	Total in MC	33	35	28	133	229	34	9	43	272
Satellite Towns (STs)	Rural	19	-	13	66	98	2	-	2	100
	Urban	18	16	18	39	91	7	-	7	98
	Total in the STs	37	16	31	105	189	9	-	9	198

Of the within-state urban migrants the largest number came to MUA from the distant districts. But among the urban migrants the important groups are those who moved within MC and those who moved from MC to the STs (see Table III.2).

3.2. Socio-Economic Characteristics of Migrants in the MUA

3.2.0. The main objective here is to examine if the migrants in MC differ from those in the STs in terms of age, assets, educational and occupational characteristics. This attempt follows from the fact that the nature of urbanisation, in terms of the growth of economic activities was different in MC from that in the STs (Nagaraj and Majumdar). Question is, did the nature of urbanisation attract different stream of migrants in MC from that in the STs. To this end, we shall analyse the socio-economic characteristics of the migrants in MC and the STs.

3.2.1. Age Characteristics

The table III.3 shows that the migrants in both MC and the STs are mainly from the working age groups 15-59 years. The age groups refer to the age at migration. This is in conformity with most of the migration studies. However, that the migrants in the working age groups came in search of employment and higher income will be shown in Section V.

Table III.3: Number of Migrants in MUA by Age Groups

Place of Inmigration	Age Groups				
	0 - 14	15 - 25	26 - 59	60 & above	Total
MC	28 (10.41)	145 (53.90)	94 (34.94)	2 (0.74)	269 (100.00)
STs	8 (4.10)	110 (56.41)	77 (39.49)	- -	195 (100.00)

3.2.2. Landed and Landless Migrants

It is difficult to obtain a precise estimate of value or a description of different types of economic assets which might provide a basis for income accrual to the migrants either at the origin or in the place of inmigration (i.e., MUA). We shall, therefore, confine ourselves to the distinction of migrants into landed and landless ones, as observed in the places of origin. The drawback of our study in this regard is that the ownership of landholding at the origin is often not clear. We do not know whether the land was possessed by the migrant or any other nonmigrant member of the family at the origin, or whether the income from land accrues to the migrant or not. To that extent the relationship between the income prospect from land and the process of migration will be missed out. However, it cannot be denied that for the migrant possessing land, (as long as it is within the family) there will always be some bearing on his occupation, earning, education etc. With this in mind, we shall examine the landed and landless migrants' characteristics hence forward.

The distribution of the landed and landless migrants from rural and urban areas to MC and the STs is shown in Tables III.4 and III.5. It can be seen from the tables that the landless migrants substantially outnumber the landed migrants in both MC and the STs. The difference in the number between the landed and landless migrants is larger among the urban than among the rural migrants in both the places. Taking the rural and urban migrants together the percentage of landed migrants is 34.67 in MC and 32.66 in the STs. This shows that, by and large, the asset characteristic of the migrants, in terms of landed and landless in MC is similar to that in the STs.

Table III.4 : Landed and Landless Migrants in MC

Origin	From Rural Areas			From Urban Areas		
	Landed	Landless	Total	Landed	Landless	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Chingleput	11 (47.83)	12 (52.17)	23 (100.00)	2 (20.00)	8 (80.00)	10 (100.00)
Madras	--	--	--	3 (8.57)	32 (91.43)	35 (100.00)
North & South Arcot	9 (56.25)	7 (43.75)	16 (100.00)	8 (61.54)	5 (38.46)	13 (100.00)
Ramanathapuram	14 (68.42)	6 (31.58)	19 (100.00)	4 (33.33)	8 (66.67)	12 (100.00)
Thanjavur	1 (10.00)	9 (90.00)	10 (100.00)	2 (28.57)	5 (71.43)	7 (100.00)
Tirunelveli	12 (48.00)	13 (52.00)	25 (100.00)	2 (16.66)	10 (83.33)	12 (100.00)
Other districts of Tamil Nadu	5 (33.33)	10 (66.67)	15 (100.00)	7 (17.65)	28 (82.35)	34 (100.00)
Other states in India beyond T.N.	8 (44.44)	10 (55.56)	18 (100.00)	9 (36.00)	16 (64.00)	25 (100.00)
Total	60 (46.83)	67 (53.17)	126 (100.00)	37 (24.32)	112 (75.68)	148 (100.00)

*Three interstate migrants to MC could not be classified by their R/U origin and are not included.

Table III.5 : Landed and Landless Migrants in the STs

Origin	From Rural Areas			From Urban Areas		
	Landed	Landless	Total	Landed	Landless	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Chingleput	4 (21.05)	15 (78.95)	19 (100.00)	4 (22.22)	14 (77.78)	18 (100.00)
Madras	-	-	-	1 (12.50)	14 (87.50)	16 (100.00)
North & South Arcot	6 (46.15)	7 (53.85)	13 (100.00)	7 (36.84)	12 (63.16)	19 (100.00)
Ramanathapuram	7 (36.84)	12 (63.16)	19 (100.00)	-	3 (100.00)	3 (100.00)
Thanjavur	5 (45.45)	6 (54.55)	11 (100.00)	3 (37.50)	5 (62.50)	8 (100.00)
Tirunelveli	9 (52.94)	8 (47.06)	17 (100.00)	1 (10.00)	9 (90.00)	10 (100.00)
Other districts of Tamil Nadu	8 (42.12)	11 (57.88)	19 (100.00)	7 (38.89)	11 (61.11)	18 (100.00)
Other districts in India outside T.N.	1 (50.00)	1 (50.50)	2 (100.00)	1 (14.29)	6 (85.71)	7 (100.00)
Total	40 (40.00)	60 (60.00)	100 (100.00)	24 (25.25)	74 (74.75)	99 (100.00)

For 3 interstate migrants R/U origin is not available and are not included.

We noted from the tables III.4 and III.5 that in both MC and the STs the landless migrants far outnumber the landed ones. While the reason for the landless to migrate is obvious, there can be two possible explanations for the landed ones to migrate. One is that migrants from the landed households moved to MUA for higher education or white-collar jobs (Dasgupta and Laishley). Another possibility is that those who have inadequate land resource migrate in order to improve their level of living which was otherwise deteriorating (Arizpe). In the first case we shall expect the migrants to be from the households of large and productive holdings, and in the second case they were from those having small and not-so-fertile holdings. To this end, we shall show shortly, the size of holdings of the migrants' households.

The basic relationship between the size of holding and migration is established through the income potential (or productivity) of land. The fact that a good number of both rural and urban migrants are from Ramanathapuram and Tirunelveli, - the two districts where the net area irrigated is much lower than the state average, implies that income from land is unlikely to be sufficient to support the family. The landed migrants from these generally outmigrating districts might have migrated to ensure their survival. A large number of landed migrants are from Chingleput, North and South Arcot also. The net areas irrigated in these districts are high,[6] but their closeness to MUA perhaps induces the landed ones to migrate. The landed migrants from these adjacent districts can advantageously negotiate between MUA and their origin of

---

6. Percentage net area irrigated is 77.7 in Chingleput, 70.8 in Thanjavur, 49.6 in North and South Arcot together, 34.8 in Tirunelveli and 30.0 in Ramanathapuram whereas 38.8 is for the state. (See Government of Tamil Nadu, Season and Crop Report, 1976-77). Argument derived from these data are extremely tentative, because we do not know whether the land held is actually irrigated or not.

migration. Thus, generally, the lack of income potential from land and the nearness of origin may act as factors behind migration. One exception is that a good proportion of landed migrants are from a highly irrigated district of Thanjavur.

3.2.3. Size of Landholding

The distribution of the migrants in MC and the STs is shown by their size of holdings at the origin in Table III.6. It is clear from the table that the number of landed migrants in MC declines with the increase in the size of holding. Concentration is very large in 0.6-2.50 acres and 2.51-500 acres of holdings. In other words, large number of landed migrants in MC are from the households with small holdings. In the smallest size group 86 per cent of the migrants from both rural and urban areas are from Chingleput, Ramanathapuram and Tirunelveli. In the next size group (2.51-5.00 acres) about 74 per cent of the landed rural and urban migrants are from Chingleput, Ramanathapuram, Tirunelveli, Salem, North and South Arcot. It is clear that the migrants from adjacent districts, with high (Chingleput) to moderate (North and South Arcot) level of irrigation, and distant and less irrigated (Ramanathapuram, Tirunelveli and Salem) districts came to MC mainly from small holdings of 0.06 to 5.00 acres.

In the STs there is a good concentration of the landed migrants in 5.01-10.00 acres (medium holding) group also, along with those in the small size of holdings (0.06-5.00 acres). Migrants from Chingleput, Ramanathapuram, Tirunelveli, Salem, North and South Arcot account for 79 per cent of the migrants in 0.06-2.50 acres, 68 per cent of the migrants in 2.51-5.00 acres and 60 per cent of the migrants in the medium size group 5.01-10.00 acres. Of the migrants from these districts in the medium size group about 58 per cent are from Ramanathapuram and Tirunelveli alone. This again shows that

Table III.6 : Landed Migrants in MUA

Size of Holding (acres)	Migrants in MC			Migrants in STs		
	From Rural Areas	From Urban Areas	Rural and Urban Total	From Rural Areas	From Urban Areas	Rural and urban Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
0.06 - 2.50	26 (43.33)	12 (34.29)	38 (40.00)	14 (35.00)	6 (25.00)	20 (31.25)
2.51 - 5.00	21 (35.00)	15 (42.86)	36 (37.89)	10 (25.00)	9 (37.50)	19 (29.69)
5.01 - 10.00	9 (15.00)	5 (14.29)	14 (14.74)	13 (32.50)	8 (33.33)	21 (32.81)
10.01 and above	4 (6.67)	3 (8.57)	7 (7.37)	3 (7.50)	1 (4.17)	4 (6.25)
Total	60 (100.00)	35 (100.00)	95 (100.00)	40 (100.00)	24 (100.00)	64 (100.00)

Note: Figures in parantheses indicate percentages in column total.

the migrants are basically from irrigated and adjacent districts with small holdings, and the migrants with small and medium holdings are from less irrigated and distant districts.

The land owned per migrant household is shown in Table III.7. It shows that generally the migrants are from bouseholds owning small holdings, but there is a considerable difference across districts in this regard. The figures in the table indicates the possibility that the migrants from Chinglepet, North and South Arcots came following the nearness of the places to MUA and those from distant Ramanathapuram and Tirunelveli due to low income potential from land. The migrants in the STs from Thanjavur, a distant and highly irrigated district, does not conform to this argument.

However, in terms of average size of holding owned by the migrant household, the migrants in the STs are better endowed than those in MC.

Table III.7 : Land Owned per Migrant Household at their Origin

Origin	Migrants in MC	Migrants in ST
Chingleput	3.94	5.09
North & South Arcot	5.04	3.63
Ramanathapuram	3.97	6.29
Thanjavur	1.83	5.02
Tirunelveli	5.29	7.25
Total of Intrastate migrant	5.09	5.17
Total including inter-state migrants	4.95	5.20

The above analysis of the landholding patterns of the migrants is only partial. Since we do not have data on the size of households at the origin we cannot really judge whether the available land was sufficient for the migrants' livelihood or not. We also do not know whether the landed migrants are substantially different from the landless ones. Also the inferences drawn earlier on the basis of percentage area irrigated are tentative. With these limitations we may summarise the earlier observations.

1. Landless migrants are more numerous than the landed ones.

2. Landed migrants in MUA generally came from the small holdings (0.06-5.00 acres). While most of the migrants in MC came from small holdings, in the STs, migrants came from both small (below 5 acres) as well as medium holdings (above 5 acres). The migrants with medium holdings are mainly from Ramanathapuram and Tirunelveli which have low income potential from land. But the landed migrants in the STs are relatively better endowed than those in MC.

3. The distribution of landed and landless migrants, is the same in MC and the STs.

3.2.4. Educational Characteristics of the Migrants in MUA

Educational levels of the migrants may indirectly imply a general awareness of the migrants about the socio-economic circumstances at the origin as well as at the place of migration. At the same time, it may indicate the level of skill one has acquired which helps a migrant to enter a particular kind of occupation. In the context of outmigration from the Indian villages it was noted that the migrants were generally more educated (literate or above) than the nonmigrants (Dasgupta and Laishley). This is assumed to imply the migrants' general

awareness about the circumstances at the two geographical ends of migration. While this is true, in the context of inmigration to Calcutta it was found that the migrants had moderate to high levels of formal education without any particular technical education, and they swelled the tertiary sector of the economy (Ghosh)[7]. This means that while the migrants are often educated, their occupational characteristics may be partially determined by their educational characteristics. This suggests that we present the educational characteristics of the migrants before we discuss their occupational characteristics.

The data on the educational levels of the sample migrants are presented in seven groups that are by and large comparable with the 1971 Census data on the migrants' educational levels. Our sample data refer to the present levels of education. A comparison of the sample data with the census distribution of the migrants educational levels shows a discripancy. Sample data, relative to the census data, show larger concentration at middle and secondary level and beyond. At lower levels than these, sample concentrations are much smaller than the census concentrations (Table III.8). This could be because of the fact that we chose mainly the active migrants often in the working age groups whereas in the census the migrants of all age groups are included.

