Agrarian Transition and Migration in a Village of Bihar

Pushpendra*

Introduction

The paper tries to understand the relation between agrarian transition and migration in rural areas of Bihar by collecting and analysing data from a village. The basic research questions are: What is the status of small peasant proprietor holdings and growth of capitalism in agriculture? To what extent free wage labour market has grown and what is the impact of migration on the growth of capitalism in agriculture? The paper is divided into five sections. In the first section I briefly discuss how agrarian transition has been conceptualised in Marxist literature and challenges posed to this conceptualisation by actual developments. The next three sections I present empirical material from my own fieldwork to illustrate the conceptual arguments about the relation between emerging property ownership pattern and the characteristics of migration. In section two, I have given a brief description of the village setting. In the third section, I present key characteristics of migration from the village by using quantitative data collected in the village. In doing so, I have specifically made inquiries into circular migration of workers because circular migrants maintain strong links with the village and continue to be part of its labour force. I have attempted to assess the magnitude of labour migration, the socio-economic and demographic background of migrant workers and the occupational mobility made possible by migration, I have also tried to investigate the remittances of the migrating workers and whether migrants are able to produce a flow of investible surplus? And finally, and most importantly, what is the specific impact of labour migration on labour relations in the village? In the fourth section, I have tried to answer the main research question related to agrarian transition and migration. In the concluding section, I have highlighted the need for a new conceptual tool to theorise the emerging relationship between land, labour and migration.

The paper is based on fieldwork in a village, Jitwarpur, in Sadar block of Araria district in Bihar by using census approach.

Section I

The Problematique of Agrarian Transition

I begin by asking the oft-repeated question, that is, why peasantry persists in the countries of the South? Unlike the Anglo-Saxon classical path of development of capitalism in agriculture, which is characterised by disappearance of peasantry, the three regions of the globe – Sub-Saharan Africa, South and continental South-east Asia, and China – continue to be essentially dominated by their villages and small peasant holdings and comprise half the world's population in the 1990s (Bernstein 2001). These regions are separated from other regions by a massive gap in labour productivity in farming. The regions and countries where
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large-scale capitalist and ‘peasant’ farming are concentrated, though account for only 15 percent of the world’s population and just four percent of the world’s agricultural labour force, trade 62 percent of exports (by value) of agricultural commodities world-wide (Weis 2007).

Marx considered the proprietorship of small land parcels to be only transitional stage in the development of capitalist agriculture. He argued that the following factors would destroy small landed property: a) destruction of rural domestic industry by large-scale industry; b) gradual impoverishment and exhaustion of the cultivated soil; c) usurpation of common lands by big landowners; and d) competition from large-scale capitalist agriculture (Marx, 1966, p. 807). As facts from the study village will show later in the paper, the reality does not support Marx’s optimism about agrarian transition. In the process of capitalist development in agriculture, peasant proprietorship has displayed a remarkable capacity of survival. In advanced capitalist countries, capitalism did transform the feudal rural relations and moulded agriculture on the lines of capitalist production, i.e., land concentration, proletarianisation of small landowners, economies of scale, the multiplication of large-scale enterprises, use of modern technology, free wage labour and so on. The classical path of this transition was reproduction of capital from agriculture for investment outside agriculture. This transition depended on separating the predominant means of production, i.e., land, from the small landholders and emergence of large landholdings managed by capitalist farmers through hired labour and the use of labour minimising technologies.

In 1960s and 70s, world-wide emphasis on Green Revolution, gave birth to a new debate regarding the scale and nature of transition of feudal or semi-feudal agriculture into capitalist agriculture and emerging class differentiation. The question of capitalist transition of agriculture was widely termed as the classical agrarian question. In India, this debate is well-known as the ‘mode of production debate’, particularly in seventies and early eighties. However, the persistence of small peasantry in many parts of India, even after globalisation, has forced us to have a fresh look at the process of subsumption of subsistence agriculture and its labour by the capital. The question is why did capitalist development in India did not alter the technical relations of production in large parts of the country?

Cristobal Kay (2010) says that “the persistence of the subsistence sector was a result of the process of dependent capitalist development which, in turn, required continual reproduction of the former……Through the internationalisation of capital, the industrialisation process in dependent countries resulted in distorted production and consumption patterns and in the adoption of inappropriate technologies. Such an industrialisation process created insufficient employment opportunities, making it impossible for many small-scale producers to abandon subsistence production. Thus, a large reservoir of surplus population was continually reproduced in the subsistence sector, keeping wages in the industrial sector well below increases in productivity…..Small proprietors can work for simple reproduction and subsistence and not for profit.”

