Socioeconomic Determinants and Impacts of Labour Migration: A Field-Based Study in Ramanathapuram District

*Mrs. M. Vasuki, **Dr. S. Ganapathy, ***Dr. P. Amarjothi, ****Mr. R. Maharaja

*&****Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, Alagappa University, Karaikudi, India.

**Professor and Head, Department of Commerce, Alagappa University, Karaikudi, India.

***Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Madurai Kamaraj University, Madurai, India.

*E-mail ID: vvasu4903@gmail.com

**E-mail ID: ganapathysuruthi@gmail.com.

***E-mail ID: amarjothisuruthi@gmail.com.

****E-mail ID: r.mahendrakannan97@gmail.com

Abstract

The most obvious form of globalization is labor migration. Our daily activities are entwined with those of the global political, economic, and cultural spheres. This paper attempts to explore the impact of migrant labour in Ramanathapuram district and factors responsible for migration of workers to the various industries. To meet up the objectives of the present article a field based survey design is used as the data collection method. A sample of 150 migrant respondents in Ramanathapuram district has been collected by using simple random sampling technique method. A set of structured questionnaire were distributed to the selected migrant workers using simple random sampling technique. Gender of the responders was highly positively correlated with monthly income and monthly saving. The study finds that the age of the responders was highly positively correlated with marital status, monthly income and monthly saving. Educational qualification of the responders was highly positively correlated with monthly income. Decision to migrate of the responders was highly positively correlated with monthly income, monthly expenses and reason for leaving.

Keywords: Migration, Labour, Rural, Factors, Workers.

Introduction

According to the Population Census of 2011, there are a lot of unorganized workers in the Indian economy. A considerable portion of India's unorganized workforce relies heavily on the agricultural and construction industries for their existence, as shown by reports and the census. After the agricultural sector, the construction sector has become the primary source of employment and income for large numbers of unorganized, unskilled workers. It is obvious that the construction sector has been defending these substantial populations of low-skilled, low-wage employees. India's building industry has higher potential, and the demand for them is rising in several industrialized emerging nations as well.

Workers are moving to the various industries in search of employment due to the underdevelopment of other sectors, and current government policies and developmental requirements are increasing this need. The current study makes an effort to look at the current circumstances of migrant workers in the global economy, the strength and expanding potential of the Indian industries, the registration of migrant workers in welfare boards, constitutional provisions, and other welfare programs that are available to them, as well as an evaluation of their socioeconomic circumstances based on the perceptions of the local workforce.

Objectives

1.   To evaluate the socio-economic conditions of migrant labour in Ramanathapuram district.

2.   To scrutinize the impact and factors responsible for migration of workers to the various industry.

Review of literature

Numerous researches on migrant labor have already been done. A few significant studies have been reviewed, and the results of each study are methodically given as follows.

In his research, Dadabhai Naoroji1 (1888) identified a number of factors that were major contributors to labor migration in India. The key causes included a decline in the number of village industries, marginal farmers with tiny agricultural holdings, unemployment, and landlessness among the economically underprivileged and socially backward segments of society, including caste and famine-affected areas. On the basis of fieldwork conducted in the Karnataka State city of Raichur from the 300 sample families, Joshi (1989) has performed a research study relating to the occupational mobility of migrant laborers. According to the study's findings, respondents from middle caste and middle class backgrounds are more mobile than those from other castes and classes.

In rural India, the National Commission on Rural Labour (NCRL) (1991) discovered that there are more over 10 million circulars in circulation. In India's rural areas, 4.5 million and 6 million interstate and intrastate migrants, respectively, have been counted. The sectors had been corrected by the commission. According to a study by the Ministry of Housing & Urban Poverty Alleviation43 (2015), migrant workers should be treated the same as local citizens in the areas where they had been living. According to the report, improving working conditions where Indian migrant workers live is crucial if they are to survive and maintain a decent quality of life. In her analysis, C. Annie Jane (2016) concentrated on the difficulties faced by migratory employees. It was discovered that migrant workers are not in a secure environment, despite the fact that they have contributed in some measure to India's GDP. The prosperity of migrant workers over time depends heavily on the protective and prospective strategies.