Table III.8 : Percentage Distribution of the census 1971 and the Sample (1981) Migrants Across Educational levels

Educational Levels*	Census Migrants, 1971	Sample Migrants, 1981
Illiterate	18.21	7.78
Literates and upto Primary	31.69	21.17
Middle and upto Secondary	41.86	54.00
Technical and non-technical diplomas and degrees	8.19	16.41
Others	0.05	0.65
Total	100.00	100.00

*Our sample data are compressed into five categories of education for comparison with the census data. Census distribution is taken from Majumdar S. and Nagaraj, K. (1982).

Table III.9 presents the distribution of the rural and urban migrants in MC and the STs by their educational levels. It shows that there is not much of a difference in terms of percentage distribution of the rural and urban migrants across educational levels, especially in MC. In the STs a larger percentages of the rural migrants are found among illiterates and upto primary level as compared to the percentages of the urban migrants at these levels. The difference, however, is not too wide. The table suggests that most of the migrants in MC and in the STs (i.e. about 90 per cent) are literate and among them a large number is moderately (secondary) educated. The concentration is generally low at the degree level. We may observe that broadly the migrants have low (primary) to moderate levels of education. Though there are a few migrants with degree and diploma a relatively large number of them have general education rather than any technical education. We may, therefore, conclude that the migrants have low to moderate levels of education of general type.

Table III.10 presents the distribution of the landed and the landless migrants in MC and the STs by their educational levels. The difference between the landed and the landless migrants is very little in MC in terms of their educational levels, whereas it is sharper in the STs. At the levels of education below secondary the percentage concentrations of

---

7. One of the reasons cited for swelling of the tertiary sector is the slow growth of industrial investment in Calcutta. But the positive association between very general nontechnical education and swelling of tertiary employment is also noted by Ghosh.

Table III.9 : Distribution of the Migrants in MUA by their Educational Levels

Education Levels	Migrants in MC			Migrants in the STs		
	From Rural Areas	From Urban Areas	Rural-Urban Total	From Rural Areas	From Urban Areas	Rural-Urban Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1. Illiterate	14 (11.11)	14 (9.72)	28 (10.37)	2 (2.04)	6 (6.32)	8 (4.15)
2. Literate to Primary	31 (24.60)	28 (19.44)	59 (21.85)	25 (25.51)	14 (14.74)	39 (20.21)
3. Above Primary and upto Secondary	67 (53.17)	81 (56.25)	148 (54.81)	52 (52.04)	52 (53.68)	104 (52.85)
4. Nontechnical UG and PG degrees	10 (7.94)	11 (7.64)	21 (7.78)	14 (14.29)	15 (15.79)	29 (15.03)
5. Technical diploma and Technical UG and PG Degrees	3 (2.38)	9 (6.25)	12 (4.44)	6 (6.12)	8 (8.42)	14 (7.25)
6. Others	1 (0.79)	1 (0.69)	2 (0.74)	-	1 (1.05)	1 (0.52)
7. Total	126 (100.00)	144 (100.00)	270 (100.00)	99 (100.00)	96 (100.00)	195 (100.00)

Note: Figures in the parantheses indicate percentage in column total.

Table III-10: Distribution of Landed & Landless Migrants in MUA by their Educational Levels

Educational Levels	Migrants in MC			Migrants in the STs		
	Landed	Landless	Total	Landed	Landless	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1. Illiterate	12 (11.65)	16 (9.58)	28 (10.37)	-	8 (6.30)	8 (4.15)
2. Literate and upto primary	18 (17.48)	41 (24.55)	59 (21.85)	8 (12.12)	31 (24.41)	39 (20.21)
3. Above primary and upto secondary	59 (57.28)	89 (53.29)	148 (54.81)	35 (51.52)	69 (53.54)	104 (52.85)
4. Nontechnical UG and PG degrees	11 (10.68)	10 (5.99)	21 (7.78)	15 (22.73)	14 (11.02)	29 (15.03)
5. Technical Diploma and Technical UG&PG degrees	3 (2.91)	9 (5.39)	12 (4.44)	8 (12.12)	6 (4.72)	14 (7.25)
6. Others	-	2 (1.20)	2 (0.74)	1 (1.52)	-	1 (0.52)
7. Total	103 (100.00)	167 (100.00)	270 (100.00)	67 (100.00)	128 (100.00)	195 (100.00)

Note: Figures in parantheses indicate percentages in column total.

the landless are relatively larger than those of the landed. At the levels above secondary the percentages of the landed are larger than those of the landless. In short, while the distribution of landed and landless migrants in terms of educational levels does not differ in MC, in the STs many more of the landed migrants are moderate to highly educated than those of the landless migrants.

A comparision of the distribution between MC and STs shows that a relatively larger number of illiterate and primary educated migrants are absorbed in MC than in the STs. The percentage of the migrants at the levels beyond secondary is higher in the STs than in MC. This suggests that migrants in the STs have an edge over those in MC, in terms of education. This may be a reflection of more specific pattern of urbanisation through industrialisation in the STs than in MC. The industrialisation in the STs has perhaps selected more of moderate to highly educated than of less educated manpower, whereas MC provided scope for all kinds of migrants to be absorbed.

Summary of Observations

1. Migrants in MUA have low to moderate levels of education. Of those who have higher than secondary level of education a large number has education of nontechnical degrees.

2. Landed migrants in the STs are often more educated than the landless.

3. Larger proportion of the migrants in the STs has better education than the that in MC.

With this background we shall next analyse the occupational characteristics of the migrants in MUA.

3.2.5. Occupational Characteristics of Migrants in the MUA

We shall now examine the occupational characteristics of the migrants at the origin and in the present place of migration (i.e. in MC and in the STs). This will help us understand the background of the migrants as well as the occupational shift associated with migration. This may also indirectly explain the factors behind migration. We shall henceforth avoid the rural/urban distinction of the migrants' origin, since there is not much of difference in the migrants' characteristics across these areas. Our ways of classifying the migrants by their occupation are discussed in Appendix I.

3.2.6. Occupation at the Origin

The distribution of the landed and the landless migrants by their occupation at the origin is presented in Table III.11. As may be seen from the table a large proportion of the migrants (both landed and the landless) in MUA were nonworkers at the origin. Of these nonworkers 56 per cent of landed and 62 per cent of the landless migrants were unemployed at the origin. While rest of the landed nonworking migrants were students, the rest of the landless migrants were minor at the time of migration.

Among the landed working migrants at origin a large proportion came from the primary occupation. The majority in this occupation either owned poultry or were agriculturists.

The relative importance of various occupations among the landless working migrants differs from those among the landed. Landless migrants are spread across both skilled occupations like traditionally skilled workers' and the 'skilled production workers' and unskilled occupations like 'trading and money-lending' and 'unskilled sales/service workers'. The latter of these unskilled occupations implies wage employment in the 'trading and moneylending' activity.

Table III--11: Occupation of the Migrants at Origin

Places of Migration	Type	Primary Activity workers	Professional & Technical & managerial workers	Traditionally skilled occupation	Traders & Money-lenders	Unskilled sales/ service workers	Semi-skilled workers (often in unorganised sectors)	Skilled Production workers (often in organised sectors)	Production/ service workers (unorganised sectors)	Other service workers (often in organised sectors)	Students, unemployed, retired etc.	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Madras City	Landed	23 (22.77)	1 (0.99)	2 (1.98)	8 (7.92)	4 (3.96)	-	2 (1.98)	2 (1.98)	2 (1.98)	57 (56.44)	101 (100.00)
	Landless	8 (4.82)	5 (3.01)	15 (9.04)	13 (7.83)	15 (9.04)	-	20 (12.05)	3 (1.81)	12 (7.23)	75 (45.18)	166 (100.00)
	Total	31 (11.61)	6 (2.25)	17 (6.37)	21 (7.87)	19 (7.12)	-	22 (8.24)	5 (1.87)	14 (5.24)	132 (49.44)	267 (100.00)
Satellite Towns	Landed	17 (25.37)	-	-	4 (5.97)	2 (2.99)	-	2 (2.99)	-	6 (8.96)	37 (55.73)	68 (100.00)
	Landless	7 (5.51)	4 (3.15)	8 (6.30)	14 (11.02)	17 (13.39)	-	12 (9.45)	2 (1.57)	10 (7.87)	53 (41.73)	127 (100.00)
	Total	24 (12.37)	4 (2.06)	8 (4.12)	18 (9.28)	19 (9.79)	-	14 (7.22)	2 (1.03)	16 (8.25)	90 (45.88)	195 (100.00)

Note: Figures in parentheses indicate percentages in row total.

In a nutshell, a large proportion of the migrants were unemployed and students at the origin. Among the workers, a good proportion of the landed migrants came from an unskilled primary occupation while the landless came from both skilled and unskilled occupations.

3.2.7. Present Occupation of the Migrants

Present occupational characteristics of the migrants in MUA are shown in Table III.12. It shows that the proportions of the nonworkers (students and unemployed) are very low among the landed as well as the landless migrants. Comparing these proportions with those in Table III.11, it is clear that the migrants came to MUA in search of employment, and the proportions of nonworkers have declined sharply between the origin and MUA. A comparison of the working migrants in different occupation between MC, NC and the STs shows that there is a sharp increase in the proportion of working migrants in the unskilled occupations, like 'trading', sales and service work as well as the skilled occupations like 'production work' and 'other services'.[8]

The distribution of the migrants by their present occupation in MUA shows that the occupational characteristics of the migrants differ between the landed and the landless, as between MC and the STs.

The landed migrants in MC are heavily concentrated in unskilled 'trading and moneylending' and 'sales and service' work and to a much less extent in 'other services'. The landless migrants are also concentrated heavily in the same occupations but an important difference is that the landless are substantially engaged in 'skilled production work' often in the organised sector.

---

8. 'Other services' include moderate to highly educated personnels sometimes with particular skills like typewriting, stenography etc. For this reason we shall always consider this as a skilled occupation.

Table III-12: Distribution of the Migrants in MUA by their present occupation

Places of Migration		Primary workers	Professional technical managerial workers etc.	Traditionally skilled occupation	Traders & Money-lenders	Unskilled sales/ service workers	Semi-skilled workers (unorganised)	Skilled Production workers	Production/ service workers (unorganised sector)	Other service sector (organised sector)	Unemployed, students, retired etc.	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Madras City	Landed	4 (3.96)	6 (5.94)	4 (3.96)	38 (37.62)	17 (16.83)	2 (1.98)	8 (7.92)	6 (5.94)	13 (12.87)	3 (2.97)	101 (100.00)
	Landless	2 (1.21)	8 (4.82)	12 (7.23)	41 (24.69)	33 (19.88)	2 (1.21)	34 (20.48)	9 (5.42)	21 (12.65)	4 (2.41)	167 (100.00)
Sub-total		6 (2.25)	14 (5.24)	16 (5.99)	79 (29.59)	50 (18.73)	4 (1.50)	42 (15.73)	15 (5.62)	34 (12.73)	7 (2.62)	268 (100.00)
Satellite Towns	Landed	-	7 (9.09)	1 (1.52)	23 (33.33)	4 (6.06)	2 (3.03)	12 (18.18)	1 (1.52)	14 (21.21)	4 (6.06)	68 (100.00)
	Landless	-	8 (6.35)	6 (4.76)	24 (19.05)	21 (15.87)	- (26.19)	34 (26.98)	6 (4.76)	24 (19.05)	4 (3.18)	127 (100.00)
Sub-total			15 (7.29)	7 (3.65)	47 (23.96)	25 (12.59)	2 (1.04)	46 (23.96)	7 (3.65)	38 (19.79)	8 (4.17)	195 (100.00)

The landed migrants in the STs are concentrated mainly in unskilled 'trading and moneylending' 'skilled production work' and 'other services'. The landless are concentrated in 'trading and moneylending', 'sales and service', 'skilled production work' and 'other services'. In the 'skilled production work' and 'other services' of the STs, the numerical dominance of the landless over the landed is clear from Table III.12.

These two observations suggest that both the landed and the landless enter, to a large extent, the unskilled occupations like 'trading and moneylending' and 'sales and services' and the landless migrants numerically dominate the landed in skilled occupations like 'Production work' and 'other services', which are basically organised sector wage employment.

The entry of the landless into unskilled 'sales and services' is obvious, and that is perhaps the reflection of their poverty. Entry of the landed into this occupation requires us to examine as to why they enter this unskilled wage employment and join the poor. Similarly the entry of the landless into 'trading and moneylending' also requires an explanation.[9] We shall attempt the explanation in Section V.

The numerical dominance of the landless over the landed in 'skilled production work' suggest that these migrants acquire skill in the process of migration. Since the migrants generally are low to moderately educated, and very few have technical education, they must have acquired technical skill through on the job training after migration. Perhaps the

---

9. One possibility is that the 'trading', excluding the moneylending activity, includes wide range of occupations like peanut vending to iron trading, requiring different amounts of capital. In that, both the landed and the landless have equal access to this occupation.

landless migrants are economically hard pressed and have a drive for acquiring skill to find employment in organised sector. A similar phenomenon of acquiring skill by the unassetted workers has been observed earlier [Kurien, C.T., and James, Josef (1979); see also Appendix II in subsection 6.4.2 of the present paper].

A comparison of migrants in MC and the STs shows that while MC absorbed a large proportion of the migrants in unskilled 'trading and moneylending' and 'sales and service' occupations, the STs absorbed large proportions of skilled workers in 'production' and 'other services'. Though not rigorously shown, this may be a reflection of rapid growth of 'manufacturing' activity in the STs. Manufacturing sector grew in MC as well, but as we noted earlier perhaps the migrants' entry into this activity is severely restricted by the competition from the resident workers (Majumdar and Nagaraj).