Thus, according to Cristobal Kay (2010), small peasant enterprises produce use values rather than exchange values and in both simple commodity production predominates, as the commercialised surplus is only sufficient to purchase essential commodities. Thus, little capital accumulation takes place. Nun, Murmis and Marin (1967) explain this further,
“the penetration of capitalist relations into subsistence agriculture in dependent countries does not dissolve the old links of the worker with the land thereby maintaining and even recreating the subsistence economies.” Hence, even if land does not contribute significantly in the livelihoods of the poor peasants and agricultural labourers, they maintain old links.

The penetration of capitalism into certain regions (for instance, Punjab) has led small landholders and labourers from non-Green Revolution areas to migrate to seek seasonal wage employment in areas of Green Revolution or to migrate to the urban sector as proletarians. This is referred to as external proletarianisation by Cristobal Kay (2010). Small peasant proprietors are able to resist full proletarianisation, as seasonal wage employment – a partial proletarianisation – enables them to retain small plots of land. It also serves as a cheap labour reserve for capitalism. These different types of proletarianisation have led to different types and degrees of migration. Krishna Bharadwaj (1994) explains the phenomenon of migration in the context of under-formation of local labour markets. According to her, the under-formation of local labour markets is compensated by expansion of external labour markets through opportunities to migrate.

Section II
Ecological Setting of the Village

Jitwarpur village is located in Kismat-Khawaspur Panchayat of Araria Sadar block in Araria district. It is a remote village considering its distance from the district headquarters and also the fact that Araria is a new district carved out from Purnea which is about 40 km away. Araria still looks like a typical block or at most, a sub-division in Bihar. It is well linked by a metallic road with the district headquarters (22 km) in the south and the Indo-Nepal border at Kursa Kanta (18 km). The village is prone to floods. River Bhalua passes through the village on the eastern side.

Jitwarpur is a large village with a population of 5,600 and is spread over 2 km from north to south. The village comprises 10 tolas (hamlets). These tolas are based on caste and religion. The main village is known as Palasi which is inhabited mainly by brahmans. Other tolas are Puraini tola, Jhaua tola, Yadav tola, Musahari tola, Kewat tola, Mansoori tola, Godhi tola, Tegachhia Brahmin tola and Nonia tola.

As per our field survey, the total number of households in the village is 950. Out of these, 847 households belong to Hindus and 103 to Muslims. Habitations separated by caste and religion reflect the old power structure and social segregation. Out of 103 Muslim households, 101 belong to dhuniya (momin) community and two belong to the ansari community. Within Hindus, there are 12 castes present in the village—brahmin, nonia, godhi, kewat, yadav, sudhi, chamar, baniya, musahar, badhai, nai and halwai. Brahmins, the single largest caste in the village, constitute 31 per cent of the population; other big castes are nonia 19.58 per cent, godhi 13.26 per cent, kewat 12.53 per cent, musahar 3.89 per cent and yadav 3.05 per cent. In addition to this, there are 23 Santhal households (2.42 per cent) in the village which belong to the Scheduled Tribe (ST) category. In terms of caste groups, Other Backward Classes (OBC)-I constitutes the largest caste group. They have a population share of 45.9 per cent; general castes constitute 30.95 per cent, OBC-II 5.26 per cent and Scheduled Castes (SCs) 4.63 per cent.

In the village, 46 per cent of the households have Below Poverty Line (BPL) cards and 12 per cent have Antyodaya Anna Yojana (AAY) and Annapurna Yojana (AY) cards. About 19 per cent
of the households have no card as either they were left out at the time of BPL survey, or they are new households as a result of separation in the family after BPL survey, or their card is under review.

Land Utilisation Pattern

As per official revenue records, the total area of the village is 1,484.8 acres. This includes land belonging to Government of Bihar as well as private lands. Around 45.6 acres of land have been classified as Gair Majarua Khas, out of which some land has been given to the landless and some are in the river belly. Nearly 42.14 acres of land have been classified as Gair Majarua Aam, which are under public use and cannot be distributed. The record shows 7.54 acres of land belong to the old district board. Part of the land is under common use but the rest is under encroachment by different households. Under the land ceiling programme, 28.35 acres of land were declared ceiling surplus. As per the official records, all these lands have been distributed among eligible beneficiaries. As of now, there are 1,754 survey khata and the total number of plots is 3,390.

The total land reported under ownership of households is 886 acres. This includes land used for cultivation and homestead, land under kitchen gardens, orchards, current and permanent fallows, and land used for other purposes. Land under operational holding amounts to 1,134 acres, which is much more than ownership holding. The gap between ownership and operational holding can be attributed to the well recognised technical hazard of field survey where some households tend to conceal information regarding ownership in general and leased-out land in particular.

