Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry

Available online at www.phytojournal.com

TV Kumar
PG Student, Dept. of Extension
Education, Assam Agricultural
University, Jorhat, Assam, India

U Barman
Professor, Dept. of Extension
Education, Assam Agricultural
University, Jorhat, Assam, India

Profile characters of out migrants rural youth of Assam

TV Kumar and U Barman

Abstract

Migration is the movement of people from one geographical location to another in a given period of time. Assam is predominantly a rice centric agricultural state. The youth who are living in rural areas also mostly depends on agriculture. However, presently, a trend is observed that rural youths are now reluctant for farming activities and looking for alternate livelihood sources. Because of that they are moving out from rural to urban areas, mainly for non-farm livelihood activities. This also leads to large scale interstate out migration of rural youths from Assam. The study on profile characters of out migrants rural youths of Assam was conducted with 150 respondents. The respondents were rural youths of Assam migrated to Hyderabad and worked in unorganized sector. The Snow ball technique was applied to select the respondents. The study revealed that at the time of migration mean age was 22.04 years and at the time of interview mean age was 25.64 years. A majority (49.33%) of the respondent's formal education was up to high school level and 89.34 percent were belonged to marginal farmers. Total half of the respondents (50.00%) were motivated by family members, and 36.67 per cent (36.67%) of the respondents were motivated by friends/relatives for out migration.

Keywords: Interstate out migration, rural youth, snow ball technique, unorganized sector, alternative livelihood sources

Introduction

Migration involves the (more or less) permanent movement of individuals or groups across symbolic or political boundaries into new residential areas and communities (Oxford University Press, 1998). Migration (human) is the movement of people from one place in the world to another for the purpose of taking up permanent or semi-permanent residence, usually across a political boundary. People can either choose to move ("voluntary migration") or be forced to move ("involuntary migration"). Migrations have occurred throughout human history. Migration occurs at a variety of scales: intercontinental, intra continental, and inter-regional. One of the most significant migration patterns has been rural to urban migration—the movement of people from the countryside to cities in search of opportunities (National Geographic Society, 2005). According to UN-DESA and OECD (2013) world migration stock up to 2013 was 231.5 million. Based on newly available census data, the stock of international migrants was estimated at 247 million in 2013, significantly larger than the previous estimate of 232 million, and was expected to surplus 250 million in 2015 (World Bank, 2013) [13].

Rural to urban migration is a response to diverse economic opportunities across space. Historically, it has played a significant role in the urbanization process of several countries and continues to be significant in scale, even though migration rates have slowed down in some countries. (Lall et al., 2006) [9].

Kyaing (2013) [8] observed that 27.70 per cent (27.70%) of the migrants were aged between 50 and 59 years. The second highest percentage can be seen in the age-group of 40-49 years 22.50 per cent (22.50%), followed by age group of 30-39 years 10.40 per cent (10.40%), then least were of age group of 80-89 years 2.95 per cent (2.95%). Singh et al. (2011) [16] revealed that most of the migrants 75.00 per cent (75.00%) from both Uttar Pradesh and Bihar were literates and only 25.00 per cent (25.00%) of the total migrants from these states were illiterates.

Present study was carried out with following objective.

- To describe some selected profile characteristics of out migrant

Materials and Methods

The Research design of the present study was "exploratory study" and the study was conducted in Hyderabad city of Telangana state during 2015-2016. A multi stage sampling design with the snow ball technique was followed in the present study. To obtain the information and response from the present study, total 150 respondents were selected by

Correspondence
U Barman
Professor, Dept. of Extension
Education, Assam Agricultural
University, Jorhat, Assam, India

following snow ball technique. Respondents were rural youth of Assam who migrate to Hyderabad for livelihood and engaged in unorganized sectors/own business. The data were collected from the respondents by the investigator himself approaching each and every respondent personally and interviewed with the help of interview schedule. The collected data were coded, tabulated and analyzed in accordance with the objectives of the study by using appropriate statistical procedures like calculating frequencies, percentages, standard deviation, mean and class interval

Results and Discussion
The findings of the present study have been discussed in the following heads.

