

**RESEARCH ARTICLE :**

A critical study on factors influencing for migration of small and marginal farm family members in Raichur district of Karnataka

■ R. SHRUTHI, S.K. METI, D.M. CHANDRAGI, S.B. GOUDAPPA AND AMRUTHA T. JOSHI

ARTICLE CHRONICLE :**Received :**

15.07.2017;

Accepted :

30.07.2017

SUMMARY : A study was conducted on purpose and factors influencing the small and marginal farm family members for migration in Raichur district of Karnataka. A purposive and random sampling technique was used to select the samples of taluks (3), villages (6) and migrant small and marginal farmers (60 each) which constituted 120 sample size. The study revealed that large majority (98.30 %) of the small farmers migrated due to push factors like unemployment followed by poor economic condition of the family and low wage rate with 96.60 per cent each. Whereas, large majority (98.30 %) of the marginal farmers migration was influenced by factors like poor economic condition of the family and agriculture offseason. The purpose or pull factor which influenced for migration of small and marginal farmers were employment (98.30 %), regular income (98.30 %) and better amenities (96.60 %), wage differentials (96.60 %). Hence, the government should ensure for development of non-farm rural activity with the intervention of public private partnership.

KEY WORDS :

Migration, Factors,
Small farmers,
Marginal farmers

How to cite this article : Shruthi, R., Meti, S.K., Chandragi, D.M., Goudappa, S.B. and Joshi, Amrutha T. (2017). A critical study on factors influencing for migration of small and marginal farm family members in Raichur district of Karnataka. *Agric. Update*, 12(TECHSEAR-5) : 1323-1327; DOI: 10.15740/HAS/AU/12.TECHSEAR(5)2017/1323-1327.

Author for correspondence :**R. SHRUTHI**

Department of
Agricultural Extension
Education, College of
Agriculture, University
of Agricultural Sciences,
RAICHUR (KARNATAKA)
INDIA
Email :
shruthishekar9113@
gmail.com

See end of the article for
authors' affiliations

BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

Agriculture is the backbone of the rural population. Although agriculture accounts for only 14 per cent of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP), it is still the main source of livelihood for the majority of the rural population. And it may be noted that Indian agriculture is the home of small and marginal farmers (80.00 %). Therefore, the future of

sustainable agriculture growth and food security in India depends on the performance of small and marginal farmers. But the critical issues plague Indian agriculture and farmers at present are the knowledge deficit and infrastructure deficit especially in the rural areas. Problems related to irrigation infrastructure, market infrastructure and transport infrastructure add significant cost to farmers operation.

And like any other business enterprise, agriculture is subjected to high risks because of the volatile nature of the factors involved. For instance, weather is often a problem- you have droughts in one year and heavy rains in the next. In both cases, farmers lose out, hence they have to look for a normal period to make money. And the land available to each family has remained the same and the number of family members has grown, supporting all of them through agriculture alone is becoming difficult. Hence these problems has lead to migration. In India, migration of farmers from village to town is not a new phenomenon, but its magnitude in the past decade has arrested the growth of agriculture. It is estimated that approximately 2 million people are shifting from rural to urban areas annually and approximately 22 million people have migrated from rural to urban areas. Since 2001, India is losing more than 2000 farmers every single day and that since 1991, the overall number of farmer has dropped by 15 million (Sainath, 2013).

Migration of population has been a recurrent phenomenon since the dawn of human civilization. Migration refers to a process of “spatial separation between the location of a resident household or family and one or more livelihood activities engaged by family members” (Ellis and Ade Freeman, 2006). In developing country like India, low agricultural income, productivity, unemployment, poor economic conditions, lack of opportunities for advancement, exhaustion of natural resources and natural calamities may be the factors pushing the migrants towards developed areas with better economic opportunities. With regard to structural reasons for migration in India, poverty, unemployment, famine is the most commonly cited factor for migration with poor, small and marginal farm family members migrating to urban areas, especially during the agricultural lean seasons, to avail themselves of employment opportunities in urban areas in an attempt to smoothen their income flows.

Nearly 90.00 per cent of the population in the semi-arid region is dependent on agriculture for their livelihood in Karnataka state. The drought prone area has put most of the farmers in the state to the precarious situation leading to migration to nearby towns and cities besides high rainfall areas to work as labour (Nagaraja *et al.*, 2009). Hence one can see the stark contrast between the rainfed dry areas and the other area irrigated by the Tungabhadra left canal. While the former is deserted

following large scale migration. The cropping pattern is dominated by jowar and pulse. Employment in agriculture is seasonal and not available throughout the year. The poor, small and marginal farm households have to search for alternative sources of livelihood during the slack season in agriculture. Further the small size of land holding also does not help generate employment on a large scale. Hence one or two members of the household move out in search of employment. Hence migration seems to be a common phenomenon. With this background, the study was undertaken with specific objectives to identify the factors influenced for migration of small and marginal farm family members as well as to know the purpose of migration of small and marginal farm family members.