3.2.8. Occupational shift between Origin and MUA

We noted earlier that there was a sharp increase in the proportion of working migrants in both skilled and unskilled occupations in MUA, compared to those in the origin. How did this increase come about?

The occupations in MUA are inflated mainly by the entry of those who were nonworkers at the origin (see Table III.13). Very few have switched over to other occupation from their own at the origin, except that the substantial proportions of the primary workers have entered the unskilled 'trading and moneylending' and 'sales and services' occupation, and to some extent in 'skilled production work'. Most of these primary workers are from rural areas. Apart from these primary workers, most workers have retained their original occupation even after migration, as can be seen from the large proportion of the working migrants in the diagonal cells of Table III.13.

Table III-13. Distribution of Migrants by Occupations Before and After Migration into MUA

Occupation at Origin	Present Occupation in MUA: Primary activity workers	Professional, Technical & Managerial workers	Traditionally skilled workers	Traders & Moneylenders	Unskilled sales/service workers	Semiskilled workers (often in unorganised sector)	Skilled production workers (often in organised sector)	Production/service workers (unorganised sector)	Other services (often moderately educated & in organised sector)	Students, unemployed retired etc.	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Primary Activity.	3	1	1	26	11	1	7	1	2	2	55
Professional, technical etc. workers.	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	10
Traditionally skilled workers.	-	-	17	3	-	-	3	1	1	-	25
Traders & Moneylenders.	1	1	-	28	-	-	3	2	1	3	39
Unskilled sales/service workers.	-	-	-	9	28	1	4	1	1	-	38
Semiskilled workers (often in unorganised sector).	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Skilled production workers (often in organised sector).	-	-	-	5	-	-	28	-	2	1	36
Production/service workers (unorganised sector).	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	7
Other services (often moderately educated & in organised sector).	-	3	1	5	1	-	4	-	15	-	29

Table III-13 (contd.)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Students, unemployed, retired etc.	2	14	4	50	41	4	39	10	48	9	221
Total	6	28	23	126	75	6	88	22	72	15	461

This indicates that the migrants in MUA are not generally footloose in terms of occupations, though in terms of geographical movement, they are. This also suggests that the migrant workers' mobility across occupations is limited. This is in contrast to what Todaro's model suggests.

Non workers at the origin appear to have benefited from migration, as the unemployed and the students (at the origin) found employment after migration. They mainly entered into four occupations - unskilled 'trading and moneylending' and 'sales and service' occupations and the skilled 'production work' and 'other services'.

Our data further suggest that of the non workers who entered 'trading and moneylending' occupation in MUA 52 per cent are landed. About 40 per cent of the nonworking landed migrants have entered 'sales and service' occupation. But in this occupation landless migrants numerically dominate over the landed. In skilled 'production work' and in 'other services' also the dominance of the landless over the landed migrants is observed. In these two occupations in MUA the landless non workers form about the 60 per cent of the total workers. Since the skilled migrants came with general education, their technical skill was acquired after migration.

The above observations in this section may be summarised as follows:

1. Nearly half (48 per cent) of the migrants in the origin were non workers and they came to MUA in search of employment. This requires us to examine as to why the workers at the origin also migrated.

2. Present occupational characteristics of the migrants suggest that both landed and the landless migrants are engaged in unskilled 'trading and moneylending' and 'sales and service'

activity to a large extent. At a smaller scale the migrants are engaged in 'skilled production activity' and 'other services' where the landless are dominant over the landed migrants. In the skilled occupations migrants acquired skill after migration.

3. The past and the present occupations of most of the working migrants have not changed, except for these primary workers at the origin who entered 'trading and moneylending' and wage employment in the 'sales and service' occupations in MUA.

4. There is greater scope for skilled employment in STs than in MC. MC absorbed a large number of migrants in the unorganised sector.

3.2.9. Summary of Important Observations of Section III

The analysis of the characteristics of the migrants in MC and the STs shows that there are differences between the streams of migrants into these places.

1. Migrants from within Tamil Nadu form the largest group out of the total in MUA.

2. Of the within-state migrants those from Chinglepet, North and South Arcots, Tirunelveli and Ramanathapuram are the dominant groups.

3. Within MUA, those who moved within MC and from MC to the STs form an important category of migrants.

4. While the landless migrants outnumber the landed both in MC and the STs, the landed migrants in the latter places are better endowed in terms of the size of landholding.

5. Educationally, a larger proportion of the migrants in the STs, are in the categories of secondary and above,

than those in the MC. That is the migrants in the STs have a little edge over those in MC, in terms of education.

6. In the STs, the proportion of migrants engaged in skilled production and service works is slightly higher than that engaged in unskilled, occupations like 'trading and moneylending' and 'sales and service' work. The reverse is true in the case of MC. This could be an effect of industrialisation of the STs.

3.2.10. Appendix I : On Occupational Classification

Sample data on occupational characteristics of the migrants are not always precisely obtained so as to be comparable with the census. Census occupational categories are too aggregative and may not help us to relate the occupational categories with the process of migration. Also, the response of the migrants to our question was not always so clear as to find him in the census occupational categories. Therefore, we tried to evolve alternative categories of occupation, from our judgements, which may be indicative of their skills. For example, while carpenters, goldsmiths, weavers or cobblers are entered as production workers, irrespective of the sectors (organised or unorganised), in the census, we treated them as workers in traditional occupation. Since the modern industrial production may threaten their existence at the villages or smaller towns and induce them to migrate it would be worthwhile to classify them in their own occupation. Another example, is of a rickshawpuller or an auto driver. While there is some skill required for the latter, not much skill is required to pull rickshaws. In that case we thought it would be useful to have the two separately. Further problem we encountered was in classifying the migrants by organised and unorganised sectors. But as far as information was available we tried to supsimpose the nature of these sectors on the skill. For example, a mechanic in Avadi Tank Factory

is a skilled worker in organised sector and considered in the production and related workers' occupation. So are the typists, PA's or Secretaries who have been considered as semi-skilled but organised sectors workers. Classifying the traders into organised or unorganised sector was difficult. Cloth merchant and tea stall owners have been included in trading and moneylending occupation. In that both organised and unorganised sectors have to be merged following the lack of information on these sectors. We judged them as unorganised sector workers. However, in all cases we went by our judgement and they are tentative. Various activities in the broad occupational groups are shown in Table III.14.

IV

4.0. Mode of Migration and Job Prospects

In this section we shall analyse as to how the process of migration is set in among the migrants in MUA. Mode of migration attempts to answer the questions like, (i) did the migrants move on their own without any contact with other migrants in MUA, (ii) did they move with such contacts, or (iii) did they move in groups etc. Job prospect, on the other hand, attempts to answer such questions as: (i) whether the migrants had fixed up or an assured job before migration, or (ii) whether they came in search of job without any assurance etc. While the answers to these questions reveal the process of migration, they may indirectly help us understand the factors behind migration. We shall use the rural/urban distinction in this analysis, because the rural and urban migrants may not receive information regarding MUA identically and thereby the mode of migration and job prospects may differ between the migrants from these areas. Of the two aspects of study we analyse the mode of migration first.

Table III-14: Profession of the Migrants classified into Broad Occupational Groups

OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS									
Primary workers	Professional Technical Managerial etc.workers	Traditially Skilled Occupation	Trading & Money-lending	Unskilled Sales/ service workers	Semi-skilled workers (unorganised sector)	Skilled Production Workers	Production/ Service workers (unorganised sector)	Other services (often moderately educated and in organised sector)	Students, unemployed, retired etc.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Agriculturists	Doctor	Goldsmith	Shop-owner	Waiter	Compounder	Electrician	Tailor	Clerk	
Paultry Owner	Engineer	Weaver	Contractor	Shop-Assistant	Cook	Progress man	Cycle-shop workers	Steno-typist	Students
Cowherd owner	Officers	Carpenter	Merchant	Watchman	Shop accountant	Chargeman	Watch repairer	Checking Inspector	
Agricultural labourer	Manager	Butcher	Agent	Sweeper		Airman		Cashier	Trainee
Poultry worker	Auditors	Beedi maker	Money-lender	Gardener		Technician		Govt.office worker	
Cowherd worker	Consultant	Wood-cutter	Business-man	Peon		Mechanic		P.A.	Apprentice
	Accountants	Barber	Fruit-seller	Guard		Supervisor		Sales rep.	unemployed
		Cobbler		Coolie		Maulder		Superintendent	
		Doll-maker		Points-man		Foreman		Transport Inspector	
				Paperman		Driver		LIC Agent	
				Corporation/worker		Mason		Bus conductor	
				Cart puller		Fitter		Hospital employee	
				Pandal worker		Welder		Asst. Station master	
				cycle-rickshaw driver		Overseer		Teacher/ Professor	
						Linesman		Instructor	
						Textile & Printing workers		Defence/ Police	
						Operators			

4.1. Mode of Migration into MUA

The distribution of the migrants by different modes of migration is presented in Table IV.1. It shows that the largest single mode of migration into MUA is the one where the migrants had moved with the help or contact from the migrants who were already in MUA. This process of migration can be called 'chain migration'. Next to this, stands the migration without any contact, which can be called self induced migration.

The dominance of 'chain migration' implies that, to a large extent, migration at any period of time is often induced by the migrants of earlier periods. In that the process of current migration gets related to the previous processes of migration. Help provided by the previous migrants at the places of migration may be of several types of which two are very important. One is to inform the prospective migrants about the circumstances in the places of migration which helps the decision process of the prospective migrants at the origin. The other is to support the latest migrants at the places of migration before the migrants fetch a job. They can also help by fixing up a job before migration. Both types of help, from the previous migrants, together work out to improve the expected income from migration as well as cut the cost of migration and waiting before finding an employment. As a result the expected income, *a la*' Todaro, from migration will increase, and hence inmigration to urban areas will also increase. However, one should not overlook the possibility of migration due to contact, despite a low probability of urban employment, because such a process of migration is less risky.

As for the self induced migrants the above advantages will not be there. It is possible that these migrants will either come with a fixed or assured job. How self induced

Table IV - 1

Modes of Immigration to MC and the STs

Modes of Migration	Migrants in MC		Migrants in the STs		Total in MUA
	From Rural areas	From Urban areas	From Rural areas	From Urban areas	
1.Without any contact	34 (28.10)	38 (26.95)	39 (40.21)	32 (34.41)	143 (31.64)
2.With the help of a family member/relative/ friends who is already a migrant	58 (47.93)	82 (58.16)	43 (44.33)	43 (46.24)	21.6 (47.79)
3.Come with family member/ relative/friend to seek employment/business	13 (10.74)	6 (4.26)	12 (12.37)	10 (10.75)	51 (11.28)
4.Commissioned by a contractor	3 (2.48)	1 (0.71)	2 (2.06)	1 (1.08)	7 (1.55)
5.Came as a group on their own	5 (4.13)	4 (2.84)	-	-	9 (1.99)
6.Any other	8 (6.61)	10 (7.09	1 (1.03)	7 (7.53)	26 (5.75)
7.Total	121 (99.99)	141 (100.01)	97 (100.00)	93 (100.01)	452 (100.00)

migration takes place will be examined later with the help of the data on job prospects. But from the possibility as observed in the case of 'chain migration' we can imagine that the self induced migrants will induce others to migrate in future.

Other modes of migration are not quite important, except the one in which the migrants are commissioned by an employer. This mode is numerically insignificant. We found that two of these migrants came with their employers. A weaver came with his employer and a shop assistant came with his shop owner. Both these employers came to MC in order to expand their business activity.

The modes of migration among the rural and urban migrants do not appear to be significantly different, except that there is a slightly greater degree of chain migration among the urban migrants than among those from rural areas. In fact, since migration, to a large extent, is induced, similar processes of information percolation may be at work in rural as well as in urban areas.

Comparision between the migrants in MC and in the STs shows that the self induced migration is slightly higher among those in the STs than those in MC. In view of the existence of step migration in the STs via MC and direct migration from adjacent MC to the STs migrants are well informed about the STs and can venture movement without any contact. We have analysed the mode of migration of the step migrants including only the mode at the last step. Since most of the step migrants came to MUA in their first step and got pushed around within MUA, contact at the last step of migration is immaterial. Total of self induced migrants in MUA is 143. Of these 30 (21 per cent) migrants who came to MUA in more than one step had initiated their move with the help from the contacts and in their final move they migrated on their own.

This observation, though not very significant statistically, is of immense importance in providing an insight. It suggests that migration is initiated as chain but later takes the form of self induced migration.

4.2. Job Prospects

The distribution of the rural and urban migrants in MUA by their job prospects is presented in Table IV.2. It shows that more than 30 per cent of the migrants fall in the first three types of job prospects, such as, i) fixed up job before migration, ii) firm assurance of job before migration and iii) hope of getting a job.

Of the three, first two types of job prospects imply job certainty. Migrants in MUA who came with job certainty account for about 50 per cent of total of 431 migrants. It can be seen from the table that among the migrants who came with fixed up jobs urban migrants numerically dominate the rural migrants both in MC and in the STs. Urban migrants dominate over the rural migrants in MC in the case of those with firm assurance of job. It is, therefore, clear that about half of the total migrants came with job certainty and more of urban migrants came to MUA with job certainty than of rural migrants.

