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The liberalization period witnessed the increasing crisis in the agriculture and allied sector that supports a large chunk of the population and subsequently, the slow and gradual displacement of the millions of people from their traditional livelihoods result in increasing underemployment and unemployment in rural areas. This scenario has pushed the people to opt for migration for livelihood expansion. Migration is best understood as one of the strategies adopted by individuals, households or communities to enhance their livelihoods because in general migration has a function of reducing vulnerability – effective migration strategies helps people to reduce the risks of seasonality, harvest failure, etc. Present paper analyzes seasonal migration from remote tribal villages of South Chotanagpur in Jharkhand.

INTRODUCTION

Development economists such as Lewis (1954) and Fei and Rains (1964) considered rural urban migration essential for the economic development of developing countries. However Brown (1991) has viewed internal migration rural to urban areas in many cases to be detrimental as it leads to high rates of urbanization and a number of social and economic problems. However, its positive impact could be through the improved efficiency of labour markets. Migration is also viewed as a response to job opportunities and wage incentives, and to communication or information linkages between places through which incentive differentials become known. Empirically lack of employment opportunities is found to be more important than low wages for out migration. On the other hand, place specific wage rates play a significant role along with distance, population, employment opportunities; etc Brown identified three stages of internal migration, in the first stage, the Early Migrants, who were moved towards modernization, as their origin pushed and oriented towards opportunities of the informal, small scale enterprise labour market, in second stage, migration increased with development. Migration of more well to do social classes is governed by educational and medium sector employment opportunities but migration by less well off social classes maintains its origin push motivation. Rural to urban flow increased with development. And, in third stage migration took place at the advanced level of development. As development reaches a relatively advanced level, migration of classes is oriented towards formal, modern sector employment, etc.

The available evidence for developing countries shows that internal migration in these countries is basically of three types:

a. In most of the developing nations, the largest principal political, commercial and industrial centers are enjoying moderate to rapid growth, both as a result of high fertility and net in migration. However wholesale exodus from rural areas to principal urban areas has not materialized.

b. An amazingly high proportion of the rapidly accumulating ‘surplus population’ in the developing nations appears to be staying in the rural areas and is struggling to exist through more intensive cultivation of the land.

c. Whenever significant industrial and commercial expansion does take place, an immediate stream of migration ensues. Some of this migration results in failure and return to the place of origin.
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CAUSES OF MIGRATION

The analysis of the causes of migration has attracted considerable attention, in particular, the issue of decision to migrate. The decision where to migrate to, and the criteria involved in such decisions. Most of the emphasis of the research, however, has been on the latter aspect of the causal nexus.

It is argued that migration is caused by a series of forces that encourage an individual to leave one place (push) and attract him to another (pull). So if an individual’s needs cannot be satisfied at his present location, then he considers moving elsewhere. On the other hand, despite being satisfied with his present situation, information about greater opportunities elsewhere may persuade the individual to move. For each migration, however, several pull and push forces may be operating and interacting, so that the move cannot be attributed wholly to a single force. Bogue has succinctly summarized these ‘push-pull’ forces as follows:

**Push Factors**

1. Decline in a national resource or in the price paid for it, decreased demand for a particular product or the services of a particular industry; exhaustion of mines, timber or agricultural resources.
2. Loss of employment resulting due to different reasons like mechanization or automation, etc.
3. Oppressive or repressive discriminatory treatment because of political, religious or ethnic origins or membership.
4. Alienation from a community because one no longer subscribes to prevailing beliefs, actions or mode of behavior either within one’s family or within the community.
5. Retreat from a community because it offers few or no opportunities for personal development, employment or marriage.
6. Retreat from a community because of catastrophe – floods, fire, drought, earthquake or epidemic.