Selected profile characters of interstate out migrant:
1. Age
The respondent's age divided into two categories i. Age at the time of out migration and ii. Age at the time of interview.
The table 1 shows that, majority (63.33%) of the respondents age at the time of migration was 21 to 24 years of age, followed by 20.66 per cent were in 18-21 years of age group and 16.00 per cent of the respondents were found in 24 to 27 years age group. The table 1 shows that, majority (86.00%) of the respondents present age was 23 - 27 years of age, followed by 11.34 per cent were in 27 - 31 years of age group and 2.66 per cent of the respondents were found to be 31 – 35 years of age.
From the results obtained on age at the time of out migration, it can be concluded that the respondents 21 to 24 years migrated more (63.33%) at early age. One of the reasons for above trend might be due to the fact that young people were not interested in study, wanted alternative jobs and prefer to work in cities. The respondents who belonged to 18-21 years of age group (20.67%) migrated to metro cities for same reasons like employment and business. These results clearly shown that the out migration mostly appeared in youth at early stages. The results conformity with the results of Chandan (2006) [1], Singh et al. (2011) [16].

2. Education
The table 1 shows that, majority (49.33%) of the respondents had completed education up to high school level followed by middle school level (16.67%). Respondents with primary school level were 15.33 per cent (15.33%), followed by illiterate 12.00 per cent (12.00%), and higher secondary 6.67 per cent (6.66%) of the respondents.
Most of the respondents (49.33%) had formal education up to High school level. If we look back to age, most of the respondents were migrated at their early stage. The economic condition of the respondent family, lack of interest to continue study might influence/compel them to search jobs. For that purpose they might move out of the villages for job and better wages. Because of that they might ultimately migrate to other states. The finding is in conformity with the results of Singh et al. (2011) [16], Kyaing (2013) [8].

3. Gender
The table 1 shows that, majority (92.67%) of the respondents was male, followed by 7.33 per cent (7.33%) were female at destination.
Initially, male was migrated, and later, in case of few, some female family members also migrated to join with their family at destination. After migration some of them also worked at

destination. The finding is in conformity with the results of Kumar et al. (1998) [7].

4. Marital status
The table 1 shows that, majority (95.34%) of the respondents was unmarried at the time of out migration. Only 4.66 per cent of the respondents were married at the time of out migration.
It was obvious since most of the respondents migrated at their early age. In case of Assamese society, traditionally their age is early to get married. The finding is in conformity with the results of Gupta (1988) [6], Sidhu and Rangi (1998) [15].

5. Family type at source
The table 2 shows that, majority (52.00%) of the respondent's family type is nuclear, and 48.00 per cent (48.00%) of the respondent's family is joint type at source.
From the results of family type at source it can be concluded that more than half (52.00%) of the respondents were migrated from nuclear family. Through the joint family, the numbers of migrated respondents were also not low (48.00%). The higher out migration occurred in nuclear family. The results is in conformity with the results of Sidhu et al. (1997) [14].

6. Size of family at source
I. At the time of out migration, II. Present family size at source
The table 1 shows that family size at the time of out migration, majority (82.00%) of the respondents family size was 4 to 6 members and 15.34 per cent (15.34%) of the respondents family size was 6 to 8 members followed by 2.66 percent (2.66%) of the respondents family size was 8 to 10 members at source place.
The table 1 shows that present family size at source, majority 96.66 per cent (96.66%) of the respondents have family size ranging from 4-6 members and 3.34 per cent (3.34%) of respondents have family size ranging from 6-8 members.
From the results of family size at source at the time of out migration and at the time of interview of the respondents, it can be concluded that majority (82.00%) of the respondents have family size ranging from 4 to 6 members in family, but this was only before migration, present situation was changed other family members of respondents come out from their families family size automatically decreased. It was observed that most of the respondents migrated from family size ranging from 4 to 6 members, in this case the economic condition of those families might be a reason for their interstate out migration for more money. The results is in conformity with the results of Kumar et al. (1998) [7], Osondu and Ibezim (2013) [11].