Those came with the hope of getting a job in MUA form a substantial number. This type of job prospect indicate some degree of job uncertainty. The extent of risk involved in this type of migration depends upon the lack or existence of contact in the places of migration which can be examined with the help of modes of migration that was available to them.

4.3. Mode of Migration and Job Prospects

We left an open question as to how or why self induced migration takes place (see section 4.1). Again, we are required to examine if the risk of migration with job

Table IV - 2

Distribution of the Migrants by Job prospects in MC and the STs

Job Prospects	Migrants in MC		Migrants in the STs		Total in MUA
	From Rural areas	From Urban areas	From Rural areas	From Urban areas	
1. Had a fixed up job before migration	36 (30.25)	45 (32.85)	22 (24.72)	35 (40.7)	138 (32.02)
2. Had a firm assurance of job before migration	20 (16.81)	30 (21.90)	20 (22.47)	9 (10.47)	79 (18.33)
3. Hope of getting a job	40 (33.61)	39 (28.47)	31 (34.83)	22 (25.58)	132 (30.63)
4. Self Employment	3 (2.52)	2 (1.46)	2 (2.25)	-	7 (1.62)
5. Any other	20 (16.81)	21 (15.33)	14 (15.73)	20 (23.26)	75 (17.4)
6. Total	119 (100.00)	137 (100.00)	89 (100.00)	86 (100.00)	431 (100.00)

uncertainty was too high. These questions can be partly answered from the distribution of the migrants by their modes of migration and the job prospects. The distribution is presented in Table IV.3.

It can be seen from the table that of the self induced migrants more than 50 per cent came with a fixed up job or with firm assurance of job. That is, a good proportion of self induced migrants ventured to migrate because of job certainty. Also those who came with contacts (chain migrants) came with job certainty.

As for the 132 migrants with job uncertainty, 65 (i.e., about 49.24 per cent) came to MUA with contacts from family member, friends or relatives who were already the migrants. The rest (50.76 per cent) came without contact and job certainty. It may be noted that the migrants commissioned by contractors do not appear in the category of uncertain job prospects. However, those who came without contact and job certainty, 16 of them took more than one step before settling in MUA. These facts suggest that a good proportion of the migrants without job certainty (about 50 per cent) came to MUA with low risk, as they had earlier contacts, others undertook a more risky venture of migration.

The above observations may be summarised as the following:

1. Migration to a large extent is a chain process. Migration at a period is induced by migration prior to that period. In the case of self induced migration it was observed that they came to MUA because of job certainty in MUA.

2. To a small extent chain migration initiates the move and later migrants move on their own.

3. Contacts at the places of migration help migration even with uncertain job prospects. Those who have no contact

Table IV - 3

Distribution of the Migrants by Modes of Migration and Job Prospects

Modes of Migration	Job Prospects: Had a Fixed up Job before Migration	Had a firm assurance of job before Migration	Migrated with the hope of getting a job	Migrated for self employment	Others	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1. without any control	54 (39.13)	19 (13.77)	42 (30.43)	3 (2.17)	20 (14.49)	138 (100.00)
2. with the help of family members/ relatives/friends who is already a migrant	60 (28.44)	44 (20.85)	65 (30.81)	2 (0.95)	40 (18.96)	211 (100.00)
3. came with family members/relative/ friends to seek employment/business	13 (31.71)	8 (19.51)	11 (26.83)	2 (4.88)	7 (17.07)	41 (100.00)
4. commissioned by a contractor	1 (16.67)	4 (66.67)	-	-	1 (16.67)	6 (100.00)
5. came as a group on their own	-	1 (11.11)	7 (77.78)	-	1 (11.11)	9 (100.00)
6. others	9 (36.00)	3 (12.00)	7 (28.00)	-	6 (24.00)	25 (100.00)
Total	137	79	132	7	75	430

or job certainty tend to grope for job, in the process some of them tend to make more than one move.

V

5.1. Factors Behind Migration

We noted in the previous section that a large number of migrants came with assured job and/or with contacts with migrants who came earlier to MUA. These are some indirect indications of the operation of pull factors[10] at the places of inmigration. There is also a hint that the growth of 'manufacturing' activity in the STs provided scope for skilled migrants and educated migrants, whereas in MC because of the growth of several activities it provided scope for varied types of migrants - skilled, unskilled, moderately educated etc. (see Section III) In this, there is a hint that industrialisation acts as a pull factor. These are merely hints, yet to be proved rigorously, and are, therefore, indirect. However, along with pull, push factors coexist and often are inseparable from one another (Connell, et.al). In this section we shall attempt to identify the factors behind inmigration to MUA with the sample data on the reasons for migration.

Though we shall look for the general processes behind inmigration to MUA, we shall also examine if there are reasons to believe that a process of suburbanisation is on. The process of suburbanisation will be considered only in the flow of migrants from MC to the STs. To these ends, we shall present the reasons as perceived by the migrants.

---

10. The terms push and pull factors are used to mean the factors at the outmigrating and inmigrating ends respectively. In the course of the analysis this factors have been specified.

While dealing with the aggregate static data on reasons, we shall present a few cases to have an insight into the wider processes, if any, behind migration. The distribution of the migrants in MC and the STs by various reasons for migration is presented in Table V.1.

The Table shows that well above 30 per cent of the migrants moved into MUA due to inadequate employment and income earning opportunities at the origin. Unemployment, irregular or short-duration employment and low wages caused them to migrate. These factors may be considered as push factors. Next to these factors, are the search for permanent employment and business opportunities. Though these two factors may imply the existence of pull factors, in the nature of round-the-year urban activities and wider market, those who seek permanent employment can be assumed to be plagued by chronic or unemployment or irregular employment at the origin. If we add these migrants to those who were unemployed had irregular employment and earned low wages, migration for improved income-earning opportunities and employment account for more than 50 per cent of the total migrants both in MC and the STs.

Further, the number of migrants, stating reasons, such as eviction from house, lack of good housing and high cost of living and dispossession of land, is though small, the reasons imply the important qualitative aspects of urbanisation and migration.

It can be seen from Table V.1 that those evicted from houses are mainly from urban areas to MC, and those migrated due to lack of good house and high cost of living are from urban areas to the STs. Our respondents were evicted from the houses in MC and had to settle in another place within MC. Those who settled in the STs, all of them outmigrated from MC due to lack of good housing, and high cost of living.

Distribution of Migrants by their Reasons for Migration

Places of Migration	Nature of Origin	Unemployment and loss of jobs	Irregular and short duration employment	Low wage	In search of employment for dependents	To set up business	Permanent employment	Eviction from house	Land sold off	Lack of good houses and high cost of living	To Pay Off	For Education	Others	Total
Madras city	Rural	38 (30.89)	8 (6.50)	9 (7.32)	3 (2.44)	13 (10.57)	12 (9.76)	1 (0.81)	9 (7.32)	1 (0.81)	-	4 (3.25)	25 (20.33)	123 (100.00)
	Urban	34 (24.11)	1 (0.71)	11 (7.80)	2 (1.42)	14 (9.93)	16 (11.35)	9 (6.38)	3 (2.13)	3 (2.13)	2 (1.42)	5 (3.55)	41 (29.08)	141 (100.00)
Total in MC		72	9	20	5	27	28	10	12	4	2	9	66	264
Satellite Towns	Rural	33 (32.35)	8 (7.84)	7 (6.86)	-	9 (8.82)	22 (21.57)	-	4 (3.93)	-	-	5 (4.9)	14 (13.73)	102 (100.00)
	Urban	19 (19.39)	7 (7.14)	7 (7.14)	2 (2.04)	12 (12.24)	18 (18.37)	-	3 (3.06)	7 (7.14)	-	4 (4.08)	19 (19.39)	98 (100.00)
Total in the STs		52	15	14	2	21	40	-	7	7		9	33	200

Note: Figures in paratheses indicate percentages in row total

Of these, a few (numbering six) areskilled production workers, workers in 'other services' and a very few are in 'trading and moneylending' activities. While traders are likely to move along as the population moves across space, migrants in other occupations moved due to eviction or high cost of living. However, these reasons and the corresponding occupations may indicate that the migrants are not economically very sound.

Migration from MC to the STs due to high cost of living and lack of relatively good housing(perhaps within the migrants' reach) is an indication of suburbanisation around MC. This process of suburbanisation is clearly different from that in the western countries where the population keeps itself away from the city bustles. The fact that some persons were evicted from their houses in MC shows how the process of urbanisation in MC with increasing population density and rental values pushes around the residents, particularly the production and service workers. They may well be on the verge of outmigrationto the STs.

The above facts suggest, therefore, that the migrants came to MUA mainly due to push factors like lack of employment and income earning opportunities at the origin. Housing (including eviction) and cost of living have also pushed people in and around Madras city, indicating the process of suburbanisation, though at a very small scale. Some migrants came due to the operation of pull factors such as business and education.

The distribution of the landed and the landless migrants in MUA by their reasons for migration shows that the lack of employment and income earning opportunities at the origin has pushed out the migrants. About 50 per cent of the migrants came to MUA due to these reasons (Table V.2). The difference in the magnitude between the landed and the landless under these reasons is not substantial. This is not quite surprising

ıtion of the Landed and Landless Migrants in MUA by Reasons for Migration

Places of Migration		Unemployment and loss of jobs	Irregular and short duration employment	Low wage	In search of employment for dependents	To set up business	Permanent employment	Eviction from house	Land sold off	Lack of good houses and high cost of living	To Pay Off	For Education	Others	Total
Madras city	Landed	28 (27.45)	6 (5.88)	5 (4.9)	1 (0.98)	13 (12.75)	11 (10.78)	4 (3.92)	10* (9.80)	-	1 (0.98)	4 (3.92)	19 (18.63)	102 (100.00)
	Landless	44 (27.16)	3 (1.85)	15 (9.26)	4 (2.47)	14 (8.64)	17 (10.49)	6 (3.70)	2 (1.23)	4 (2.47)	1 (0.62)	5 (3.09)	47 (29.01)	162 (100.00)
Total in M.L.		72	9	20	5	27	28	10	12	4	2	9	66	264
S.Ts.	Landed	19 (27.14)	5 (7.14)	-	1 (1.43)	9 (12.86)	14 (20.00)	-	5* (7.14)	1 (1.43)	-	5 (7.14)	11 (15.71)	70 (100.00)
	Landed	33 (25.39)	10 (7.69)	14 (10.77)	1 (0.77)	12 (9.23)	26 (20.00)	-	2 (1.54)	6 (4.62)	-	4 (3.08)	22 (16.92)	130 (100.00)
Total in STs		52	15	14	2	21	40	-	7	7	-	9	33	200

*These migrants are often small holders and sold off substantial part: of their holding, and at present they hold very little land.

since we know that the majority of the migrants came from households owning small holdings in adjacent districts; and small and medium holdings in dry districts like Ramanathapuram and Tirunelveli.

There are a few cases which substantiate the fact that the landed migrants came due to push factors. Velupillai from North Arcot sold off his 2 acres of land because his well dried up. Also, his son being disabled, managing the farm was difficult. So he migrated to MC to start a petty shop. Migrants from Ramanathapuram like Ponnusami holding five acres of land, Nurul Mohammed holding 10 acres and Rathnam having one acre of land came to MUA because of unprofitability of the cultivation of land. All of them owned dry lands. That cultivation was uneconomical can be gauged from the fact that Nurul Mohammed was working as a hotel-boy in Ramanathapuram, even though he had 10 acres of land. None of the three sold off his land. Ponnuswami started a provision store and Rathnam is engaged in 'skilled production work' in the STs, while Nurul Mohammed still works as a cook in a hotel. All these suggest that the lack of productive infrastructure in agriculture pushed out the landed migrants.[11]

Other processes of migration are at work too. Ibrahim from South Arcot had 7 acres of land. Since cultivation was uneconomical, he learned tailoring and was pursuing this profession in his village. Market for his services was too limited in and around the village and this pushed him out to MC. The case of Gurusami, a goldsmith from Tirunelveli is not different. He went to Coimbatore in order to expand his business of jewellery and ultimately landed up in MC.

---

11. Of the four cases, two landed migrants have joined the wage employment (Nurul Mohammed and Rathnam). Even if they are wage employees, they are not dispossessed yet. Hence, migration need not imply always a flow of free wage labo

Krishnamoorthy, a weaver from Madurai, came with his employer who sought to establish a weaving unit in Madras. These are some examples of migration due to lack of wider market.[12]

All the above cases indicate the preponderance of economic reasons behind migration. There are other social factors also. For instance, Marudhian from Tirunelveli, owning 10 acres of land, migrated to the STs. The year he started working on his land there was a crop failure and he was sent off, being unlucky in cultivation. This is a case of social backwardness of Marudhian's family. In two other cases, the landed migrants were educated upto S.S.L.C. and graduation level and decided to work in an urban area like MUA. The decision of these two migrants to move was due to moderate and high education.

To sum up, we may say that migration into MUA is basically due to push factors like chronic unemployment, irregular employment, low wages etc. These factors affect the landed and the landless in a similar way. Landed migrants more often reported outmigration from their villages due to uneconomic cultivation of land. Relatively large outmigration of the landed from the dry districts reinforces this point (see Section III). Migrants of traditional skill outmigrated due to lack of market for their services. That is, unemployment , lack of rural infrastructure (like irrigation) and limited rural market have pushed out migrants to a large extent, while other social factors have also contributed marginally to the process of outmigration. As for the growth of satellite towns there is a process of suburbanisation around MC.