**Pull Factors**

1. Superior opportunities for employment in one’s occupation or opportunities to enter a preferred occupation.
2. Opportunities to earn a larger income.
3. Opportunities to obtain desired specialized education or training such as college education.
4. Preferable environment and living conditions – climate, housing, schools, other community facilities.
5. Dependency – movement of other persons to whom one is related or betrothed, such as the movement of dependents with a bread winner or migration of a bride to join her husband.
6. Line of new or different activities, environment or people, such as the cultural, intellectual or recreational activities of a large metropolis for rural and small town residence.

Todaro (1969) in his old model explains this paradox of accelerated rural urban migration in the context of rising urban unemployment in developing countries postulating that ‘migration proceeds in response to urban rural differences in expected rather than actual earning’. In other words, it is lure of the luxuries of urban life that forces the rural poor to resort to outmigration as a sustainable livelihood option.

Several theories and models have been developed by economists to identify the ‘Push’ ‘Pull’ and ‘Pushback’ factors of rural urban migration. Liften (1976), ILO (1966), and Dandekar and Rath (1971) identify poverty in the rural area as the main ‘push’ factor, while the study by Sen Sharma (1997) negates
this view. Bose (1978) finds that the ‘pushback’ factor acts as a deterrent to the fresh flow of migration from rural to urban areas. Singh and Aney et al. (1997) find scarcity of good quality of land in rural areas as a major push factor in rural urban migration. Chakrapani and Mitra (1993) notice a strong negative correlation between employment in rural non household manufacturing sector and rural urban migration and a positive and strong relation between employment in urban non household manufacturing sector and rural urban migration. Sen Sharma (1997) finds rural literacy and employment in the tertiary sector of urban area as the main contributing factor to the phenomena of rural urban migration.

The empirical studies reviewed above evince that rural poverty, literacy, size of operational holdings, employment in non household manufacturing in both rural and urban sector and employment in the urban tertiary sector are the main contributing factors in rural urban migration. However diverse findings of some of the studies necessitate a fresh look at the major ‘push’ and pull factor in rural urban migration.

**REVIEW**

The objective of the Lewis-Fie-Rains (L-F-R Model), which is based on the concept of dual economy comprising a subsistence agriculture sector and a modern urban sector, rural urban migration plays a balancing role by transferring manpower from low income activities of rural sector to higher ones of urban sector and thus, narrows down the rural urban gap.

However, L-F-R model has failed to explain the phenomenon of coexistence of surplus labour in the urban sector with substantial and steady movement of rural workforce to urban areas. The experiences of developing countries like India reveal that the modern sector, due to its relatively slow pace of growth and its pursuit of capital intensive techniques, cannot absorb the natural growth of the urban workforce. Thus, rural urban migration in this country neither results in rapid economic growth in urban area, nor brings about fundamental transformation in rural areas therefore, rural urban migration is now seen as the major factor contributing to the ubiquitous phenomenon of urban surplus labour, as a force that continues to exacerbate already serious urban unemployment problems caused by economic and structural imbalances between urban and rural areas (Todaro, 1969).

**Migration – A Livelihood Strategy**

Many development studies have stressed increasing landlessness, capitalist transformation and the need for poor rural people to leave home villages in search for opportunities elsewhere (McGee 1982; Standing 1985; Breman 1985 and Rubenstein 1992). The liberalization period witnessed the increasing crisis in the agriculture and allied sector that supports a large chunk of the population and subsequently, the slow and gradual displacement of the millions of people from their traditional livelihoods result in increasing underemployment and unemployment in rural areas. Their vulnerability increases as they have meager physical assets, human capital, inability to adapt to the needs of the new economic production methods and the prevailing rural infrastructure deprivations, clubbed with the fact that they largely belong to socially deprived groups (Deshingar and et al. 2006; Fan 2005; Hirway 2001 and Mitra 2003). This scenario has pushed the people to opt for migration for livelihood expansion. In other words, migration is best understood as one of the strategies adopted by individuals, households or communities to enhance their livelihoods because in general migration has a function of reducing vulnerability – effective migration strategies helps people to reduce the risks of seasonality, harvest failure, etc.