Out of total owned land, 53 per cent is under self-cultivation. However, in the case of operated land, cultivated area is about 80 per cent. This shows that land lease and mortgage are important sources of augmenting landholding for cultivation. If we consider leased-in land as a proportion of owned land, it is close to 45 per cent. Though there is abundance of surface water, but in the absence of any public irrigation system, cultivators tend to minimise the cost of irrigation by compromising the frequency and adequacy of irrigation. Paddy, wheat and jute are the main crops in the village. Together they account for approximately 94 per cent of the total cultivated area. Minor crops include moong, masoor, khandsari, tisi, mustard, chana, potato and green vegetables. Overall, agricultural productivity is low in the village. Further, productivity in leased-in land is significantly low compared to that of owned-cum-self-cultivated land. While the difference is less in the case of wheat, it is very high in the case of paddy and jute. The benefits of Green Revolution have gradually penetrated the village, but it is still trapped in the low investment and low output cycle. Modernisation of agriculture is limited to the widespread use of tractor and threshers. Draught animals are gradually disappearing.

However, it is important to note that in recent periods, a small section of enterprising cultivators has emerged. A few families belonging to kewat, nonia and brahmin castes reported impressive productivity in their field. But in the case of all such families, we found that they had multiple sources of income which included their being in politics, having regular jobs, owning a PDS shop or a tractor, and so on.

Agriculture has remained subsistence based but there is also an element of ‘forced commerce’ that brings the cultivators into direct contact with the market. Most of the cultivators including the tenants hardly produce any surplus grain for the
market. However, due to the requirement of cash to meet various expenses related to consumption and agriculture, they are compelled to sell a part of their produce immediately after the harvest. Once they exhaust their grain stock, they have no choice but to buy grain from the market to meet consumption needs. In the village grocery shops, exchange of goods in kind is also prevalent, particularly immediately after the harvest. There are a few grain traders in the village. These are small time traders as their role is basically to purchase grain directly from the villagers particularly after the harvest and then sell it to large traders who send their trucks to buy these grains from the small traders.

Land Ownership Pattern

The village has a high percentage of landlessness – 399 households out of 950, that is 42 per cent of the households reported no ownership of land for cultivation at the time of the survey (see Table 1). This explains the presence of a large proportion of labourers among the adult population in the village. Further, 74 households (8 per cent) are without their own homestead land. They continue to reside on sikkmi land (land owned by the superior tenant). Jitwarpur is predominantly a village of the landless and small landholders. The survey data shows that there are only six families who own more than 10 acres of land, out of which only one family owns more than 20 acres. The largest landholder family owns 39 acres of land, which is equal to approximately 94 bighas in local measurement. While analysing the landholding pattern, we have to keep in mind that 31 per cent of the households are under joint or extended family set up. Some of the large landholders live in joint families. Another complication in analysing land ownership was when members of a joint family were absent from the village, in some cases as permanent migrants, but their land remained under joint ownership. The family residing in the village cultivates the land and in most of cases the absentee family does not take any share in the produce if it does not share the cost of cultivation. Thus, while the family jointly owns a relatively large amount of land, the actual share of each adult member of the family is small. This also implies that landholdings of households are not strictly comparable without adjusting for co-sharers in the land across households.

Table 1: Distribution of Owned Land by Number of Households and Land Area according to Size of Holdings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Holding</th>
<th>No. of HHs</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Area*</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landless</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 Acre</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>35.37</td>
<td>145.51</td>
<td>18.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 - 2.50 Acres</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>222.03</td>
<td>28.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50 - 5.00 Acres</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>166.90</td>
<td>21.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00 - 10.00 Acres</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>125.30</td>
<td>16.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00 - 20.00 Acres</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>69.42</td>
<td>9.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 20 Acres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>38.58</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>767.74</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*The area of homestead land has not been included in the total land area)
Caste-wise landholding is expectedly on the lines of traditional socio-economic hierarchy. An average landholding size of general castes (only brahmin in Jitwarpur) is the highest, followed by OBC-II, OBC-I (ST and Muslims come in between) and SCs. Similarly, landlessness is lowest among the brahmin followed by other caste groups in the same order as above (see Table 2).

Table 3 shows that only 19 per cent brahmin households reported landlessness. Out of six landholders owning more than 10 acres of land, five belonged to the brahmin caste and one to OBC-I. Among the major castes, after brahmin, nonia (28 per cent) and yadav (31 per cent) have a lower proportion of landless households. On the contrary, landlessness is very high among musahar (78 per cent), godhi (71 per cent), chamar (57 per cent) and kewat (54 per cent). Overall, 75 per cent of SC households are landless.