---

12. A process of market shrinkage and outmigration of the traditionally skilled workers is noted more clearly by Yeshwant (1962) while studying outmigration from Ramanathapuram villages.

VI

6.0. Process of Step Migration

Earlier we have analysed the sample data to observe the general process of migration in MUA, without analysing another aspect of the process, namely the process of step migration. We shall attempt to analyse this latter aspect in this section. The main questions we shall deal with are: (i) What are the various patterns of step migration in terms of the nature of places the migrants stepped in? (ii) Is there a difference in the occupational characteristics, mode of migration, job prospects and reasons for migration between the one step (or direct migrants) and multistep migrants? (iii) Are there differences in the same respects (as in question ii) across various patterns of movements of the multistep migrants? We shall treat these questions in that order.[13]

6.1. Step Migration

There is a considerable extent of step migration among those who migrated into and within MUA. About 43 per cent

---

13. With regards to questions (ii) and (iii) age, education and asset characteristics will not be discussed. As the number of step increases the age of the migrants will obviously increase. Our data suggest that one step migrants are often older at the first step than the multistep migrants. This is because many of the multistep migrants were minor or students in their first step. As for the asset characteristics there is no pattern between step migration and the size of landholding. Changes in educational characteristics between the origin and the place of inmigration are also insignificant. Hence these characteristics have not been treated in the present analysis.

of the total migrants came in more than one step (see Table VI.1), though the number of migrants declines as the number of step increases. The relevant question in this regard is whether the migrants from distant places are prone to take more than one step.

Our sample data suggest that sizeable proportions of migrants from both adjacent and distant districts of Tamil Nadu to MC and the STs have migrated in more than one step (see Tables VI.2 and VI.3). Also more than 50 per cent of the migrants who moved only within MC had taken more than one step. This implies that there is possibly no positive relationship between the distance and steps, as against the conclusions of earlier studies (see, Connell et. al, Rao et. al etc). Then the question is where did all the multi-step migrants step in before reaching MUA.

The distribution of migrants by various patterns is shown in Table VI.4. Out of 190[14] multistep migrants in MUA, the largest single proportion of migrants came to MC and got pushed around therein in the subsequent steps. About 54 per cent of the total migrants came to MUA in the first step and moved within MUA in the subsequent steps (columns 3-5), and about six per cent moved only within MC.

Migrants from outside MUA showing nonunique or heterogeneous patterns form the rest of the migrants. These migrants have several patterns of movement, e.g. five of them came to MC or to the STs went back to the native place and again came back to MUA. 24 of them stepped from one district to another within Tamil Nadu and finally settled in MUA. Many other patterns by movement across places, like

---

14. We have, in our sample, 210 multi-step migrants. 20 of them did not specify their rural urban origin, and hence are not included in the analysis.

Table VII : Absolute and Percentage Distribution of Migrants into MC and the STs Across the Number of steps of Migration

Place of Immigration (1)	Number of Migrants at various steps: 1 (2)	2 (3)	3 (4)	4and more steps (5)	Total (6)
Madras City (MC)	156 (53.98)	85 (29.41)	32 (11.07)	16 (5.54)	289 (100.00)
Satellite Towns (STs)	131 (62.98)	43 (20.67)	22 (10.58)	12 (5.77)	208 (100.00)
Total in Madras Urban Agglomeration (MUA)	287 (57.75)	128 (25.75)	54 (10.87)	28 (5.63)	497 (100.00)

Table VI-2 Migrants (in MC from Rural and Urban Areas of the Districts of Tamil Nadu and the States beyond Tamil Nadu

Rural Urban origin	No. of steps	Chingle put	Madras City	North Arcot South Arcot	Distant districts of Tamil Nadu	Within State Total	States contiguous to Tamil Nadu	Non contiguous States	Other States Total(8+9)	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Rural	1	15	-	8	37	60	2	1	3	63
	2	4	-	4	18	26	7	-	7	33
	3	3	-	3	9	15	5	1	6	21
	4	1	-	1	5	7	2	-	2	9
	Sub total Rural	23	-	16	69	108	16	2	18	126
Urban	1	8	16	10	40	74	8	1	9	83
	2	2	16	1	14	33	8	4	12	45
	3	-	2	1	5	8	1	2	3	11
	4	-	1	-	5	6	1	-	1	7
	Sub total urban	10	35	12	64	121	18	7	25	146
Total (R+U)		33	35	28	133	229	34	9	43	272

Table VI-3 Migrants in the STs from Rural and Urban Areas of the Districts of Tamil Nadu and the States beyond Tamil Nadu

Rural/ Urban	No. of steps	Chingle-put	Madras City	North Arcot South Arcot	Distant districts of Tamil Nadu	Within State Total	States contiguous to Tamil Nadu	Non contiguous States	Other States Total (8+9)	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Rural	1	16	-	10	41	67	-	-	-	67
	2	2	-	2	13	17	1	-	1	18
	3	1	-	-	9	10	-	-	-	10
	4	-	-	1	3	4	1	-	1	5
	Sub total	19	-	13	66	98	2	-	2	100
Urban	1	12	14	9	24	59	3	-	3	62
	2	2	1	6	10	19	2	-	2	21
	3	2	1	2	3	8	1	-	1	9
	4	2	-	1	2	5	1	-	1	6
	Sub total	18	16	18	39	91	7	-	7	98
Total		37	16	31	105	189	9	-	9	198

Table VI-4 Patterns of Migration

	No. of steps	Those who came from other districts of Tamil Nadu and other States to MC & remained in MC in subsequent steps (P1)	Those from other districts or states first came to STs and moved within MUA in subsequent steps (i.e., either settled in MC or STs) (P2)	Those from other districts or states first came to MC & finally pushed out to STs (P3)	Those who moved within MC alone (origin MC) (P4)	Hetergenous patterns of movements of the migrants who settled in MC (P5)	Heterogenous patterns of movements of the migrants who settled in the STs (P6)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	2	25	2	7	-	8	9
Rural	3	9	1	7	-	10	5
Origin	4	4	1	2	-	5	2
Rural sub-total		38	4	16	-	23	16
	2	17	4	12	9	14	5
Urban	3	4	2	2	1	6	4
Orgin	4	2	1	1	1	4	4
Urban sub-total		23	7	15	11	24	13
Grand total		61	11	31	11	47	29

other districts, other states, MC and the STs etc. in various combinations of these places cover the rest, but no single combination is significant enough to cite it specially.

Summary

It is evident that there is multistep migration but the steps do not indicate any intervening difficulty of reaching MUA. Most of the migrants from outside came to MUA in their first step and got pushed around within MUA. Further, we have seen in subsection 3.1.3 that a substantial number of people from MC have been pushed around within MC and also pushed out to the STs. This might be due to the nature of industrialisation as well as suburbanisation around MC (see Nagaraj and Majumdar, 1982).

With the above background of migratory movements we shall now analyse the socio-economic characteristics, modes of migration, job prospects and reasons for migration of the migrants of different number of steps. To this end, we shall first compare these aspects of migration between one step and multistep migrants. Later in subsection 6.3.1 onwards we shall analyse only the reasons for step migration and the changes in the reasons for step migration between the first and the final steps. As the comparison of reasons between first and the final steps is likely to blur the process of step migration, we have presented a few case studies indicating the changes in reasons and occupation through different steps (Appendix II).

6.2. Comparison of the one step and Multistep Migrants

6.2.1. Occupational Characteristics of the Migrants by Number of Steps

It can be seen from Table VI.5 that the occupations, like 'trading and moneylending', unskilled 'sales and service'

Migrants in MUA by the Number of Steps and Occupation

No. of Steps	Primary Workers	Professional Technical, etc. Workers	Traditionally skilled Occupation	Traders & Money Lenders	Unskilled Sales/ service workers (often in unorg. sector)	Semiskilled workers (often in unorgnl sector)	Skilled prodn. workers (often in org. sector)	Production/ service workers (often in unorg. sector)	Other services	unemployed, students, etc.	Total
1	13 (1.12)	14 (5.20)	17 (6.32)	75 (27.88)	47 (17.47)	3 (1.12)	50 (18.59)	7 (2.60)	46 (17.10)	7 (2.60)	269 (100.00)
2	1 (0.88)	6 (5.26)	5 (4.39)	35 (30.70)	15 (13.16)	2 (1.75)	25 (21.93)	7 (6.14)	13 (11.40)	5 (4.39)	114 (100.00
3	1 (1.96)	4 (7.84)	1 (1.96)	14 (27.45)	9 (17.65)	-	7 (13.73)	5 (9.80)	7 (13.73)	3 (5.88)	51 (100.00)
4	1 (3.70)	4 (14.81)	-	2 (7.41)	4 (14.81)	1 (3.70)	6 (22.23)	3 (11.11)	6 (22.23)	-	27 (100.00)
Total	6 (1.30)	28 (6.07)	23 (4.99)	126 (27.33)	75 (16.27)	6 (1.30)	88 (19.09)	22 (4.77)	72 (15.62	15 (3.25)	461 (100.00)

'skilled production work' and 'other services' are the important ones among the direct (one step) and the step migrants. Relative importance of all these occupations, except 'other services', appears similar among the direct as well as the step migrants. Relative concentration of one step migrants in 'other services' is higher than that among the step migrants. As a whole, occupational characteristics do not differ between direct and the step migrants.

6.2.2. Modes of Migration by Number of Steps

The distribution of the migrants by number of steps and modes of migration is presented in Table VI.6. Dominant modes of migration for both one and multistep migrants are self-induced migration (Mode 1) and chain migration (Mode 2). Among the direct (one step) migrants the proportion that came with contacts from earlier migrants is the largest. The proportion of chain migrants is lower among the migrants of larger and larger number of steps. In contrast, the proportions of direct and step migrants without contact appear similar. Other modes are, though minor, also the ones without contacts (except those commissioned by the contractors). It can be said from the table that the probability of step migration increases if the migrants have no contacts at the places of migration. Alternatively, migrants with contact tend to migrate in one step. This is merely a tendency because the number of migrants at successively higher steps tends to be too small to give significant support to the conclusion.

6.2.3. Job Prospects by Number of Steps

It appears that among the one step migrants though about 46 per cent came with job certainty (fixed up job or assurance of job before migration), also a good proportion (38.85 per cent) came with uncertain job prospects (Table VI.7). Since we know that migration with contacts is signi-

Table VI - 6

No. of Migrants in MUA by Modes of Migration and No. of Steps

No. of Steps	Modes of Migration						
	Migrated without anycontact	Migrated with the help from friends/relatives, etc, who was already a migrant	Migrated with family members/ friend/relatives etc.	Commissioned by a contractor	Migration with a group on their own	Others	Total
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
1.	82 (31.54)	135 (51.92)	25 (9.62)	4 (1.54)	4 (1.54)	10 (3.85)	260 (100.00)
2.	34 (32.08)	52 (49.06)	10 (9.43)	2 (1.89)	3 (2.83)	5 (4.72)	106 (100.00)
3.	15 (34.88)	17 (39.53)	2 (4.65)	-	2 (4.65)	7 (16.28)	43 (100.00)
4.	7 (33.33)	7 (33.33)	4 (19.05)	-	-	3 (14.29)	21 (100.00)
Total	138 (32.09)	211 (49.07)	41 (9.53)	6 (1.40)	9 (2.09)	25 (5.81)	430 (100.00)

Table VI - 7

No. of Migrants in MUA by Job Prospects and No. of Steps

No. of Steps	Job Prospects: Fixed up job before Migration	Firm Assurance of job before Migration	Migrated with the hope of getting a job	Self employment	Others	Total
1	74 (28.46)	46 (17.69)	101 (38.85)	2 (0.77)	37 (14.23)	260 (100.00)
2	44 (41.51)	20 (18.87)	20 (18.87)	2 (1.89)	20 (18.87)	106 (100.00)
3	10 (23.26)	7 (16.28)	10 (23.26)	2 (4.65)	14 (32.55)	43 (100.00)
4	9 (42.86)	6 (28.57)	1 (4.76)	1 (4.76)	4 (19.05)	21 (100.00)
Total	137 (31.86)	79 (18.37)	132 (30.70)	7 (1.63)	75 (17.44)	430 (100.00)

ficant among the one step migrants, perhaps migration with job uncertainty is an expected tendency. In contrast to the one step migrants, multistep migrants have a relatively heavier concentration in assured job prospects. Our data refer to job prospects at the final steps. Hence, it is possible that the step migrants without contacts at the first step of migration came to MUA and migrated later within MUA when job assurance was obtained. This may be inferred indirectly again from the fact that at the final steps the proportion of migrants moving with the hope of getting a job is considerably low. We may conclude that basically one step and the multistep migrants, at their final step moved with job certainty. Some of the one step migrants came with job uncertainty; and among them, those without contact are likely to emerge as step migrants in future and may stop stepping once they are assured a job.

6.2.4. Reasons for Migration by Steps

Reasons for migration at the first step among the direct and the step migrants do not differ from what we had seen earlier in section V. Among the specific reasons, employment and income earning opportunities stand out to be the dominant ones. Unemployment, irregular job, low wages, at the origin and search for permanent employment at the place of migration together fall within these categories of reasons (see Table VI.8). As the relative proportion of the migrants, in these reasons, does not differ among each type of step migrants, we may only say that the basic reasons for migration are similar for most of the migrants.

6.2.5. Concluding Observations

1. Direct and step migrants do not differ substantially in their occupational characteristics and in the reasons for migration.