Sharma (1997) and Karan (2003) observed that entrenched rural poverty, high population densities and growth rates, skewed access to productive resources and slow economic growth are among the drivers of migration from Bihar, Orissa, Jharkhand, West Bengal and some places in Andhra Pradesh. Many studies (Srivastava 2003 and 1998; Connell et al. 1976 and Mosse et al. 2002) mentioned that historically poor
households migrate extensively searching for livelihoods in several regions of India and the recent studies reconfirmed the fact that migration is a significant livelihood strategy for poor households in several regions of India (PRAXIS, 2002; Mosse et al., 2002; Hirway et al., 1999; Royalty et al., 2001; Srivastava, 1998), especially in the Eastern, Central and Western India which have low productivity agriculture. Census data from some districts in Jharkhand indicate that one out of every two households had a migrant labourer at the beginning of this century.

An enquiry into the pattern of migration (De Haan, 2006) indicates that slightly less poor and somewhat more food secure families migrate less often with the whole family and they send out young men, for relatively short periods and short distance, and combine migration with agricultural work in the home village. The poorer families migrate more often with all members of the family (incidence of women migration is very high among this group) and for longer periods. Whereas for the poorest families migration is the only option and often a reaction to indebtedness, those who are less destitute use migration as a means to reduce vulnerability and for some investment in agriculture. Migration is not a choice for poor people, but the only option for survival after alienation from the land (Connel et al., 1977, Lipton, 1980). Srivastava and Sasikumar (2003) observed that the rate of migration among the landless labourers is out numbering any other bottom of pyramid category in rural India in the last few years. Connel et al. noted from the Indian context that it is not only poverty that causes migration, but also inequality as the Indian Village Studies project in the 1970s found that unequal, and not necessarily the poorest villages had the highest rates of out migration. World Bank (2006) study also mentioned that migration can increase or decrease inequality but on balance migration does not lead to higher inequality.

Meanwhile, the prevailing rural deprivation and widening inequality in the rural socio economic structure, it is evident that rural migration is going to increase largely. The increasing demand for unskilled labourers, that urbanization needs, would be able to absorb a substantial amount of this migrant men and women. It is also estimated that by 2030, near 50 percent of the Indian population would be living in the urban areas (Mathur, 2004). Micro level studies of de Haan, 2000. Rodges and Rodges, 2000 and Sharma et al, 2000 observed the role of rural urban migration, for a long period term, in increasing urbanization in India.

The literature on migration also tends to analyze the spatial aspects, temporal aspects and selectivity of migration. Therefore, while labour migration affects the development process in a number of crucial ways, it impacts first and foremost on the labour market in sending and receiving areas. However, the nature and intensity of migration and its impact would vary with (i) the scale or volume of migration (ii) selectivity among migrants relating to age, sex, education and skill levels (iii) length of time for which the out migrants are absent from their place of origin (iv) the length of stay of in migrants at the new destinations (v) the nature and du ability of ties maintained by migrants with their village / town of origin and (vi) the pre-existing socio cultural structure and ethnicity.

The objectives of this paper are to analyze seasonal migration from remote tribal villages of South Chotanagpur in Jharkhand. Six villages from three districts Gumla, Semdega and Lohardaga were selected from South Chotanagpur region of Jharkhand which has majority of tribal population. The hypothesis of this paper is that:

a. Lack of employment opportunities in remote rural areas
b. Debt trap and depletion of assets and
c. Failure of agricultural crop induces seasonal migration.