Table 2: Caste Category-wise Landlessness and Average Holding Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste Category</th>
<th>Landlessness (%)</th>
<th>Average Holding Size (in acre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBC – II</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBC – I</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Average Holding Size of Households (including homestead land)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Castes/Community</th>
<th>Landowner-Ship (in acres)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total No. of HHs</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Average Holding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brahmin</td>
<td>501.52</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>30.95</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ansari</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yadav</td>
<td>42.96</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kewat</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonia</td>
<td>147.3</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>19.58</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudhi</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santhali</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baniya</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhuniya/Momin</td>
<td>35.95</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barhai</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musahar</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamar</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godhi</td>
<td>26.01</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>13.26</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nai</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halwai</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Land</strong></td>
<td><strong>886</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>950</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.81</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Landlessness is very high among the Muslims too, among whom 71 per cent of the households are landless. In comparison, 38 per cent of the Hindu households are landless. Low landownership is a pattern across size-class in the case of Muslims—more than 91 per cent of the households are either landless or own less than one acre of land.

According to Table 3, there are actually three castes accounting for 63 per cent of the households who own 84 per cent of the total land. These are brahmin, nonia and kewat. Brahmmin alone own 57 per cent of the total land of the village though their share in the total households is 31 per cent. In fact, their actual ownership of land could be more if their concealed land and land controlled by them are also investigated and taken into consideration.

Section III

Overall, majority of the villagers are permanent residents of the village as 82.6 per cent of them stay in the village (see Table 4). Commuters are less than one per cent who are mainly salaried persons and students. Roughly 17 percent population is either temporary or long-term migrant. These migrants include labourers, students, and salaried jobholders and members of their family. Out of the total population of 5604, those who migrated at least once during the last year numbered 942. However, simple statistics does not reveal either the true magnitude of migration, or the complexity and diversity of residential status in the village. This requires disaggregation of data along gender, age, marital status, educational status, caste, landholding, occupation and duration of stay outside the village.

### Table 4: Residential Status of the Population, Sex-wise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Status</th>
<th>Male (Column %)</th>
<th>Female (Column %)</th>
<th>Total (Column %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident (Row %)</td>
<td>2042 (69.4)</td>
<td>2588 (97.2)</td>
<td>4630 (82.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(44.1)</td>
<td>(55.9)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter (Row %)</td>
<td>26 (0.9)</td>
<td>6 (0.2)</td>
<td>32 (0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(81.3)</td>
<td>(18.8)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Migrant (Row %)</td>
<td>670 (22.8)</td>
<td>25 (0.9)</td>
<td>695 (12.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(96.4)</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Migrant (Row %)</td>
<td>204 (6.9)</td>
<td>43 (1.6)</td>
<td>247 (4.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(82.6)</td>
<td>(17.4)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2942 (100.0)</td>
<td>2662 (100.0)</td>
<td>5604 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(52.5)</td>
<td>(47.5)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Magnitude of Migration

The magnitude and importance of migration can be understood by considering the following four facts. First, out of the total 950 households (HHs), 636 HHs (67% of the total HHs) reported at least one HH member as migrant during last one year (see Table 5). Second, if gender disaggregated data for male migrants is used, male migrant workers account for 52 per cent of total male labour force (see Table 6) in the village. Third, in terms of caste, migrant workers constitute 40 per cent of the labour force in case of Scheduled Caste workers and 30 per cent of the relatively poorer OBC I (see Table 7). And fourth, in terms of landholding
size-class, 62 per cent male migrant workers belong to landless HHs and another 52 per cent to those HHs owning less than 1 acre of agricultural land (see Table 8). Thus, the importance of migration for the labour force as well as for the local labour market cannot be over-emphasised.

Table 5: HHs with Migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HHs with at least one migrant worker</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs with at least one worker</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Migrants by Duration of Their Stay

Clearly, short-term migration is much higher than long-term migration, close to three-fourth of all migration. In terms of numbers, 695 persons are short-term migrants and 247 are long-term migrants out of the total population of 5604. Of the total 942 migrants, 841 (89.2%) are migrants who are part of the labour force while rest 101 are either students or non-working dependents. Temporary migrants are 652 (77.5%) and long-term migrants 189 (22.5%) of the migrant labour force. Short-term migrants are mostly workers, non-workers constituting only 6.2 per cent of them. Only a small fraction of them are salaried while for 83 per cent work in agriculture and non-agriculture is the main occupation both in the village as well as at destination. However, long-term migrants include 23 per cent non-workers – students and dependents. They are mostly engaged in salaried work (25 per cent) and non-agricultural work (33 per cent). Only a small section of them (6 per cent) are engaged in agricultural work as their main occupation.