Table VI - 8

Distribution of the Migrants by Steps and Reasons

No. of Steps	Unemployment & Loss of jobs	Irregular & short duration employment	Low Wages	In search of employment for dependents	To set up business	Permanent employment	Eviction from house	Land sold off	Lack of good housing & high cost of living	To pay off debt	For Education	Others	Total
1 step	71 (26.30)	18 (6.67)	21 (7.78)	5 (1.85)	34 (12.59)	42 (15.56)	4 (1.48)	14 (5.19)	8 (2.96)	2 (0.74)	6 (2.22)	45 (16.67)	270 (100.00)
2 steps	36 (31.03)	4 (3.45)	9 (7.76)	1 (0.86)	9 (7.76)	15 (12.93)	4 (3.45)	2 (1.72)	2 (1.72)	-	4 (3.45)	30 (25.86)	116 (100.00)
3 steps	9 (18.37)	2 (4.08)	3 (6.12)	1 (2.04)	5 (10.20)	7 (14.29)	2 (4.08)	2 (4.08)	-	-	5 (10.20)	13 (26.53)	49 (100.00)
4 steps	6 (22.22)	1 (3.70)	1 (3.70)	-	-	4 (14.82)	-	1 (3.70)	1 (3.70)	-	4 (14.82)	9 (33.33)	27 (100.00)
Total	122 (26.41)	25 (5.41)	34 (7.36)	7 (1.52)	48 (10.39)	68 (14.72)	10 (2.16)	19 (4.11)	11 (2.38)	2	19 (4.11)	97 (21.00)	462 (100.00)

2. Possibility of step migration increases if the migrants move without a contact at the places of migration.

3. One step migrants at their first step and multistep migrants at their final step move with assured job prospects, while some of the one step migrants, perhaps who came with contacts, came with uncertain job prospects also.

Thus, it may be observed that while the migrants of various steps do not differ in terms of occupational characteristics and the reasons for migration, the direct and multistep migrants differ to some extent in terms of modes of migration and their job prospects. An important aspect of the observation 2 above is that one step migrants are basically 'chain migrants' and it shows as to how periodically related migration can be somewhat more stable than those periodically unrelated.

6.3.1. Occupational Characteristics and Reasons for Migration by Various Patterns of Migrations

In this subsection, we shall analyse the main features, such as occupational characteristics and the reason for migration, among the step migrants across various patterns of movement. That is, the features of one step migrants will be left out in this analysis. The patterns of migration, as given in Section 6.1 (Table VI.4), are given as P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4 and P_6, in Tables VI.9 to VI.11. P_1, P_4 and P_5 refer to those who finally settled in MC (at the time of survey) and the rest refer to those who were found in the STs.

6.3.2. Occupational Characteristics of the Step Migrants by Patterns of Migration

Table VI.9 presents the occupational characteristics of the migrants by patterns of migration. It shows that among the migrants who came to MC at the first step and

Table VI - 9

Occupation of Multistep Migrants by various Patterns of Movement

Patterns of Movement	Primary Workers	Professional, Technical, etc. Workers	Traditional ly skilled occupation	Trading & Money lending	Unskilled Sales/service workers (often unorg. sector)	Semiskilled workers (often in unorg. sectors)	Skilled Prodtn/ workers (often in orgn. sector)	Semi prodtn/ service workers (often in unorgn. sector	Other services	unemp. loyd students etc.	Total
From outside MUA to MC at first step and remained within MC in subsequent steps (P_1)	2 (3.28)	2 (3.28)	2 (3.28)	21 (34.43)	12 (19.67)	1 (1.64)	9 (14.75)	5 (8.20)	5 (8.20)	2 (3.28)	61 (100.00)
From outside MUA to the STs at first step and remained within the STs in subsequent steps. (P_2)	-	2 (18.18)	-	2 (18.18)	-	1 (9.09)	4 (36.36)	1 (9.09)	1 (9.09)	-	11 (100.00)
From outside MUA to MC at first and finally pushed out to the STs (P_3)	-	5 (15.63)	-	10 (31.25)	3 (9.38)	1 (3.13)	5 (15.63)	2 (6.25)	5 (15.63)	1 (3.13)	32 (100.00)
Moved within MC only (P_4)	-	-	-	1 (9.09)	-	-	6 (54.55)	-	3 (27.27)	1 (9.09)	11 (100.00)
Heterogeneous patterns of movement and finally settled in MC (P_5)	1 (2.13)	1 (2.13)	3 (6.38)	12 (25.53)	12 (25.53)	-	7 (14.89)	6 (12.77)	3 (6.38)	2 (4.26)	47 (100.00)
Heterogeneous patte of movement & finally settled in the STs. (P_6)	-	4 (13.33)	1 (3.33)	5 (16.67)	2 (6.66)	-	6 (20.00)	1 (3.33)	9 (30.00)	2 (6.60)	30 (100.00)
Total	3 (1.56)	14 (7.29)	6 (3.13)	51 (26.56)	29 (15.10)	3 (1.56)	37 (19.27)	15 (7.81)	26 (13.54)	8 (4.17)	192 (100.00)

remained within MC in the subsequent steps, the important occupational groups are 'traders and moneylenders', 'sales/service workers' and 'skilled production workers'. Among those who got pushed around within MC (P_4), the relatively important occupations are 'skilled production work' and 'other services'. 'Traders and moneylenders' also have moved the same way. With sprawling population from the centre of MC[15] might have attracted the traders and moneylenders to move along. Those who settled in MC with heterogeneous patterns of migration (P_5), among them 'traders and moneylenders', 'sales/service workers', and the 'skilled production workers' are the important groups.

Among those who settled (at the time of survey) in the STs (i.e. patterns P_2, P_3 and P_6) relatively important occupational groups are, 'traders and moneylenders', 'skilled production workers', 'other services' and 'professional, technical workers'. 'Traders and moneylenders' might have followed the skilled workers in production, professionals and the moderate to highly educated 'other service workers'. But the inmigration of these latter occupational groups to the STs could be associated with the process of industrialisation therein. Incidentally, the sales and service workers in these patterns of migration into the STs are almost nonexistent.

From the above, it may be observed that basically the skilled and unskilled migrants have been pushed around within MC in several steps, implying perhaps the impact of rapid urbanisation of MC on the relatively weaker sections. However, MC having a wider base to provide employment for both skilled and unskilled workers, has been able to absorb all these types

---

15. Nagaraj and Majumdar (1982) show that the population of MC has been moving out from the trade and commerce zone (centre) of MC to other areas.

of workers. To the contrary, the growth of specific activity, like 'manufacturing activity', in the STs has drawn large number of educated and skilled migrants. Since we know that the skilled production workers acquired skill after they moved out of their origin, they might have acquired the skill in the process of step migration. We do not have data relating to the process of skill acquiring, but several other studies have noted this process (Connell, et. al, Simmons etc., see subsection 6.4 also).

Though industrialisation worked as an important pull factor in the STs, the process of suburbanisation around MC however small, cannot be ruled out. We shall examine these aspects in the study of reasons below.

6.3.3. 'Reasons for Step Migration by Patterns of Migration'

To capture the process of step migration we have presented the distributions of the step migrants by the reasons at the first step and at the final step (see Tables VI.10 and VI.11). It is clear from Table VI.10 that most of the migrants reported that they migrated to a large extent in search of employment and income earning opportunity. A few migrants in P_3 came in search of business opportunity. Only exception is that a large proportion of those in pattern P_4 moved within MC because of eviction from their houses.

Let us now compare these with the reasons at the final step (Table VI.11). While a large proportion of migrants in each pattern, except P_4, came to set up business at the final step as compared to the first step, even larger proportion in each pattern had reasons 'others' which is non-specific. This implies that some of the migrants who did not plan to start a business at the first step had decided to start one at the final step. Could this be that these migrants, clearly having no skill, failed to enter the

Table VI-10 Reasons at the First Step for Multistep Migration by various patterns of Movement

Patterns of Movement	REASONS												
	Unemployment and loss of job	Irregular and short duration employment	Low Wages	In search of employment for dependents	To set up business	Permanent employment	Eviction from house	Land sold off	Lack of good house and high cost of living	To pay off debt	For education	Others	Total
From outside MUA to MC at first step and remained in MC in subsequent steps (P1)	24 (38.71)	2 (3.23)	4 (6.45)	-	4 (6.45)	5 (8.06)	1 (1.61)	3 (4.84)	1 (1.61)	-	2 (3.23)	16 (25.81)	62 (100.00)
From outside MUA to the STs at first step and remained in the STs in subsequent steps (P2)	2 (18.18)	-	1 (9.09)	1 (9.09)	-	4 (36.36)	-	-	-		1 (9.09)	2 (18.18)	11 (100.00)
From outside MUA to MC at first step and finally pushed out to the STs (P3)	5 (15.63)	2 (6.25)	1 (3.13)	-	5 (15.63)	10 (31.25)	-	1 (3.13)	1 (3.13)	-	1 (3.13)	6 (18.75)	32 (100.00)
Moved within MC only (P4)	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 (36.36)	-	1 (9.09)	-	-	6 (54.55)	11 (100.00)
Heterogeneous patterns of movement and finally settled in MC (P5)	16 (33.33)	1 (2.08)	7 (14.58)	1 (2.08)	2 (4.17)	1 (2.08)	1 (2.08)	-	-	-	4 (8.33)	15 (31.25)	48 (100.00)

Table VI-10 Contd....

Patterns of Movement	Unemployment and loss of job	Irregular and short duration employment	Low Wages	In search of employment for dependents	To set up business	Permenent employment	Eviction from house	Land sold off	Lack of good house and high cost of living	To pay off debt	For education	Others	Total
Heterogeneous patterns of movement and finally settled in the STs (P6)	6 (20.00)	1 (3.33)	-	-	3 (10.00)	6 (20.00)	-	1 (3.33)	-	-	5 (16.67)	8 (26.67)	30 (100.00)

... reasons at the Final step ... step Migrants by various patterns of Movement

Movement	Unemployment and loss of job	Irregular and short duration employment	Low Wages	In search of employment for dependents	To set up business	Permanent employment	Eviction from house	Land sold off	Lack of good housing and high cost of living	To pay off debt	For Education	Others	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
From outside MUA to MC and remained within MC in subsequent steps (P1)	3 (4.85)	1 (1.61)	2 (3.23)	-	15 (24.19)	1 (1.61)	4 (6.45)	1 (1.61)	5 (8.06)	1 (1.61)	1 (1.61)	28 (45.17)	62 (100.00)
From outside MUA to the STs at first and remained in the STs in the subsequent ste (P2)	-	-	-	-	1 (9.09)	-	-	-	1 (9.09)	-	1 (9.09)	8 (72.72)	11 (100.00)
From outside MUA to MC at the first step and finally pushed out to the STs (P3)	1 (3.23)	2 (6.45)	-	-	4 (12.90)	3 (9.68)	-	-	11 (35.48)	-	-	10 (32.26)	31 (100.00)
Moved within MC only (P4)	-	1 (9.09)	-	-	-	-	2 (18.18)	-	2 (18.18)	-	-	6 (54.55)	11 (100.00)
Heterogeneous pattern of movement and finally settled in MC (P5)	4 (8.33)	2 (4.17)	6 (12.50)	1 (2.08)	12 (25.00)	2 (4.17)	1 (2.08)	-	4 (8.33)	-	1 (2.08)	15 (31.25)	48 (100.00)
Heterogeneous patterns of movement and finally settled in STs (P6)	3 (10.00)	2 (6.67)	2 (6.67)	-	3 (10.00)	3 (10.00)	-	-	6 (20.00)	-	2 (6.67)	9 (30.00)	30 (100.00)

organised sector employment? Or, did they plan to accumulate some capital and start a business later? Lacking data on this precise issue we cannot examine these aspects. But the migrants' failure to obtain an organised sector employment, being competed out by the resident population, is not a question without basis /see Deshpande; Joshi and Joshi7. This, however, shows as to how the decisions are revised in the process of step migration.

An important reason, among those who came to MC at the first step and were finally pushed out to the STs(P_3), is the lack of good housing and high cost of living. The most dominant group of migrants in pattern P_3 stated this reason.. This again is a clear indication of suburbanisation around the city of Madras.

6.3.4. Concluding Observations

1. While the traders and moneylenders formed often a significant group in various patterns of step migration within MUA, skilled [illegible] workers got pushed around within MC, and the skilled production workers and educated migrants in 'other services' finally stepped out from MC to the STs. Those who came to MC but stepped out to the STs show a tendency of suburbanisation, though there is a pull factor (like industrialisation) at this end as well.

2. Push factors like unemployment and low income induced migration at the first step into MUA, but later the reason like setting up a business induced them to migrate often within MUA. This may be an indication of the migrants' limited access to organised sector activities. This is a hypothesis that needs to be tested further.

6.3.5. Limitations

Our approach to understand the process of step migration by aggregating the migrants of different number of steps does not really clarify as to why and how step migration takes place. The comparison of reasons between first and the final steps, as done in 6.3.3. was not enough, because the reasons for migration at the intermediate steps were not analysed. Also, we have no clue as to the changes in occupational characteristics through the process of step migration. In order to modify these lapses we shall present a few case studies of step migration in the following Appendix II.

6.4. Appendix II

6.4.1. Case Studies of Step Migration

We shall examine below if the reasons and characteristics of the migrants change through different steps. In this attempt another important issue will be clear, viz., as to how the choice of so-called destination appears in the decision processes. While examining the questions we shall distinguish the migrants as landed and landless.