Both qualitative and quantitative method has been adopted for collection of data. The quantitative data were generated from 212 sample household selected from six villages of South Chotanagpur.
Migration in Jharkhand

Migration creates condition for deep rooted changes in the social and cultural life of both the migrant community as well as the host community. For over a hundred years, the tribals of Chotanagpur and SanthalPargana regions of Jharkhand, have been steadily migrating out of their homeland in search of livelihood. Because of the development policies of the Government, big dams and industries were established acquiring the lands and forests of tribal’s. The tribal’s are dependent on land and forests for their livelihood. This usurpation caused crisis of livelihood for the tribal’s in Jharkhand, thus the persons displaced were compelled to migrate to urban areas for their bread and butter at very low wages. Women, who play a very important role in bringing up their family and children, are also adversely affected by these development programmes. (Deogharia, 2012)

Though the early history of tribal out migration is obscure, it is generally believed that Jharkhand was the destination of the tribal’s in the early times (ancient and medieval period). This region was relatively isolated from other regions of the country. Different tribes migrated to this region in different periods of time and lived a relatively isolated life free from the interference from the rest of the world. Oraon, the second most numerous tribe of the region entered this area as late as fourteenth century, after the fall of Rohtasgarh fort. With the great out migration of Santhals, the most numerous tribe of the region, from Hazaribag to the Damin-e-koh, which took place in late 18th century, started the modern phase of migration in this region.

Since the early nineteenth century, seasonal and permanent out migration from this area was reported. There is evidence of regular seasonal migration of hill coolies of Chotanagpur to the Bengal districts as early as 1827 during the winter, (post harvesting) months. (Cuthbert, 1847). The extent of migration from this region increased as the years passed. Between 1880 and 1921, a large number of the aboriginals and semi aboriginals migrated from this region. Two major streams of labour migration emanated from this region in this period, one directed to the tea gardens of Assam and the other to the coalmines of Jharia (Mohapatra, 1985) Therewas a regional and ethnic specialization in migration within Jharkhand. The semio aboriginals and landless castes of Manbhum and Hazaribag mostly migrated to the coalfields to Jharia while the tribes like Oraon, Munda, Kharia, Ho and Bhumij of Ranchi, Singhbhum were found to be migrating to both the coalfields as well as tea gardens. The volume of migration to these areas depended on the economic condition of the recruiting districts of this region.

Breman (1985) describes seasonal migration as marginal tribal farmer’s efforts to prevent a slide down in the agrarian ladder. Evidences that are more recent reveal that over a period of time, the intensity of migration in terms of number, duration and distance has increased. This increase in migration can be attributed to both push and pull forces operating on the tribal economy; access failure to food in the village pushes the tribal’s out to seasonally migrate whereas the expansion of labour demand in irrigated agriculture as well as in the urban industrial sectors pull them to migrate in search of higher wages. But such explanations will be partial for, at societal level a complex process operates that governs migration.

Agriculture is the main economic activity for the tribal’s of Jharkhand during normal years. But agriculture does not provide sustenance for the whole year for a sizeable number of households even during normal years. Poor quality of land, insufficient landholdings and low productivity are the main reasons that force households to resort to laboring in and around the villages or migrate seasonally. In abnormal situations about 92% of the households have reported seasonal migration of some of their family members.

Drought or crop failure is one of the major reasons of Migration. Drought affected families, opted for larger out migration both in terms of number of members migrating and duration of migration. Some migrants, in distress, remained outside the village even during festivals like Sarhul, Karma and Diwali.
(Sohrai). Food availability alarmingly reduces during monsoon when food stock depletes and current harvest would reach the hearth after nearly four months. For a large number of poor households forest product becomes staple food. Non availability of fodder and malnutrition resulted in loss of milch animals whereas goat and sheep herds deplete because of additional demand for cash. Borrowings increases, and in order to repay the loans, the intensity of migration, duration of migration and number of family members who would migrate increases.

SEASONAL MIGRATION FROM TRIBAL VILLAGES OF JHARKHAND

Our study analyzed the asset structure of the migrant samples. In a resource poor economy where the concept of asset are synonymous to possession of animal and silver, we find that asset position of migrants is significantly poor compared to non migrants (Table. 1). The evidences relating to drought indicate that a social process of indebtedness, repayment, short term land transaction, and migration starts when savings are not enough to sustain the current consumption.