In their concluding observations, Rajib Sutradhar (2016) and Ravi Srivastava stated out revealed that the majority of the current workers on building projects have moved from other locations. It was discovered that there were differences in the recruitment and migration patterns among the sectors that are structured and unorganized. The research also revealed that there greater disparities between organized and unorganized workers' treatment and working conditions India's unorganized industries. Srivastava (2016) focuses on

migrant workers' health in his study because a healthy workforce in the nation depends in large part on health. Additionally, movement of laborers causes significant health problems.

Research methodology

To meet up the objectives of the present article a field based survey design is used as the data collection method. A sample of 150 migrant respondents in Ramanathapuram district has been collected by using simple random sampling technique method. A set of structured questionnaire were distributed to the selected migrant workers using simple random sampling technique.

Gender

The table 1 shows the gender of the respondents and it can be observed that 66.7 percent of the respondents are male and remaining 33.3 percent are female.

Table 1: Gender of the respondent

Gender	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	100	66.7	66.7	66.7
Female	50	33.3	33.3	100.0
Total	**150**	**100.0**	**100.0**	

Source: Primary Data

Age

From the table 2 we can indicate that 23.3 percent of the respondents' age is below 18 years, 44 percent of the respondents' age is between 18-25 years, 16 percent respondent's age is between 26-30 years, 16.7 percent of the respondents age is above 30 years.

Table 2: Age of the respondent

Age	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Below 18 years	35	23.3	23.3	23.3
18 - 25 years	66	44.0	44.0	67.3
26 - 30 years	24	16.0	16.0	83.3
Above 30 years	25	16.7	16.7	100.0
Total	**150**	**100.0**	**100.0**	

Source: Primary Data

Marital Status

Table 3 shows the marital status of the respondents and it is found that 56.7 percent of the respondents are married, and remaining 43.3 percent respondents are unmarried.

Table 3: Marital Status of the respondent

Marital Status	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Married	85	56.7	56.7	56.7
Unmarried	65	43.3	43.3	100.0
Total	**150**	**100.0**	**100.0**	

Source: Primary Data

Educational Background

Table 4 observed that 28.7 percent of the workers are illiterate, 36.7 percent of the workers attained primary education, 14 percent have obtained high school education, 9.3 percent have obtained diploma qualification, 6.7 percent have obtained graduation qualification and only 4.7 percent have got professional qualification.

Table 4: Educational Qualification of the respondent

Educational Qualification	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Illiterate	43	28.7	28.7	28.7
Primary School	55	36.7	36.7	65.3
High School	21	14.0	14.0	79.3
Diploma	14	9.3	9.3	88.7
Degree	10	6.7	6.7	95.3
Professional	7	4.7	4.7	100.0
Total	150	100.0	100.0	

Source: Primary Data

Monthly Income

It is seen from table 5 that among the total respondents, 19.3 per cent have less than Rs.10,000 as their monthly income followed by 46 per cent having Rs.10,001-15,000, 22 per cent having Rs.15,001-20,000 and the remaining 12.7 per cent having more than Rs.20,000 as monthly income.

Table 5: Monthly income of the respondent

Monthly Income	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Below 10,000	29	19.3	19.3	19.3
10,001 – 15,000	69	46.0	46.0	65.3
15,001 – 20,000	33	22.0	22.0	87.3

Above 20,000	19	12.7	12.7	100.0
Total	150	100.0	100.0	

Source: Primary Data

Monthly Expenses

The table 6 shows the monthly expenses spent by the respondents and it can be observed that 10 percent of the respondent's monthly expenses were below Rs. 5,000, 19.3 percent of the respondent's monthly expenses were between Rs. 5,001-10,000, 46 percent of the respondent's monthly expenses was between Rs. 10,001-15,000 and the remaining 24.7 percent of the respondent's monthly expenses were above Rs. 15,000.