Distribution of Migrants by Sex

A sex-wise disaggregation shows that female residents constitute 97 per cent of total female population while in case of males, 69.4 per cent reside in the village and 29.7 per cent are migrants. In fact, there are more female residents (55.9 per cent of the total residents) in the village than male residents (44.1 per cent). This scenario was clearly visible in the village, particularly amongst the labouring communities, where we could see more women than men. In case of temporary migration females are just 3.6 per cent of temporary migrants whereas their proportion is higher (17.4 per cent) in case of long-term migration.

Thus, it is safe to conclude that migration from the village is basically a male phenomenon. This is further reinforced by finding in Table 6 which shows that out of the total 1554 male workers in the village, migrant workers are 803 (which is more than half of the village labour force). In comparison, female migrant workers are just 2.6 per cent of total women workers. Regarding women workers, our respondents, both male and female, identified domestic work their main (first) occupation. Out of 1467 women workers, 1208 (82 per cent) of them identified domestic work as their main occupation. In case of women migrant workers, 30 out of 38 are engaged in domestic work, also implying that all migrant workers involved in domestic work are female. This clearly shows the gender segregation in migrants’ occupation.

Table 6: Sex-wise Distribution of Migrant and Total Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male/Female</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Male Workers</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Male Workers</td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Female Workers</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution of Migrants by Age

Table 7 shows differential pattern of age-distribution among migrants and residents workers. Migrant workers mostly start migrating at the young age of 17 or 18 years and majority of them work up to the age of 50 years. Of all migrant workers, those in the age group of 15-39 years constitute 78.3 per cent whereas there are only 50.4 per cent resident workers in this age-group. In the age group above 50 years, just 6.5 per cent of migrant workers are engaged in labour force. In case of resident workers, 27.5 per cent workers are found working in the same age group. This shows that migrating workers are relatively young. Work and living conditions at destination and to-and-fro journey to the destination demand high body capital. With age or disease related degradation of body, the worker returns to native place. Another reason for high working population in the above 50 age group among residents is that there is no concept of retirement in casual work or in self cultivation and other self-employment based activities. Economic necessity and the pressure to remain productive to the family compel them to continue working. Another important feature is almost an absence of very young population among migrants whereas children below the age of 18 and as young as 9-10 years were found working among the residents. This is because of a combination of factors – children not being welcomed at destination, demand of physical strength to carry out work, single male migration, temporary migration, etc. However, children do work locally if they are not in school or after dropping out of school at young age. However, we were told that very few children, boys or girls, below the age of 13-14 years work for wages; they mostly help their parents in their field or off-field activities.

Table 7: Age Distribution of Migrant Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Resident Workers (incl. Commuters)</th>
<th>Migrants (Temp.+ Long-term)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9 Yrs</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14 Yrs</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19 Yrs</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24 Yrs</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29 Yrs</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34 Yrs</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39 Yrs</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 44 Yrs</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 49 Yrs</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 54 Yrs</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 60 Yrs</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 60 Yrs</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Age Groups</td>
<td>2180</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Migrants by Caste
The caste distribution of the working population closely follows the general caste distribution in the village. Table 8 shows that among the Hindu migrant workers, those belonging to General category (brahmin) migrate less than their share in the working population. The same is the case with the upper OBC group and also the STs. Those who migrate more than their proportion in the working population belong to the lower OBC group and the SCs. Migrant workers from these two caste groups constitute more than 70 per cent of the total workers in the village. Similarly, among Muslims, the percentage of migrant workers out of total Muslim workers is 32 which is quite high. The highest percentage of migrant workers out of the total workers belongs to the SCs. In terms of individual castes, the highest proportion of migrant workers to total workers in the same caste group comes from musahar. This is followed by chamar, baniya, nonia, nai and Muslims. The lowest migration is from barhai (carpenter) which is an artisanal caste and who seem to get full opportunity from local employment. They are followed by Brahmin, which is a landowning caste, and yadav who own land as well as are in the dairy business. However, there is a different pattern if migrant workers are divided into temporary and long-term migrants. Brahmins whose educational attainments are much better, have better social network, enjoy higher social position, share higher proportion in salaried jobs, are engaged in trade and business, and have a much higher proportion (44%) of long-term migrants. Upper OBCs and Muslims have around 17 per cent of their migrants as long-term migrants. For rest of the caste groups, long-term migrants constitute less than 10 per cent.