### TABLE.1, Status and the Resource Position of Migrant And Non-Migrant Sample House Holds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non Migrant House Hold</th>
<th>Migrant House Hold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of Family</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male workers/House Hold</td>
<td>2.2/F</td>
<td>2.4/F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female workers/ House Hold</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita land (acre/House Hold)</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver (kg./House Hold)</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of farm(acre/Household)</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of holding irrigated</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of land due to drought / Failure of Monsoon</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food consumption as % of normal 2009 – 10</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 – 11</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of households migrating</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of family members migrating</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants per household</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration Intensity (man month)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total House Holds</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The seasonal migration resulted in about 20 to 33 % of family members remaining out of the village for 4 to 9 months (Table.1) Females usually migrate along with the male in the area the percentage of female migration was about 43 and 50 % of total migration. But the high female migration is not abnormal, (Mosse et al., 2002, Sah, 1999; Breman, 1996) have also found that migration of family group in order to maximize the productivity of their labour is quite common among tribal’s.
The movement generally is organized not as individual migrants but is in the form of a close kin network of families. A close relative, like brother or cousin, provides information about labour demand, wage rate and living conditions prevailing at the destination. The migrants, in order to find work especially in distant locations, form a group of 5-6 families that stay together. One member would come back to the village to look after the remaining family members of the group. He replenishes the food grain stocks and other supplies. The accumulated savings are remitted once a month, at least, this way. This person, who brings the savings back to the respective families of the group, has also an important task of meeting the sharecroppers who manage their land in their absence.

The remittance back home depends on the extent of migration a family has, the number of days the migrants could find employment, and cost of stay at the destination. Household income and savings from migration are significantly higher if total number of migrants was more. However, the income and savings across different size class of holding is not significantly different (Table 2). On an average, a migrant family earns an additional sum of Rs. 11,160 per year from migration. After meeting the day to day expenditure at the destination and some purchase (clothes, shoes, transportation expenses, etc.) the net savings accrued due to migration was about Rs. 5,984 per family.

### TABLE 2. Sizewise Distribution of Income and Savings of Sample Migrant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of holding</th>
<th>Additional Income / year</th>
<th>Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>6,352</td>
<td>2,407 (111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>11,189</td>
<td>6,867 (65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>13,304</td>
<td>6,540 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>11,160</td>
<td>5,984 (212)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures in parentheses are the number of households.

There are, however, a few households which reported permanent out migration of their close relatives in the last 20 years. The proportion of such households is 13 per cent.

Absence of good credit support is seen to be the major cause of migration, at least of distress type. However, in the case of the resource poor (i.e. those with limited land as well as irrigation resources), migration is clearly a more effective option because of the limited ‘credit worthiness’. In fact, migration in a dynamic context might help in enhancing the credit worthiness, especially by improving the repayment schedule among these households. This would imply that given the limited land base and the uncertainty associated with the stream of income flowing from the land based activities, migration becomes inevitable for most of the poor households. A ‘good’ credit support could reduce the burden of migration, whereas a ‘bad credit’ system might increase it. But credit support per se can hardly be a substitute for migration unless both the household’s resources base and the corresponding credit worthiness are enhanced.

### ANALYSIS

Linear regression analysis taking total person months of migration from the household as dependent variable has been used in this paper to find the different correlates of migration. The variations in intensity of migration across households is explained by variations in the following explanatory variables: family size, dependency ratio of the family, depletion of family assets like silver in order to borrow, depletion of own agricultural land due to drought, bullock loss, and cereal consumption during rainy season as percentage to normal cereal consumption. The regression analysis is done for all the households irrespective of the status of migration, (dependent variable taking value zero for no n migrant households), as well as for
the 60 migrating households. About 33 % of the total variations of the dependent variable are explained by the explanatory variables when all households were considered in the analysis. On the other hand, the explanatory power improves if the analysis is done only for migrating households. Over 57 % of the total variations in intensity of migration amongst the migrating households are explained by the explanatory variables considered. We had considered land holding and expenditure of the households as explanatory variables but the variations in size of landholding and variations in total expenditure of households do not emerge as significant explanatory variables in the analysis. This indicates that during an abnormal year larger agricultural land could not contain seasonal migration. What these findings, however, reconfirm is that unless a critical minimum area is available in dry land conditions, many of the households even with relatively larger cropped area but without enough credit worthiness or savings to meet the implications of a shock like crop failure, may have to resort to migration.