7. Monthly income at destination
The table 1 shows that, majority (54.66%) of the respondents monthly income was Rs. 10,000 to 12,000 followed by 35.34 per cent of the respondent's monthly income was Rs. 12,000 to 14,000 and 10.00 per cent of the respondent's monthly income was Rs. 14,000 to 16,000.
The respondent was earning good monthly income. They told during the interview time that with less hard work they are earning good wages at destination place and most of the respondents are thinking to settle permanently at destination place. If they settle permanently at destination, it may create problem to this Assam state through the loss of young workers, loss of trained or skilled young persons. This type of

out migration may bring economic, social or political problems at the source. The results is in conformity with the results of Osondu and Ibezim (2013) [11].

8. Annual family income of the respondent before out migration

The table 1shows that, majority (58.00%) of the respondents level of annual income range was Rs. 40,000 - 50,000 followed by 24.67 per cent (24.67%) of the respondents level of annual income range was Rs. 50,000 - 60,000, and 17.33 per cent (17.33%) of the respondents level of annual family income range was Rs. 30,000 - 40,000.

The majority (58.00%) of the respondent's annual income was Rs. 40,000 - Rs. 50,000, they got average Rs. 3917 per month at source (mean annual income 47010). It was very less money to run their family at source, so the respondents decided to take the decision to migrate metro cities for better wages. The results are in conformity with the results of Santosh (2014) [13].

9. Motivation source for out migration

The table 1 shows that, half of the respondents (50.00%) were motivated by family members, and 36.67 per cent (36.67%) of the respondents were motivated by friends/relatives for out migration. For some other respondent's motivated source were job contractors (10.67%) and 2.66 per cent (2.66%) of the respondents were motivated by newspaper/T.V towards out migration.

From the results it was found that for half of the respondents' (50.00%) source of motivation was a family member. The reason behind this might be that with less household income at source, their family might found it difficult to maintain a livelihood. So this reason, family member of the respondents might encourage them to migrate to cities for better wages. The results is in conformity with the results of Srivastava and Sai kumar (2003) [17].

10. Nature of job done by the respondent before migration

The table 1 shows that, majority (64.00%) of the respondents nature of job was farming before migration. About 15.34 per cent of the respondents nature of job was agricultural labour, 18.00 per cent (18.00%) of the respondents nature of job was skilled work (like electrician, plumber), 2.66 per cent (2.66%) of the respondents nature of job was own business before migration.

From the results of nature of job done before migration, it can be concluded that most of the migrant's nature of job was farming before migration. The probable reason for the out migration might be that rice centric agriculture is non-remunerative particularly for small and marginal farmers and migrated for doing non- agricultural work with an expectation of high wages and throughout the year secured employment. This finding is in conformity with the results of Osondu and Ibezim (2013) [11] found in their study that farming was the major occupation of 63.30 per cent of the respondents.

11. Nature of job done after out migration

The table 1 shows that, majority (61.33%) of the respondents was working as private security guards, 28.67 per cent (28.67%) of the respondents were working as daily wage labour in construction field, 8.67 per cent (8.67%) of the respondents working as skilled labour like electrician, only 1.33 per cent (1.33%) of the respondents had maintaining their own business at destination.

From the results it can be concluded that a majority (61.33%) of the respondents were working as private security guards. According to them, they were receiving a good salary (average Rs.12, 237), so the respondents satisfied with this job. They also expressed their satisfaction with this job because the job is less laborious and standing in the A.C shopping malls was quite comfortable. Some (28.66%) of the respondents worked as daily wage labour in the construction field, this job consisted with heavy work and working extra hours but respondents getting 2 kgs of rice, dal and oil from the contractors per 15 days of interval, and the wages of Rs. 350 per day, so they were satisfied with these facilities. This finding is in conformity with the results of Deshingkar (2006) [4].

12. Amount of money sends to home per month

The table 1 shows that, majority (52.66%) of the respondents sends Rs. 3000 – Rs. 5000 per month to home, 35.34 per cent of the respondents sends Rs. 5000 – Rs. 6000 per month to home and 12.00 per cent of the respondents sends Rs. 1000 - 3000 per month money to their home.