Our case studies below indicate that there are varied patterns of change in occupational characteristics and reasons for migration. The decision to move from one place to another is conditioned by the changes in the circumstances in the earlier step(s).

6.4.2. Case Studies of the Landed Migrants

1. Rajappa from Kanyakumari district has two acres of land and studied upto the eighth standard. Owing to household trouble and the failure to secure any job outside agriculture in Kanyakumari, he migrated to Kodambakkam

in MC, where he found a job as a cleaner in a hotel. He chose MC as it is a place of known language, Tamil. He finished his SSLC while working as a cleaner in MC. Due to his enhanced educational level he no longer wanted to remain a cleaner in a hotel. He moved to Saidapet to work as a waiter in a hotel. While in Saidapet he completed his technical training from Industrial Training Institute. This enabled him to secure a job as an instructor in a school in Adyar. He then migrated to Adyar. Later, Rajappa having constructed a house in Perungudi moved therein and started a business there. He chose Perungudi, for land was cheaper there.

The case of Rajappa is interesting. As the educational level improved his aspirations and occupation changed. His decision to move from place to place is influenced by the availability of occupation according to changed aspirations due to education and accumulation. From a worker in a hotel to owning a business and a house is a significant change in the occupational characteristics as well as income prospect.

2. Rama Naidu's is a case in contrast to Rajappa's. Naidu came from Nellore owning three acres of land and having education upto eighth standard. He came to Pudupet to start a business. He incurred loss in business at this place. Then he joined a factory as a worker and moved out from Pudupet and settled near the factory in MC. Thus through step migration Naidu's working status changed from owning a business to selling his labour. The last move, near the factory, might be based on minimization of the cost of transport.

3. Karuppia owned four acres of land in Ramanathapuram and had education upto ninth standard. Since cultivation was unprofitable he sold off his land and came to MC for earning a higher income and educating his children. He took four steps before settling at Poonamallee but at each

place he worked as a cook. He moved from one place to another because of higher salary at the place of inmigration and plans to move again if he finds a job with higher salary elsewhere. His decisions to move from place to place is based on the income prospects at the places of inmigration.

None of these three cases had any job assurance in MC. These are not planned moves. They came to MC for survival with no particular occupation in mind and moved from place to place within MUA as and when circumstances changed, that is, when educational levels improved for Rajappa, and Rama Naidu incurred loss in business. In the process, two migrants have changed their occupational characteristics. The reasons for migration also differ from one step to another as between the migrants. For Rajappa it is education and changed aspiration and accumulation at different steps, for Rama Naidu loss in business and finding a job in a factory and for Karuppia it is higher income.

4. Velan a two-step migrant owned four acres of land in Tirunelveli and studied upto secondary level. Following lack of employment at his native place he migrated to MC with the objective of starting a business. But before starting a business he wanted to gain some experience in that. His friends fixed up a job as a shop assistant in a vessel shop in Mannadi. After six years of running the business as a shop assistant he migrated to George Town and started his own business there. Choice of George Town, according to Velan's own estimate, is based on the possibility of a good business as this place is densely populated. Velan has changed occupationally from a shop assistant to a shop owner. His first step in Mannadi was a preparation for the second step to George Town. It therefore appears to be a planned move. While at first step the reason was to gain some business experience, in the second step it was to start a business.

5. Raghavan from Cannanore, Kerala, owned half an acre of land and has education upto the eighth standard. He owned a tea stall in Cannanore. Since business was dull there, he migrated to the Mint area in MC. He came with contacts in the Mint area and wanted to set up a tea stall. On his friends' advice he worked as a worker in a hotel for understanding the ways to run such a business. After three years he left this job and started a tea stall at Tondiarpet. He incurred loss in his business. Later he ran a tea stall in Royapuram on contract. From this contract he accumulated some cash. After the contract period was over, he migrated to Korkkupettai where he set up a tea stall again. He is living in Korkkupettai for the last nine years.

In the case of Raghavan the movement from one place to another is not quite planned but his objective of owning a tea stall is similar to that of Velan. Occupational characteristics in terms of working status changed across places. Reasons for migrating from one place to another are availability of job in a particular trade, loss in business and the possibility of setting up a business.

Thus we see that among the landed step migrants there is a substantial change in the workers' status through steps and the direction of this change differs across migrants. Reasons for stepping from one place to another are also different both across steps and individuals. It is possible that in the three cases where the migrants changed occupation from workers to owning business have accumulated some cash through steps and moved to places where they invested in small business.

The accumulation of some cash at one place and moving to another place where the business will find good market is not unnatural. Even in the case of migrants owning land, the holding being small in every case, accumulation of cash might be a necessary step before setting up a business. Those who

came to stay as workers did not accumulate any cash. As for choice of the places of migration it may be observed in the case studies that this is based on higher income prospects, better business possibilities, housing near the workspot and cheap housing outside MC.

6.4.3. Case Studies of Landless Step Migrants

As in the case of landed migrants reasons, occupation, choice of destination (place of migration) etc differ across steps and individual landless migrants. The following case studies are a reflection of this.

6. Pillai from Guduvancheri, in Chinglepet, with education upto fifth standard came to Idapalayam in MC with his uncle. His uncle found him a job as a moulder in a foundry shop in Idapalayam. After his marriage he separated from his uncle and found an accommodation in Purasawakkam. Later for a cheaper accommodation he moved to Vannarapettai. While at this place, he lost the job as a moulder following the closure of the foundry. Though he found a job in 'ADDISONS', he was evicted from his house in Vannarapettai, and he moved off to Poycroft Road. Very soon 'ADDISONS' also closed down. With the compensation money due to the closure of 'ADDISONS' he started a small shop selling lubricants in Chintadripet. The choice of Chintadripet is based on the availability of the shop floor and cheaper housing.

Pillai changed occupationally from a worker to an owner of a small business, but his decisions to move from one place to another is mainly based on suitable house after marriage, cheaper housing facility, eviction from house and suitable business site.

7. Balakrishnan from Thanjavur was an SSLC. In Thanjavur he was working as a clerk in a theatre. He migrated to Chintadripet in MC, with the help of a friend, in order to

find a better job, preferably a technical one. At this place he was sharing a bachelors' accommodation. As the inmates of this accommodation left one by one rent burden became heavy and Balakrishnan had to leave the place. He found a similar accommodation in Mambalam. Later as he got married, he looked for a low rent accommodation for himself. Meanwhile, with the cash he received in marriage and with his own savings he purchased equipments to start a radio mechanic shop. He moved to Chintadripet again where he lived earlier and started a radio repairing shop. The choice of Chintadripet is based on cheap housing and old contacts, the latter factor helped him in his business.

Though Balakrishnan came to MC in search of a better job, his movements within the city is guided by the availability of living accommodation, low rent house, marriage and business consideration with a particular skill where old contacts matter. Occupational shift is from a clerk at the origin to an owner of a radio repairing shop.

8. V.T. Thomas from Kottayam, Kerala, had education upto eighth standard. He was unemployed in Kottayam and came to Periamedu, in Madras, and learnt tailoring. He lived at this place four years as a worker in a tailoring shop and was evicted from his house. Following the eviction Thomas moved out to Kosapet. As he got married while at Kosapet, he looked for a suitable accommodation which he found in Choolai. While at Choolai, Thomas set up a tailoring shop at Pattalam. He finally migrated to Pattalam to be near his tailoring shop.

Thomas shifted his occupation from a worker in a tailoring shop to owning a tailoring shop where he was self employed. Step migration in this case, as in many other, arose due to required housing facilities. It reflected in his eviction from a house, requirement of a suitable accommodation after marriage and to be near the workspot.

Interesting common aspects of these three migrants are that (i) they earned skill through migration, (ii) one of their steps was due to increase in the family size following their marriage.(iii)In two cases, eviction from house led the migrants to step elsewhere.

9. Mariappan from Tirunelveli studied upto the eighth standard. He first came to somewhere in Mount Road and worked as a shop assistant. As he got a higher pay in another shop at Pudupet he migrated there. In the latter job he accumulated a little cash, then migrated to Choolai and set up a shop there. He chose Choolai, because it provides a good market on his own account.

Thus Mariappan changed his occupation through steps. Higher income and business prospects induced to choose one place over another in succession.

10. Subramanian from Tirunelveli with no education moved first to Nagercoil in Kanyakumari district where he worked as a shop assistant. Later, for a higher pay he moved with a contractor to Pollachi in Coimbatore district. After the contract work at this place was over Subramanian migrated to Mambalam in MC where he again worked as a shop assistant. Income being insufficient in this job he left the shop and started distributing goods to the petty shops. Later, he set up his own shop in Perumalkoil Garden.

Till before the last step, Subramanian's decisions to step from one place to another was mainly guided by the prospects of earning higher income. Before the last step he perhaps accumulated some cash in the goods distribution job which helped him set up his own shop. Occupational shifts are clear across steps.

In the above five cases reasons for step migration differ. While Pillai, Balakrishnan and Thomas moved from one place to another often in search of living house and

business site, Mariappan and Subramanian stepped often for higher income and suitable business site. Common feature of these five migrants is accumulation or acquiring of small cash, through steps, and setting up business, perhaps small.

11. Sundaram moved from place to place within MC only. He is a four-step migrant having education upto SSLC. He is an electrician in 'SIMPSON'. He was brought up at Pudupet. After his marriage he left Pudupet for Otteri. In the former place suitable accommodation for a couple was not available. Later Sundaram moved to Chintadripet to be near the workspot. From Chintadripet he moved to Annanagar with the hope of getting a Tamil Nadu Housing Board flat there. He thought unless he is near the housing site he might not get an allotment of flat. Having failed in this mission Sundaram again came back to Chintadripet. His plan to move further is conditioned by the availability of Housing Board flat.

In Sundaram's case different moves are guided by different reasons. At first, an accommodation for a couple, then to be near the workspot and owning a flat influenced his decision. But in a nutshell, it may be said that he would prefer to be near the workspot, thus minimising the transport cost, unless he owns a living accommodation. His last move is indicative of such a possibility.

12. Mohaideen hails from Tirunelveli town with no education. He was working as a cycle repairer in his own shop in his native place. He first migrated to Thalayuthu in search of a job in a company, presumably in organised sector, as a fitter of cycles. In his estimate Thalayuthu was an industrialised town, so he came to find a job in a factory. However, he failed to get a job in a factory, and worked there in a cycle repairing shop. Since his expectation was not fulfilled at Thalayuthu he came back to Tirunelveli and worked as a cycle repairer again. He attempted once again to improve his fortunes and this time he migrated to

Mambalam in MC. He worked as a shop assistant in this place, though he wanted to become a cycle fitter here also. Since his income at this place was not adequate he further migrated to Pursawakkam within MC, with the same occupation (shop assistant). At Pursawakkam his income was somewhat better than Mambalam, and he acquired a watch, suitcase etc. Later with the help of a friend, Mohaideen found a job as cycle repairer at Besant Nagar at a higher salary. He hopes to save some money and start a cycle repairing shop of his own.

Mohaideen's is a case of step migration where unfulfilled expectation about job, matching his skill, and lack of adequate income drove him from place to place. As he intends to start his own cycle repairing shop, he may move further.

In the last two cases the migrants remained workers. But Sundaram, a worker in the organised sector (SIMPSON), differs from Mohaideen who worked either as a cycle repairer or a shop assistant. Sundaram's moves were due to housing need, for either to be near the workspot or to own a house, whereas Mohaideen's moves were for different reasons. Mohaideen moved from one place to another in search of a job, matching his skill, and higher income. Mohaideen changed his occupation at different steps from owning a cycle repairing shop to a shop assistant to a worker in a cycle repairing shop, whereas Sundaram remained a worker in 'SIMPSON' in all his steps.

6.5. Observations on the Case Studies

6.5.1. Process of Step Migration

In the above case studies we have observed that reasons behind step migration differ both across steps and across individual migrants. Because the reason vary it is not possible to find any unique pattern, except that housing

problem[16] and low income compelled the migrants to move from one place to another, often within MUA. However, two cases, those of Rajappa (case 1) and Mohaideen (case 2) are interesting. Rajappa's improved educational levels at the initial steps changed his job aspirations; as he got the job accordingly, he stepped further. Finally, his accumulation that led him to construct his house and own a business made him to step again. Mohaideen's is a clear case of step migration due to unfulfilled expectation of getting an organised sector employment matching his skill and availability of unorganised sector job at higher salary.

An interesting aspect of the process of step migration is that those who started business in their final step (seven out of 12 cases) have surely accumulated small cash over the years of step migration. This is evident from the fact that a number of them who began as shop assistants finally became owners of small business in unorganised sector. In this respect landowning and landless migrants are likely to have undergone a similar process, because the landed ones hold very small amount of land.

6.5.2. Occupational Shifts

What is uniquely clear from the case studies is that the migrants are occupationally often footloose.[17] Except

---

16. Housing problem includes the problem of eviction from house, requirement of low rent house and required of larger living space due to marriage.