Table 8: Caste/Community Category-wise Distribution of Migrant Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste / Community Category</th>
<th>Total Workers (No.)</th>
<th>Distribution of Total Workers (%)</th>
<th>Total Migrant Workers (No.)</th>
<th>Distribution of Total Migrant Workers (%)</th>
<th>% of Migrant Workers to Total Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBC II</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBC I</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Castes</td>
<td>2681</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Caste/Community-wise Migrant Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste / Community</th>
<th>Total Workers</th>
<th>Migrant Workers</th>
<th>% of Migrant Workers to Total Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brahmin</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonia</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godhi</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Caste / Community  | Total Workers | Migrant Workers | % of Migrant Workers to Total Workers
--- | --- | --- | ---
Kewat | 364 | 101 | 27.7
Baniya | 52 | 19 | 36.5
Sudhi | 11 | 3 | 27.3
Chamar | 29 | 11 | 37.9
Nai | 3 | 1 | 33.3
Barhai | 19 | 3 | 15.8
Yadav | 89 | 20 | 22.5
Santhal | 68 | 15 | 22.1
Musahar | 130 | 53 | 40.8
Halwai | 4 | 1 | 25.0
All Castes | 2681 | 732 | 27.3
Muslims | 340 | 109 | 32.1

Table 10: Temporary and Long-term Migrant Workers, Caste/Community-wise

| Caste / Community Category | Temporary Migrant Workers | Long Term Migrant Workers | Total | %
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
| No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
General | 114 | 55.9 | 90 | 44.1 | 204 | 100.0
OBC-I | 334 | 82.7 | 70 | 17.3 | 404 | 100.0
OBC-II | 41 | 91.1 | 4 | 8.9 | 45 | 100.0
SC | 58 | 90.6 | 6 | 9.4 | 64 | 100.0
ST | 14 | 93.3 | 1 | 6.7 | 15 | 100.0
All Castes | 561 | 76.6 | 171 | 23.4 | 732 | 100.0
Muslim | 91 | 83.5 | 18 | 16.5 | 109 | 100.0

Migrants by landholding Size-class

The highest proportion of migrant workers belongs to the landless group. They form half of the migrant workers. Together with those holding less than one acre of land, they constitute 83 per cent of total migrant workers. Table 11 shows that among the landless and lower landholding size classes migrant workers are overwhelmingly temporary migrants. As one moves to higher landholding size classes, the proportion of temporary migrant workers decreases and that of long-term migrants increases. As Table 12 for male workers as well as male migrants workers in the village shows, the proportion of residents goes up with the rise in the size classes of landholding whereas in case of migrant male workers a converse relationship applies.
Table 11: Migrant Workers According to Landholding Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landholding Size (in acres)</th>
<th>Temporary Migrants</th>
<th>Long Term Migrants</th>
<th>Total Migrant Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landless</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 - 2.5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 - 5.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 - 10.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0 - 20.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 20 Acres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Male Workers According to Residential Status and Landholding Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landholding Size (in acres)</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Commuter</th>
<th>Temporary Migrant</th>
<th>Long Term Migrant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landless</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 - 2.5</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 - 5.0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 - 10.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0 - 20.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 20 Acres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution of migrants by educational status

Overall, literacy and educational attainments are quite poor in the village. 54.7 per cent working population is illiterate and another 16.6 per cent is merely literate, i.e., below primary level. Data also shows that illiteracy is much higher among residents than the migrants (See Table 13). This is primarily because female concentration among the residents is very high and 73 per cent of them are not literate. In fact, 80 per cent of illiterates among residents are female. Illiteracy is higher among male migrants in comparison to male residents. Overall, male residents show better educational attainments compared to male migrants. There is similar pattern in terms of caste and landholding class. Higher the caste status and landholding, better the educational achievements among male workers including male migrant workers. This explains why majority of male migrants workers is employed as casual labour both at the source as well as destination areas. Within migrants, long-term migrants have better educational attainments. A considerable number of them are graduates. This explains why more long-term migrant workers are in regular jobs. Many of them, particularly belonging to the upper caste (brahmin) work in supervisory capacity. Temporary male migrants have less educational attainments. Educational attainments are highest among the commuters followed by long-term migrants. In terms of caste and community, the illiterates and below primary educated mainly belong to OBC-I, SC, ST and Muslims. While 44 per cent of male temporary migrants among brahmin was either illiterate or below primary education, the corresponding figures for OBC-II, OBC-I, SC, ST and Muslims were 53.7, 68.9, 67.9, 92.3 and 84.9 per cent respectively. This shows a clear caste pattern in educational profile of the migrant and non-migrant population. The same pattern is observed in the relationship between educational status and landholding size class. Higher educational qualification is found progressively in higher landholding size classes. The trend is same for the resident workers as well as the migrant workers. It also shows that for long-term migration education opens more opportunities as not only illiteracy is low among them but technical and other attainments are also better.