The majority (52.66%) of the respondents sent Rs. 3000-Rs. 5000 per month to their home because the respondents' family income was less at source, and their family depends basically on migrated respondents' income. Some (35.33%) of the respondents sent Rs. 5000 - Rs. 7000, because they were getting good wages per month at the destination. About 12.00 per cent (12.00%) respondents sent a less amount of money (Rs. 1000 to Rs. 3000) because respondents' income at destination was less and an expenses at destination was high. This finding is in conformity with the results of Chawla (2000) [2].

13. Caste

The table 1 shows that, majority (28.00%) of the respondents belongs to OBC caste, 24.67 per cent (24.66%) of the respondents belongs to MOBC caste. And 22.66 per cent (22.66%) of the respondents belongs to general category. About 21.33 per cent (21.33%) of the respondents belonged to SC caste, 3.34 per cent (3.34%) of the respondents belonged to ST caste.

From the results of the caste of the respondent it can be concluded that a majority respondents belonged to OBC, MOBC, SC, and a general category (96.66%). It was found that respondents belonged to ST migrated in a less proportion. ST people are indigenous, and they might have some coping mechanism through which they were maintaining their livelihood without migration. This finding is in conformity with the results of Choudhary (2000) [3].

14. Land holding of the family

The table 1 shows that, majority (89.34%) of the respondents was marginal farmers, 9.33 per cent (9.33%) of the respondents were small farmers, and only 1.33 per cent (1.33%) of the respondents belonged to semi medium farmers. The majority (89.34%) of the respondents were marginal farmers, with land holding size less than 1 ha. the amount of land was not sufficient for the respondents for livelihood. Because of this reason they might left farming and migrated to metro cities for better livelihood. Some (9.33%) of the respondents were small farmers with land holding size was 1 to 2 ha, with this land holding size also farming was not profitable, so the people migrated to urban areas. This finding is in conformity with the results of Deshingkar and Start (2003) [5].

Conclusion

As agriculture is one of the most promising sectors for rural youth employment, Assam governments must prioritize investments and programs in irrigation, water resource management, and improved agricultural practices in order to expand young rural farmers' capabilities to produce food and conserve the land's natural resources while providing them with the skills and abilities to increase their rural incomes. Diversification of agriculture is better idea to control the migration because with less existing land of small and marginal farmer's rice centric agriculture not profitable so, government should encourage the small and marginal farmers to grow remunerative crops instead of rice. Government should help the rural youth for establishing their own enterprises. It is necessary to provide training, support and guidance for all those occupations which any skill based like carpenters, cobblers, welders, blacksmiths, masons, nurses, tailors, weavers etc. Through Skill India programme it may be done. Provision of appropriate support to rural youth livelihood activities and the strengthening of access of young men and women to technical and financial services as well as access to market information is vital for expanding rural employment opportunities

Table 1: Frequency distribution of respondents according to their profile characters (n=150)

S. NO	Independent Variables	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
1	Age at the time of migration	18-21	31	20.67
		21-24	95	63.33
		24-27	24	16.00
2	Age at the time of interview	23-27	129	86.00
		27-31	17	11.34
		31-35	4	2.66
3	Education	Illiterate	18	12.00
		Primary school level	23	5.33
		Middle school level	25	16.67
		High school level	74	49.33
		Higher secondary	10	6.67
4	Gender	Male	139	92.67
		Female	11	7.33
5	Marital status	Unmarried	93	62.00
		Married	57	38.00
6	Family type at source	Nuclear	78	52.00
		Joint	72	48.00
7	Size of family at source	4 to 6	123	82.00
		6 to 8	23	15.34
		8 to 10	4	2.66
8	Monthly income at destination	10,000 - 12,000	82	54.66
		12,000 - 14,000	53	35.34
		14,000 - 16,000	15	10.00
9	Annual family income	30,000 - 40,000	26	17.33
		40,000 - 50,000	87	58.00
		50,000 - 60,000	37	24.67
10	Motivation source	Family members	75	50.00
		Friends/Relatives	55	36.67
		Job contractors	16	10.67
		Newspaper/T.V	4	2.66
11	Nature of job done by the respondent before migration	Private Security guard	92	61.33
		Skilled labour (electrician, plumber)	13	8.67
		Own business	2	1.33
		Daily wage labour in construction field	43	28.67
12	Amount of money sends to home per month	1,000 - 3,000	18	12.00
		3,000 - 5,000	79	52.66
		5,000 - 7,000	53	35.34
13	Caste	General	34	22.66
		OBC	29	28.00
		MOBC	37	24.67
		SC	32	21.33
		ST	5	3.34
14	Land holding size	Marginal	134	89.34
		Small	14	9.33
		Medium	2	1.33