17. Earlier in subsection 3.2.8 we mentioned that the migrants were not occupationally quite footloose. The observation in that case was based on the comparison of occupation of the migrants at their origin and at the place of inmigration. Since we not consider the occupation of the step migrants at each step, the aspect of occupational foot- /be looseness could not /captured, but our case studies /out have brought/clearly this aspect.

for Karuppia (case 3) and Sundaram (case 11) all other migrants have changed their occupation in the process of step migration. Those who started their own business in their final step were often employed as workers in their initial steps. A good number of them worked as shop assistants in the same unorganised sector. These facts imply that the migrants are mobile only horizontally. Their shift in occupation is confined generally within the unorganised activities. The interesting exceptions in this regard are Rama Naidu (case 2) and Pillai (case 6). While Naidu changed from his own business to a worker in a factory, Pillai changed from a factory worker to an owner of a shop.

However, an interesting feature of three landless migrants is that they acquired professional skill in the initial steps (see cases 6-8). Dire need for survival in an alien place must have induced them to acquire some skill.

6.5.3. Choice of Destination

Here we shall choose a few out of 12 cases to illustrate the point that the choice of destination is often objective. Cases of Velan (case 4), Balakrishnan (case 7) and Mariappan (case 9) are important in this regard.

Velan came with a clear objective of starting a business, though in order to gain business experience he worked as a shop assistant. After sufficient experience in business, he chose a densely populated George Town to set up his business. He felt that this place would provide him a good market. Balakrishnan once lived in Chintadripet in one of the initial steps. He came back to Chintadripet, in the final step, to set up his radio repairing shop, since old contacts there would help his business. Mariappan chose choolai to set up his business, because the place was densely populated and thus provided a good market. All this cases showed that

the choice of destination depended on what the migrants want to do and where can they do their best. Since these migrants are in business and chose places based on the demand for their goods and service, they prove our earlier hypothesis that those who are engaged in 'trade and commerce' move along with the movement of population (see subsection 6.3.2.).

VII

Concluding Observations

7.1. We attempted to capture mainly four aspects of migration into and within MUA:

1. The difference in the migrants' characteristics in MC and the STs.

2. The process of migration into and within MUA.

3. The process of step migration in MUA.

and 4. the process of suburbanisation around MC.

7.2. Generally we observed that the migrants from outside into MUA came from both adjacent as well as distant districts. It is natural that the migrants from the adjacent districts - Chingleput, North and South Arcot - came to MUA in good numbers. The migrants from the distant districts are mainly from the dry districts of Ramanathapuram and Tirunelveli. It is understandable that a large number of landed migrants came from dry districts, given that the land is not adequately productive. We have also noted that landed and the landless from these dry districts came almost in equal number. So far as all the migrants are concerned it was observed that the migrants are generally in the working age group. Educationally they are often literates and above. It appears that the migrants

prepared themselves educationally for migration, as evident from unchanged educational characteristics between the places of out-and inmigration.

7.3. Comparison of Migrants' Characteristics between MC and the STs

The percentage distribution of the landed and the landless within MC and the STs appear to be similar. But educationally and occupationally there is some difference between the migrants in MC and in the STs. MC absorbed more illiterates than the STs did. On the other hand, the proportion of those educated above secondary level is higher in the STs, than in MC. The educational differences somewhat get reflected in the differences in occupational characteristics of the migrants in the two places. In MC, the workers in 'trading and moneylending' occupation and the 'sales and service' workers form a higher proportion, in the total workers, than those in the 'skilled production' and 'semi-skilled other services'. The reverse is true for the migrant workers in the STs. In terms of landholdings also the migrants in the STs are better endowed than those in MC.

7.4. Process of Migration

As for the process of migration two sets of factors - those at the (i) outmigrating end and (ii) inmigrating end- have induced migration. Factors that operate at the outmigrating end are generally unemployment, irregular employment, low wages etc. While these reasons apply well to the landless migrants, we observed that lack of irrigational facilities or decline in the water table has induced outmigration from the landed households of the dry districts. In some cases migrants came after disposing off their land. Some of the migrants with traditional skill moved out of their villages following the lack of market for their services. Social values are also observed to be factors behind migration. These results correspond to the earlier studies cited in section I.

At the inmigrating end, i.e., MUA, where job prospects worked as a general basis for migration. A very large proportion of migrants came to MUA with assured or fixed up job. An interesting process at this end is chain or induced migration. We noted that a large proportion came with the help of those who migrated into the place earlier. There is also a good degree of self induced migration, but a large proportion of these migrants had either fixed up job or firm assurance of job in MUA. Those who did not have any job certainty also migrated because of contacts from the migrants of earlier period. Further, there was a small group of migrants who neither had job certainty nor previous contacts. This last group is though likely to be footloose, only 23 per cent of them actually stepped more than once before settling in MUA, where step migration could be an indication of footlooseness.

7.5. Process of Step Migration

A considerable proportion of the total migrants moved into and within MUA in more than one step. Among those who came from outside to MUA distance and the number of steps have no positive correlation.[18] Most of them came in their first step to MUA and moved within MUA in the subsequent steps. Most important among them are the patterns P_1 to P_4.

A comparison of the characteristics of the migrants, job prospects, and reasons for migration between the single and multistep migrants shows no perceptible difference. As for mode of migration, fewer multistep migrants had previous contacts than the single step migrants. Among the multistep migrants a good proportion (about 17 per cent) came in their first step with contact, but later moved without contacts.

---

18. This conclusion is contrary to what is observed by Connell et. al. in various village studies.

Perhaps, the migrants moved straight into MUA in their first step and they needed support from the migrants of earlier periods, but in later moves they had a clear knowledge of job prospects within MUA and could move without contacts.

A comparison of reasons between the first and final steps shows that the migrants moved initially in search of regular employment and higher income. But in the final step they often gave nonspecific reasons. But those who settled in the STs, pushed out to the STs from MC and those who moved within MC, moved in their final step for lack of good housing and high cost of living especially in MC.

7.6. Case Studies on Step Migration

The case studies have shown some interesting processes associated with step migration. We noted that the step migrants were occupationally mobile. Many of these case studies showed that the migrants often began as wage workers, in the unorganised sector, and ended up in owning a business, perhaps small one. Some of the landless migrants have acquired professional skill in the process of step migration who later started their own business. However, most of these occupationally mobile migrants were confined within the boundary of unorganised sector. Those who started as workers and finally owned business had accumulated small cash from their income at various steps.

As for the reasons for step migration housing problems and the opportunities for earning a higher income are found to be most important.

Some of the migrants who set up business at their final step had chosen the places based on the market for their goods and services.

7.7. Suburbanisation

Our sample data show that number of migrants in the STs have moved out from MC. Both resident population of MC as well as those who stepped into MC in earlier steps form this group. One of the reasons for this movement could be the pull factor exerted by the process of industrialisation in the STs. But an alternative process which is more clearly borne out by our data is the process of suburbanisation. A number of migrants, who moved from MC to the STs, gave reasons for migration as lack of good housing and high cost of living in MC.

Further,we find that there are migrants who are pushed around within MC due to lack of housing facilities and high cost of living. An important question to be examined in this context is whether these migrants are at the verge of being pushed out to the STs.

The process of suburbanisation has been analysed with the help of very limited data, and thus requires a further elaborate study.

7.8. Limitations of the Study

The data obtained inour sample survey of migration by its very nature were inadequate to examine some of the relevant processes at both ends of migration. Usually studies in migration consider the differential income at the two ends of migration (Todaro), natural calamities in the villages (Saxena), women migrating due to marriages etc. as the basis for migration. Apart from these, the following important issues need to be tackled in a study of migration.

Through the process of rural-urban migration, the villages often provide subsidised labour to the urban capitalist sector by maintaining the workers during their

infancy as well as old age [Bagchi, (1982), p.247]. Often the reproduction needs of the workers are not adequately met in the villages and that helps the urban capitalist sector to depress the wages of migrant workers [Meillassoux (1979)7]. This requires one to study concretely the extent to which the reproduction needs are met in the villages and how far it forms the basis of rural-urban migration.

The process of subsidization, mentioned above, often works through bloated unorganised sector employment which is directly or indirectly linked to the organised sector activities. Wages in the former sector one often very low as compared to those in the latter sector. This has a political implications for segmenting the urban labour market. Thus a comprehensive study of segmented labour markets and migration should examine the logical links between the conditions in the villages and the process of capitalist development in the urban areas. Perhaps, detailed village-specific and industry-specific studies would clarify these issues.

Similarly the study of urban-urban migration should address itself to answer how far the differential growth of different urban centres and variations in their economic characteristics induce migration.

An important aspect of interstate migration is the segmentation of labour market on the grounds of nationality, caste and language. This helps the very process of capitalist development. A symptomic manifestation of this problem is the 'sons of the soil' movements emerging in different parts of the country [Sengupta (1981)7]. This issue also needs examination.

****

Reference

1. Arizpe, Lourdes (1982), 'Relay Migration and the Survival of Peasant Household' in Safa, Helen I (ed), Towards a Political Economy of Urbanisation in Third World Countries, Oxford University Press, Delhi.

2. Bagchi, A.K., (1982), The Political Economy of Underdevelopment, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

3. Baker, Christopher, (1981), 'Colonial Rule and the Internal Economy in Twentieth Century Madras', Modern Asian Studies, Vol.15, Part 3.

4. Baker, Christopher John, (1976), The Politics of South India 1920-34, Vikas Publishing House, New Delhi.

5. Bharadwaj, Krishna, (1972) 'Notes on Political Economy of Development - The Indian Case', Economic and Politica Weekly, Vol.VII, Nos 5, 6 and 7.

6. Census of India 1961, Special Migration Tables, Madras City Vol.IX, Part X-(11).

7. Connel, John, Dasgupta, Biblab, Laishley, Roy, and Lipton, Michael, (1976), Migration From Rural Areas: The Evidence from Village Studies, Oxford University Press, Delhi.

8. Dasgupta, Biblab, and Laishley, Roy, (1975), 'Migration from Villages', Economic and Political Weekly, Vol.X, No.42.

9. Deshpande, L.K., (1979), Bombay Labour Market, Department of Economics, University of Bombay, Bombay (Mimeo)

10. Ghosh, A, (1961), Calcutta the Primate City, Census of India 1961, Monograph series, Monograph No.2.

11. Joint Research Project Team (JRT) (1980), Rural-Urban Migration and Pattern of Employment in India: Survey of Kanpur, Jullendur and Fatehbad, Institute of Economic Research, Osaka City University.

12. Joshi, Heather, and Joshi, Vijay, (1976), Surplus Labour and the City : A Study of Bombay, Oxford University Press, Delhi.

13. Kula, Witold, (1976), An Economic Theory of the Feudal System, New Left Books, London.

14. Kurien, C.T., and Hug, Abdul, (1980), An Analysis of Internal Migration in Tamil Nadu, Working Paper No.12. Madras Institute of Development Studies, Madras (Mimeo).

15. Kurien, C.T., and James, Josef, (1979), Economic Change in Tamil Nadu 1960-70, Allied Publishers Pvt Ltd., Bombay.

16. Majumdar, Sarajit, and Nagaraj, K., (1982), Inmigration to Madras Urban Agglomeration, Working Paper No.26, Madras Institute of Development Studies, Madras (Mimeo).

17. Meillarsox, Claude, (1979), 'Overexploitation and Overpopulation: the Proletarianisation of Rural Workers' Social Scientist, Vol.7, No.6.

18. Mitra, Asok, Mukerji, Shekar, and Bose, Ranendranath, (1980), Indian Cities: Their Industrial Structure, Inmigration and Capital Investment, 1961-71, Abhinav Publication, New Delhi.

19. Nagaraj, K., and Majumdar, Sarajit, (1982), Growth of Madras Urban Agglomeration, Working Paper No.25, Madras Institute of Development Studies, Madras (Mimeo).

20. Rao, K.R., Rani, K.S., and Murthy, K.R., (1977), 'Migration Experience of Urban Slum-Dwellers', The Indian Journal of Social Work, Vol. XXXVIII, No.1.

21. Roxborough, Ian, (1979), Theories of Underdevelopment, The Macmillan Press Ltd., London and Basingstoke.

22. Salvi, P.V., and Bhoite, H.S., (1969), 'Role of Some Family Factors in Rural Migration', Indian Journal of Social Work, Vol.XXIX, No.4.

23. Saxena, D.P. (1977) Rur-urban Migration in India Popular Pakashan, Bombay.

24. Sengupta, Nirmal, (1981) 'Sons of the soil in Particular ethnic unsurges in general' Human Futures, Vol.4 No.4.

25. Simmons, A., et al, (1977), 'Social Change and Internal Migration', IDRC.

26. Todaro, M.P., (1976) Internal Migration in Developing Countries, ILO, Geneva.

27. Yeswant, T.S., (1962), 'Rural Migration - A Case in Four Ramanathapuram Villages', Agricultural Situation in India, Vol.XVII, No.6.

****

Acknowledgement

We must thank Prof.C.T. Kurien for his helpful comments. Mr.M.S.S. Pandian helped us in processing the data and going through the draft and we are deeply indebted to him. Ms.Dora Quadros, Mr.M.Selvam and Mr.Joshua Verghese helped us at the initial stage of data processing, and the Department of Statistics, Madras Christian College, and the students of the Department spent their valuable time in preparing the sample design and collecting of the data. Our thanks to all of them. We thank Mr.J. Robinson, Ms.M. Vijayakumari, Ms.L. Celine, Mr.S. Parthasarathy and Ms.C. Kalaiselvi for an excellent job of cutting the stencils in a very short period of time and Mr.K.C. Devassy for duplicating the paper. We must also than Dr.P. Radhakrishnan for editorial corrections. However, the errors and ommissions are our sole responsibility.

****