RESOURCES AND METHODS

The research was conducted in Raichur district of Karnataka during the year 2014-15. The district was purposively selected because of convenience and familiarity of the researcher with the study area and because one can see the stark contrast between the rainfed dry areas and the other area irrigated by the Tungabhadra left canal. While the former is deserted following large scale migration, migration rate is high (4.9 %) (Khosla, 2010) in Raichur district of North Eastern Karnataka region, because it is constituted with area under dry land leading to seasonal unemployment. Manvi, Lingsugur and Raichur taluks were selected based on highest areas under dry land cultivation. From each of the selected taluks, two villages were selected based on highest area under dry land. Thus, totally 6 villages were selected for the study. A list of small and marginal farmers was collected from RSK of the selected villages. From each selected villages 20 migrant farm families (which constituted 10 marginal farmers and 10 small farmers) were selected with the help of random sampling method. Thus, total sample size constitutes 120 respondents. A draft interview schedule against set objectives for measuring the variables of the study was first prepared and pretested in the non-sample area. In the light of pretesting, necessary changes were incorporated in the format of items. The final schedule was prepared by making necessary modifications, additions and deletions based on pretesting results. The standardized structured schedule was used to collect the data through personal interview technique. Simple statistical tools were used for the estimation and interpretation of the results.

OBSERVATIONS AND ANALYSIS

It was revealed from the Table 1 that, looking to the pooled data of small and marginal farmers, large majority (97.50 %) of the farmers migrated due to poor economic condition of the family, followed by unemployment and offseason or agriculture lean season (95.80 %), due to low wage rate (93.30 %) and due to lack of irrigation facility (83.30 %). The possible reason could be that the farmers or the migrants possess small land holding that to in rainfed condition with large family size and in rainfed situation one to two crop are taken and in offseason there is no work and a low wage existed in the rainfed area compared to the irrigated area. Majority (75.00 %) of farmers factors of migration were due to large family size followed by debt (70.00 %), limited livelihood options in rainfed areas 67.50 per cent, 59.10 per cent migrated due to improvement in transport facilities, 52.50 per cent also migrated due to lack of credit facilities.

The study was conducted in dry land area which is a major reason for migration, hence the above mentioned were the factors which in particular influenced the farmers to migrate, the probable reason may be lack of financial support employment opportunities in the study area, lack of basic amenities like medical facilities, schooling, transportation, entertainment and other possible reason could be constant debt and no opportunity to repay

it back. Only 32.50 per cent migrated due to marriage, 17.50 per cent and 14.10 per cent migrated due to low agriculture productivity and lack of timely availability of inputs, 11.60 per cent also migrated due to failure of crop due to pest and diseases. As we know agriculture is gambling with nature and lack of timely availability of inputs and pest incidence leading to crop failure and this intern leads to economic loss.

A very less per cent (4.16 %) gave the reason fragmentation of land holding and unpleasant relationship with neighbour and family (4.16 %) as a factor to migrate. In study it is observed that the majority of farmers are from big family size it is known fact that in village all live in harmony but very few villagers maintain the unpleasant relation with labour and family. The results are in conformity with the research findings of Kumar (2014) and Khosla (2010).

It was observed from Table 2 that, looking to the pooled data of small and marginal farmers large majority (96.60 %) of the farmers expressed main purpose of migration was to get regular income, followed by to get employment (95.80 %), due to wage differentials (94.80 %), to get better amenities (93.30 %), to obtain better standard of living (90.80 %) the probable reason for above findings might be that due to non availability of regular income in the place of domicile, unemployment and less

Sr. No.	Factors	Small farmers (n ₁ =60)		Marginal farmers (n ₂ =60)		Pooled		Rank
		F	%	F	%	F	%	
1.	Unemployment	59	98.30	56	93.30	115	95.80	II
2.	Off season	56	93.30	59	98.30	115	95.80	III
3.	Lack of irrigation facility	51	85.00	49	81.60	100	83.30	V
4.	Due to debt	36	60.00	48	80.00	84	70.00	VII
5.	Low agricultural productivity	11	18.30	6	10.00	21	17.50	XII
6.	Failure of crop due to pest and diseases	6	10.00	8	13.30	14	11.60	XIV
7.	Low wage rate	58	96.60	54	90.00	112	93.30	IV
8.	Lack of timely availability of quality inputs	11	18.30	6	10.00	17	14.10	XIII
9.	Limited livelihood options in rain fed areas	33	55.00	48	80.00	100	67.50	VIII
10.	Improvement in transport facilities	31	51.60	40	66.60	71	59.10	IX
11.	Unpleasant relations with neighbour and family	2	3.30	3	5.00	5	4.16	XVI
12.	Poor economic condition of the family	58	96.60	59	98.30	117	97.50	I
13.	Large family size	47	78.30	43	71.60	90	75.00	VI
14.	Marriage	17	28.30	22	36.60	39	32.50	XI
15.	Lack of credit facilities	23	38.30	40	66.60	63	52.50	X
16.	Fragmentation in land holding	5	8.30	0	0.00	5	4.16	XV

*F =Frequency, %=Percentage *Multiple responses

Table 2 : Distribution of small and marginal farmers based on purpose of migration (pull factors) (n=120)