Table 6: Monthly expenses of the respondent

Monthly Expenses	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Below 5000	15	10.0	10.0	10.0
5,001 – 10,000	29	19.3	19.3	29.3
10,001 – 15,000	69	46.0	46.0	75.3
Above 15,000	37	24.7	24.7	100.0
Total	150	100.0	100.0	

Source: Primary Data

Monthly Savings

It is seen from the below table 7 that among the total respondents, 70 per cent have monthly savings of less than 5 thousand, followed by 14 per cent having Rs.5,001-10,000, 9.3 per cent having Rs.10,001-15,000 and the rest 6.7 per cent having annual savings of above 15 thousand.

Table 7: Monthly Savings of the respondent

Monthly Savings	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Below 5000	105	70.0	70.0	70.0
5,001 – 10,000	21	14.0	14.0	84.0
10,001 – 15,000	14	9.3	9.3	93.3
Above 15,000	10	6.7	6.7	100.0
Total	150	100.0	100.0	

Source: Primary Data

Descriptive Statistics of Demographic Details of Migrants

Table 8 shows descriptive statistics details for describing the socio-economic profile of the migrant workers in Ramanathapuram district. Mean, Std. Error of Mean, Median, Mode, Std. Deviation, Variance, Skewness, Std. Error of Skewness, Kurtosis, Std. Error of Kurtosis, Range, Minimum, Maximum and Sum of the respondents are analysed as follows:

Table 8: Descriptive Statistics of the Respondents

Descriptive Statistics	Gender of the respondent	Age of the respondent	Marital Status of the respondent	Educational Qualification of the respondent	Monthly income of the respondent	Monthly expenses of the respondent	Monthly Savings of the respondent
Mean	1.33	2.26	1.43	2.43	2.28	2.85	1.53
Std. Error of Mean	.039	.082	.041	.115	.075	.074	.075
Median	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	1.00
Mode	1	2	1	2	2	3	1
Std. Deviation	.473	1.000	.497	1.406	.920	.908	.917
Variance	.224	.999	.247	1.978	.847	.824	.842
Skewness	.714	.479	.272	1.025	.407	-.523	1.612
Std. Error of Skewness	.198	.198	.198	.198	.198	.198	.198
Kurtosis	-1.510	-.787	-1.952	.239	-.595	-.423	1.372
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.394	.394	.394	.394	.394	.394	.394
Range	1	3	1	5	3	3	3
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	2	4	2	6	4	4	4
Sum	200	339	215	364	342	428	229

Source: Primary Data

Decision to Migrate

The push factors are treated as significant factors for the workers in forcing them to migrate in the study area from different places of Source: Primary Data

The person was involved in making the decision to migrate were 12.6% by migrant his/her self, 5.3% by their Father, 5.3% by their Mother, 6.0% by their Spouse/partner, 2.0% by their Siblings, 2.6% by their Children, 2.0% by their Relatives, 24.5% by their Friends, 16.6% by their Ex. Co-worker, 2.6% by their Community members, 11.9% by Recruitment agent and 7.9% by their Joint family decision.

Reason for leaving

Table 10 denotes the various important reasons for leaving the native place for migration to Ramanathapuram district.

Table 10: Reason for Leaving

Reason for leaving	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	Descriptive Statistics	
Job transfer	9	6.0	6.0	6.0	Mean	7.38
Work	7	4.6	4.7	10.7	Std. Error of Mean	.273
Seek work/better work	12	7.9	8.0	18.7	Median	7.00
Study/training	2	1.3	1.3	20.0	Mode	12
To get married and follow the spouse	2	1.3	1.3	21.3	Std. Deviation	3.343
Declining yields in agriculture	25	16.6	16.7	38.0	Variance	11.177
Family dispute/other dispute	20	13.2	13.3	51.3	Skewness	-.213
Natural disaster	18	11.9	12.0	63.3	Std. Error of Skewness	.198
To accompany family	20	13.2	13.3	76.7	Kurtosis	-.746
Marriage breakdown	2	1.3	1.3	78.0	Std. Error of Kurtosis	.394
To join friends	2	1.3	1.3	79.3	Range	12
To repay debt	29	19.2	19.3	98.7	Minimum	1
For medical treatment	2	1.3	1.3	100.0	Maximum	13
Total	150	99.3	100.0		Sum	1107