Reference

1. Chandan KS. Remittances and Sustainable livelihoods in semi-arid areas. Asian developmental Journal. 2006; 13(2):73-92.
2. Chawla KS. Migrant labour better off in Punjab. The Economic Times, the 7th August, Bennett, Cole man and Co Ltd, Mumbai, 2000.
3. Choudhary JN. A study on migration, employment and labour productivity in agriculture of Bihar Plain, Department of Agricultural Economics, Rajendra Agricultural University, Bihar, 2000.

4. Deshingkar P. Internal migration, Poverty and Development in Asia. ODI Briefing Paper No. 11, October, 2006.

5. Deshingkar P, Daniel Start. Seasonal migration for livelihoods in India: Coping, accumulation and exclusion. Overseas Development Institute. Working Paper-220. Retrieved 23 January 2015 from http://www. odi.org. 2003

6. Gupta AK. Sociological implications of rural to rural migration, Vohra Publishers and Distributors, Allahabad, India, 1988.

7. Kumar B, Singh BP, Singh R. Out migration from rural Bihar: A case study. The Indian Journal of Labour Economics. 1998; 41(4):729-735.

8. Kyaing. Pull and push factors of migration. A case study in the urban area of Monywa Township, Myanmar. Lecturer in the department of Statistics Institute of Economics in Monywa, Myanmar, 2013.

9. Lall V, Selod H, Shalizi Z. Rural Urban Migration in Developing countries. A survey of theoretical predictions and empirical findings, World Bank policy research working paper 3915, development research group, May, 2006.

10. National Geographic Society. Migration: The Human Journey, geography awareness week, 2005.

11. Osondu CK, Ibezim GMC. Determinants of rural-urban migration and its effect on rural farm labour availability in Umuahia North Local Government Area of Abia State, Nigeria. Research Web Publication. Retrieved 23 March 2015 from http://www.eajournals.org. 2013; 1(3):29-35.

12. Reardon T, Stamoulis K, Balisacan A, Cruz M, Berdegue J, Banks B. Rural nonfarm income in developing countries. Special chapter in the state of Food and Agriculture 1998. Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, Rome, 1998.

13. Santosh KH. A study on rural-urban migration among youths: Social work perspective. Indian Streams Research Journal. 2014; 4(1):1-3.

14. Sidhu MS, Rangi PS, Singh Karam. A Study on Migrant Agricultural Labour in Punjab, Department of Economics and Sociology, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, 1997.

15. Sidhu, M.S. and Rangi, PS. A study on migrant agricultural labour in Punjab. The Indian Journal of Labour Economics. 1998; 41(4):717- 727.

16. Singh NP, Singh RP, Kumar R, Padaria RN, Singh A, Varghese N. Labour migration in Indo-Gangetic Plains: Determinants and impacts on socio-economic welfare. Agricultural Economics Research Review. 2011; 2:449-458.

17. Srivastva, Sai Kumar SK. An overview of migration in India regional conference on migration, development and pro poor policy choices in Asia from 22-24 June, 2003 at Dhaka Organized by DFID and Refuge and Migration Movements Research Unit, Dhaka, 2003.

18. UNDESA, OECD. World migration in figures. A joint contribution by UN-DESA and the OECD to the United Nations High-Level Dialogue on Migration and Development, 3-4 October 2013. 2013

19. World Bank. Potential to leverage migrant savings and remittances for development financing remains. Washington, April 13, 2015. 2013

Webliography

- http://www.eajournals.org. Retrieved 23 March 2015

- http://www.odi.org. Retrieved 23 January 2015