Sr. No.	Purpose	Small farmers (n ₁ =60)		Marginal farmers (n ₂ =60)		Pooled		Rank
		F	%	F	%	F	%	
1.	To get employment	59	98.30	56	93.30	115	95.80	II
2.	To do business	1	1.60	4	6.60	5	4.16	X
3.	To obtain better standard of living	55	91.60	54	90.00	109	90.80	V
4.	To get better amenities	54	90.00	58	96.60	112	93.30	IV
5.	To get gender equality	10	16.60	16	26.60	26	21.60	VII
6.	To obtain improvement in children education	12	20.00	10	16.60	22	18.30	IX
7.	To get regular income	59	98.30	57	95.00	116	96.60	I
8.	To get marriage security	17	28.30	22	36.60	39	32.50	VI
9.	Due to wage differentials	57	95.00	58	96.60	115	94.80	III
10.	Due to Irrigation facilities	12	20.00	10	16.00	22	18.30	VIII

*F = Frequency, % = Percentage *Multiple responses

job opportunities throughout the year, due to lower wage rate in the place of origin, lack of basic facilities and low standard of living due to less annual income are the major purpose of migration.

Less per cent of farmers expressed purposes of migration was to get marriage security, to get gender equality, due to irrigation facility, to obtain improvement in children education this might be due to the fact that among the migrants, 30.80 per cent were female and it is observed in the study area that women migrate due to the reason of marriage and in few cases for economic purpose, due to education and more stress about the women empowerment due to this a few women are thinking about gender equality and migrating to earn money, it was observed that farmers migrating from dryland area to irrigated area to earn more and few farmers migrating from village to district places to provide better education for their children, very meagre (4.16 %) of the farmers migrated to do business as it is known that, to do business, business skill and finance are required so very few are migrated who are financially fit to do the business. The results are in line with the findings of Mohapatra (2011).

For many people around the world migration is a way of life, and has been for centuries. But globalization has radically altered the scale of migration, people are now more aware of opportunities elsewhere and it has become easier for them to travel. The Motivational factor for majority (97.50 %) of the migrants was poor economic condition of the family and unemployment. Hence, pro-poor strategies in backward areas, including livelihood opportunities, increased access to land, common property resources, social and physical

infrastructure has to be given by the government by strengthening already existing programmes such as NREGA and PURA and creating awareness about the poverty alleviation, social justice programmes implemented by the state and central government through mass media. And the main purpose for majority (96.60 %) of farmers migration was to get higher income. Further, majority (95.83 %) of farmers purpose of migration was employment opportunity. Hence, the government should ensure for development of non-farm rural activity with the intervention of public private partnership.

Conclusion :

Migration drains more active population from the villages and creates both benefits and problems for the people who migrate and for the areas from where people migrate and for the areas where people migrate to. On the positive side, migration may provide opportunities for the rural un-employed and under-employed and to raise standards and livelihood prospects at the household and community level. On the negative side, it may create a far reaching effect on agriculture, uncertainty in employment and income, insufficient civic amenities. Hence, pro-poor strategies in backward areas, including livelihood opportunities, increased access to land, common property resources, social and physical infrastructure has to be given by the government by strengthening already existing programmes such as NREGA and PURA and creating awareness about the poverty alleviation, social justice programmes implemented by the state and central government through mass media.

Authors' affiliations :

S.K. METI AND D.M. CHANDRAGI, Department of Agricultural Extension Education, College of Agriculture, University of Agricultural Sciences, RAICHUR (KARNATAKA) INDIA

S.B. GOUDAPPA, Krishi Vigyan Kendra, RADDEWADGI (KARNATAKA) INDIA

AMRUTHA T. JOSHI, Department of Agricultural Economics, College of Agriculture, University of Agricultural Sciences, RAICHUR (KARNATAKA) INDIA

REFERENCES

Ellis and Ade Freeman, H. (2006). Conceptual framework and overview of theme in Frank Ellis and Ade Freeman, H [eds.], *Rural Livelihood and Poverty Reduction Policies*. New York: Routledge. pp. 3-16

Khosla, R. (2010). *The new economic & climatic context and changing migration pattern in India*, Final report, **10**: 108-117.

Kumar, A. (2014). Impact of rural migration on agricultural labourers of Bihar in Assam (A case study of Cachar district), *Kurukshetra*, **62**(11): 29-31.

Mohapatra, R.S. (2011). The changing pattern of internal migration in India issues and challenges. pp. 1-15.

Nagaraja, B.C., somashekar, R.K. and kavitha, A. (2009). Impact of drought on agriculture: challenges facing poor farmers of Karnataka, south India. research report, Univ. Bangalore, Karnataka. pp 3-4.

WEBLIOGRAPHY

Sainath, P. (2013). Over 2,000 fewer farmers every day. *The Hindu*, May 2. <http://www.thehindu.com/opinion/columns/sainath/over-2000-fewer-farmers-everyday/article4674190.ece>.

Wikipedia, 2013, Accessed online at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Monsoon_ofIndiansubcontinent.

12th
Year
★★★★★ of Excellence ★★★★★