Source: Primary Data

Table 10 denotes that 6 percent of the respondents say that job transfer, 4.7 percent workers reason is work nature, 8 percent workers reason is seek work/better work, 1.3 percent workers reason is study/training and to get married and follow the spouse, 16.7 percent workers reason is declining yields in agriculture, 13.3 percent workers reason is family dispute/other dispute and to accompany family, 12 to accompany family natural disaster, 1.3 percent workers reason is marriage breakdown, to join friends and for medical treatment, and 19.3 percent of the respondents say that to repay debt is the main important reason for leaving the native place for migration to Ramanathapuram district.

Conclusion

Today, migration and globalization have largely affected every locality. Although "globalization" may sound relatively ambiguous to some1, it takes on meaning in the lives of migratory workers. Mobility opportunities for migrants are actually part of bigger social structures that connect various regions of the world. Historical, cultural, economic, social, and political relationships between the locales may influence migration pathways, but so may immigrant institutions, specifically targeted services, and industries, as well as the media and human imagination. Some of these bridged localities make up particular migration networks. All the places involved in a particular system are impacted by the way the neoliberal global economy is now organized, which encourages privatization, deregulation, and liberalization.

Some locations gain more than others from the movement and transfer of labor and other resources within such systems because they are rooted in power and economic structural disparities. However, regardless of whether they are in a more advantageous or disadvantageous position, all the hubs of a system are still vulnerable to the neoliberal restructuring of the economy and are under pressure from various, though common, sources. Low-wage migrant workers are frequently reminded at the subject level that movement is a stratifying element in our contemporary cultures and that not everyone is allowed to reap the rewards of capital accumulation despite the numerous chances and resources made possible by mobility.

References

1. Chandran A, Chacko CM. Exploitation of in-migrant construction workers in Kerala: A case study. *Scholarly Res J Interdiscip Stud*. 2017; 4(35):8623–35.
2. De Haan A. Inclusive growth: Labour migration and poverty in India. *Indian J Labour Econ*. 2011; 54(3).
3. Brush BL. Global nurse migration today. *J Nurs Scholarsh*. 2008.
4. Barik BC. *Rural migrants in an urban setting: A case study*. Delhi: Classical Publishing House; 1994.
5. Jane CA. A study on the internal migrant labour - issues and policies. *Indian J Appl Res*. 2016; 6(4):81–3.
6. Sneka C, Vijayalakshmi G. Migrant labours. *Indian J Appl Res*. 2016; 6(4):103–4.
7. Das B. Migrant labour in the construction sector. *Man Dev*. 1992; 14(1):119–32.
8. Motiram S, Singh A. How close does the apple fall to the tree? Some evidence from India on intergenerational occupational mobility. *Econ Polit Wkly*. 2012; 47(40):56–65.
9. Mowday R, Djebarni R, Thomas A. Construction of a scale measuring the job satisfaction of public sector employees in the UAE with particular reference to the Dubai Police Force. In: *Saudi Int Innov Conf, UK*. Leeds; 1982. p. 90–7.
10. Srivastava R. Migration and the labour market in India. *Indian J Labour Econ*. 1998; 41(4).
11. Bajaj SC. Inter–state migrant labour and the law. In: Iyer KG, editor. *Distressed migrant labour in India*. New Delhi: Kanishka Publishers & Distributors; 2004.
12. Subramanya RKA. Policy and administration aspects of labour migration. In: Joshi V, editor. *Migrant labour and related issues*. New Delhi: Oxford and IBH Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd.; 1987.
13. Todaro MP. A model of labour migration and urban unemployment in less developed countries. *Am Econ Rev*. 1969; 59(1).
14. Dakua T. Labour migration. *Int J Res Geogr*. 2019; 5(1):9–26.