Table 13: Educational Status of Working Population by Sex and Residential Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Status</th>
<th>Resident &amp; Commuters</th>
<th>Temporary &amp; Long-term Migrants</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>267 (35.6)</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Primary</td>
<td>136 (18.1)</td>
<td>179 (12.5)</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>47 (6.3)</td>
<td>56 (3.9)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>82 (10.9)</td>
<td>54 (3.8)</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>76 (10.1)</td>
<td>42 (2.9)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14: Educational Status of Male Temporary Migrant Workers According to their Caste/Community Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Status</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>OBC-II</th>
<th>OBC-I</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Muslim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>25 (22.5)</td>
<td>15 (36.6)</td>
<td>155 (47.3)</td>
<td>23 (41.1)</td>
<td>8 (61.5)</td>
<td>52 (58.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Primary</td>
<td>24 (21.6)</td>
<td>7 (17.1)</td>
<td>71 (21.6)</td>
<td>15 (26.8)</td>
<td>4 (30.8)</td>
<td>28 (31.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>14 (12.6)</td>
<td>6 (14.6)</td>
<td>35 (10.7)</td>
<td>11 (19.6)</td>
<td>1 (7.7)</td>
<td>3 (3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>21 (18.9)</td>
<td>6 (14.6)</td>
<td>41 (12.5)</td>
<td>2 (3.6)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>11 (9.9)</td>
<td>4 (9.8)</td>
<td>12 (3.7)</td>
<td>1 (1.8)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>3 (3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Secondary</td>
<td>11 (9.9)</td>
<td>2 (4.9)</td>
<td>13 (4.0)</td>
<td>4 (7.1)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>4 (3.6)</td>
<td>1 (2.4)</td>
<td>1 (0.3)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>1 (0.9)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111 (100.0)</td>
<td>41 (100.0)</td>
<td>328 (100.0)</td>
<td>56 (100.0)</td>
<td>13 (100.0)</td>
<td>89 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Migrant Workers by Main Occupation

Of the 841 migrant workers, the highest percentage of workers engage in non-agricultural work (48.5%), followed by agricultural work (31.5%). These two account for 80 per cent of all migrant workers. These are by and large manual workers. Those who identified non-agricultural works as their main occupation undertake them at destination as non-agricultural work opportunities are very limited in and around the village. Merely 1.4 per cent of residents and commuters are engaged in casual non-agricultural activities. In fact, except agriculture, all other occupations are non-agricultural by nature. Table 15 clearly shows that fewer long-term migrants are involved in agricultural work. They are mostly engaged in non-agricultural work and salaried jobs.
Table 15: Activity Status of Migrants and All Workers according to Duration of Migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Occupation</th>
<th>Temporary Migrant</th>
<th>Long Term Migrant</th>
<th>Total Migrant Workers</th>
<th>Resident &amp; Commuter Workers</th>
<th>Total Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Employed</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Work</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Work</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Agricultural Work</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: Migrant Workers as Percentage of Total Workers, Occupation-wise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Occupation</th>
<th>Total Workers</th>
<th>Migrant Workers</th>
<th>Migrant Workers as % of Total Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Employed</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Work Only</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Workers</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Agricultural Workers</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3021</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since migration is a male phenomenon, as stated earlier, a better picture regarding the occupational profile of the labour force can be obtained by analysing the data of male workers only. Table 17 clearly shows that for male residents and commuters agriculture and allied activities, both as casual labour and self-employed, is the main occupation engaging
almost 73 per cent of labour force. Non-agricultural wage work engages just 3.7 per cent male labour. On the contrary, agriculture and allied activities engage just 8.5 per cent of long-term male migrant workers and 42 per cent of temporary male migrant workers. For long-term male migrant workers, non-agricultural work and salaried work are main occupations, and for temporary male migrant workers, non-agricultural work and agricultural work are main occupations.