TABLE 3. Factors (Explanatory Variables) Affecting Intensity Seasonal of Migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>Explanatory Variables</th>
<th>Within households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_1$</td>
<td>Size of family</td>
<td>0.994**(III)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_2$</td>
<td>Dependency Ratio</td>
<td>-2.3125***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_3$</td>
<td>Change in silver possession</td>
<td>-1.725***(I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_4$</td>
<td>Change in own land</td>
<td>4.125*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_5$</td>
<td>Change in bullock possession</td>
<td>4.446***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_6$</td>
<td>Gap in expenditure</td>
<td>4.495***(II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R bar Sq.(percent)</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.76***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The regression equation is

$$Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + b_5X_5 + b_6X_6$$

Where $Y$ = migration intensity in person months per household.

$X_1$ = Number of family members

$X_2$ = Percentage dependent to total members in the household

$X_3$ = Silver position today – silver possession 5 years back in kg.

$X_4$ = land today in acres - land 5 years back

$X_5$ = number of bullocks today - number of bullocks 5 years back

$X_6$ = \((\text{Expenditure today} \times \text{Expenditure in normal times}) \times 100)/\text{Expenditure today}\)

The following explanatory variables are coded as:
$X_2 = $ dependent members 1upto 40%, 2.40-60% and 3->60%

$X_4 = $ agricultural land loss 1 – yes 0 – No

$X_5 = $ bullocks loss 1-yes 0-No

$X_6 = $ Expenditure gap from normal, increase 0 up to 10% reduction 1,10-20% 2, and >20% reduction 3

$a,b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4, b_5, a_2$ and $a_3$ are parameters of the equation and $e$ is error term and

i) The correlation between different explanatory variable is less than 0.3

ii) ***, ** and * indicates level of significance at 1, 5 and 10 per cent, respectively

iii) Importance of explanatory variable based on beta coefficient.

The above analysis also reveals that in distress situations, family with larger members could support large out migration for more months than smaller families. Other factors remaining the same, as dependents (old and young) increase in the households, the intensity of migration reduces. This is not surprising for, with high dependency ratio, larger work force will be needed to work on depleted agriculture as well as looking after the dependents. This is a negative imperative of the low workforce in the family those who have lost large production due to drought, have larger intensity (number of migrants as well as duration of migration) of migration. The consumption behavior during a shock is revealing; the findings indicate that those households that had not resorted to migration during the reference year were households whose gap in total expenditure compared to normal was higher.

More migrants from a family and migration for longer duration tend to help in making households expenditure in distress period towards normal. But amongst the migrant households, variations in consumption gap are not large; as the intensity of migration supports food consumption, the variations are relatively small. Although significant in explaining migration, the expenditure gap amongst the migrant households is not even one of the three important variables (Table.3). On the other hand larger the depletion of family assets, the larger would be the intensity of migration from the family.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

The above analysis identifies the individual factors that have influenced the migration. However it is interesting to note that it is factors that have influenced the migration. The result of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) reveal that interaction between (a) size of family and expenditure gap (b) dependency ratio of family and bullock loss and (c) size of family and dependency ratio have significantly influenced the migration intensity. Dependency ratio and bullock loss etc., though statistically significant have no impact in governing the migration. What matters are the combined effects of these? For example, it is neither the size of family nor the level of expenditure gap alone that has serious significance in governing the migration pattern but if large families also have large expenditure gap then the intensity of migration increases dramatically.

The findings relating to pattern of migration can be summed up as follows (a) seasonal migration in the study villages is forced by access failure to food and failing agriculture. The more the unsustainability in agriculture, the more is seasonal migration; (b) average migration is about 2.3 members per household, and such households that resorted to migrate, remain out for about 13 to 18 man months per households (c) the remoteness of the area creates paucity of off farm employment in the nearby areas, forcing the migrants to move to agriculturally vibrant Punjab and Western U.P. (d) migration is more for survival rather than for supporting capital formation (e) female migration is as high as male migration (f) migration is a group activity which attracts households in distress taking certain decisions – relating to choice of destination movement, stay and coming back between to look after remaining family members in the village – together.
Bulk of migrants from the study villages is engaged in on farm employment. In most distressed situations, they work on farms as contract labour family for whole year in tea gardens of Assam. However 25% of the migrants move to the near by town and work as a coolie or a rickshaw puller in the nearby urban centre like Ranchi.

Our study reveal that seasonal migration becomes inevitable, during a slack season, in order to have command on resources to improve food consumption and to meet the non food expenditure of the remaining members in the village, it is inevitable that some members of the affected household must migrate. While the income generating processes like operational area, access to employment in the nearby areas, better access to food are able to restrain the intensity of seasonal migration, but these process during a consecutive period of drought create market failure for individuals both as producers as well as consumers. But the migration. It provides access to additional capital and knowledge for investment not in irrigation, new inputs and agricultural technology.

Seasonal migration also results in short term land transactions like sharecropping, fixed rent and land mortgage. Some market institutions like labour and credit markets are well developed in the region. But in the absence of land market, the land related institutions working for bringing tenant and owner together have developed. These institutions have come up to minimize the cost of negotiation agriculture under resource constraints. The main role of short term land transaction is not only to share the risk of farming but it also optimizes labour use under a shock poor quality of land and the need to move out and engage the family in some economic activity other than agriculture, forces such land transactions. The importance of such land transactions in changing the migrant family’s position in social hierarchy would be worth discussing.

Tribal migration in search of employment has been a long tradition. Recent evidences reveal that the intensity of migration has increased over the years. Migration from tribal areas is not uniform some locations have large seasonal migration whereas some locations have relatively less migration. Both lack of employment opportunities and failing agriculture superimpose each other in forcing migration. But failing agriculture is relatively a more dominating factor than remoteness in explaining the migration. Although, in recent past migration has been caused by harvest failure, a shock can activate a complex socio economic process leading to migration. Apart from depletion of milk animals, reduction in the availability of food and fodder, increased debts and increased intensity of seasonal migration, the households under shock also face serious non economic problems like withdrawing children from school, inability to settle hospitalization bills, etc. Borrowings from traders located in the markets increase. The intensity of migration seems to have strong links with borrowings for meeting the current consumption needs, to repay the loan, the migration increases. Seasonal migration does supplement investable surplus when cash needs are more and the sources of institutional borrowings are few. In fact, credit and migration work as a supplement as well as substitute in the remote tribal society.

Evidently, in abnormal years larger agricultural holdings are unable to neutralize the risk of harvest loss. Unless a critical minimum area is available, a household with relatively large cropped area but without enough savings needs to resort to migration. Interactions of factors like large family, higher expenditure gap, lower dependency ratio, larger asset losses and thus larger borrowings, result in increasing the intensity of migration. More migrants for longer duration from a family help in sustaining food consumption of the remaining members to normal during bad agricultural years. Consequently, households that do not resort to migration have larger gaps in food consumption. Migration also induces short term land transactions like sharecropping, fixed rent and land mortgage. This not only reduces the risk of farming but also optimizes the efficiency of family labour. Migration in the absence of a sustainable livelihood has become unavoidable in remote rural areas.
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