Table 17: Occupation according to Residential Status of Male Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Temporary Migrant</th>
<th>Long-term Migrant</th>
<th>Residents &amp; Commuters</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed in Agriculture &amp; Allied</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Labour</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self employed in Non-Agriculture</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Agricultural Labour</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Trade &amp; Contract</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Occupations</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of caste and community, there is a definite occupational pattern which follows traditional caste and class hierarchies. There are fewer agricultural workers from among the General (brahmin) caste. They are into non-agricultural work and a considerable section of them are in salaried job too. Some of them do business and/or take up construction related contracts in government projects. Within the upper OBC (OBC II), there are more people in allied activities of agriculture, such as livestock rearing and dairy and also small trade and business. Lower OBCs are mainly in manual labour but half of them work in non-agricultural sector. SCs and STs are overwhelmingly agricultural workers and Muslims are mostly non-agricultural workers. There are some variations within the OBC II and OBC I caste groups. Within OBC I, for majority of nonia, non-agricultural work is their main occupation whereas for kewat it is agricultural work. Same is the case within SCs where 89 per cent of musahar work as agricultural workers whereas 82 per cent of chamar work as non-agricultural workers. Within OBC II, yadav mostly work in self-cultivation and dairy whereas baniya not at all engage in agricultural work. Their main occupation is non-agricultural work. Landholding wise, there are no agricultural workers among those holding more than 2.5 acres of land. Landless HHs and those owning up to 2.5 acres of land closely follow the general distribution pattern of occupational activities among the total migrant workers.
### Table 18: Caste/Community Category-wise Main Occupation of Migrant Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste / Community Category</th>
<th>Agricultural Worker</th>
<th>Non-Agricultural Worker</th>
<th>Salaried</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>12 (5.9)</td>
<td>90 (44.1)</td>
<td>59 (28.9)</td>
<td>43 (21.1)</td>
<td>204 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBC II</td>
<td>14 (31.1)</td>
<td>16 (35.6)</td>
<td>6 (13.3)</td>
<td>9 (20.0)</td>
<td>45 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBC I</td>
<td>125 (30.9)</td>
<td>206 (51.0)</td>
<td>17 (4.2)</td>
<td>56 (13.9)</td>
<td>404 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>48 (75.0)</td>
<td>10 (15.6)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>6 (9.4)</td>
<td>64 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>10 (66.7)</td>
<td>4 (26.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (6.7)</td>
<td>15 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Castes</td>
<td>209 (28.6)</td>
<td>326 (44.5)</td>
<td>82 (11.2)</td>
<td>115 (15.7)</td>
<td>732 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>11 (10.1)</td>
<td>82 (75.2)</td>
<td>8 (7.3)</td>
<td>8 (7.3)</td>
<td>109 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 19: Caste/Community-wise Main Occupation of Migrant Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste / Community</th>
<th>Agricultural Worker</th>
<th>Non-Agricultural Worker</th>
<th>Salaried</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brahmin</td>
<td>12 (5.9)</td>
<td>90 (44.1)</td>
<td>59 (28.9)</td>
<td>43 (21.1)</td>
<td>204 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonia</td>
<td>46 (22.7)</td>
<td>132 (65.0)</td>
<td>6 (3.0)</td>
<td>19 (9.4)</td>
<td>203 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godhi</td>
<td>17 (17.3)</td>
<td>52 (53.1)</td>
<td>7 (7.1)</td>
<td>22 (22.4)</td>
<td>98 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kewat</td>
<td>62 (61.4)</td>
<td>21 (20.8)</td>
<td>4 (4.0)</td>
<td>14 (13.9)</td>
<td>101 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baniya</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>13 (68.4)</td>
<td>4 (21.1)</td>
<td>2 (10.5)</td>
<td>19 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudhi</td>
<td>1 (33.3)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2 (66.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>3 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamar</td>
<td>1 (9.1)</td>
<td>9 (81.8)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (9.1)</td>
<td>11 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nai</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (100.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barhai</td>
<td>1 (33.3)</td>
<td>2 (66.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>3 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yadav</td>
<td>12 (60.0)</td>
<td>1 (5.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>7 (35.0)</td>
<td>20 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santhal</td>
<td>10 (66.7)</td>
<td>4 (26.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (6.7)</td>
<td>15 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musahar</td>
<td>47 (88.7)</td>
<td>1 (1.9)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>5 (9.4)</td>
<td>53 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halwai</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (100.0)</td>
<td>1 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Castes</td>
<td>209 (28.6)</td>
<td>326 (44.5)</td>
<td>82 (11.2)</td>
<td>115 (15.7)</td>
<td>732 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>11 (10.1)</td>
<td>82 (75.2)</td>
<td>8 (7.3)</td>
<td>8 (7.3)</td>
<td>109 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20: Occupation of Migrant Workers According to their Landholding Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Holding Size (in Acres)</th>
<th>Agricultural Labour</th>
<th>Non-Agricultural Labour</th>
<th>Salaried</th>
<th>Domestic Work</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landless</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 - 2.50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50 - 5.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00 - 10.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00 - 20.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Size-classes</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Migrants by Income and Expenditure

The data shows that migration makes definite contribution to those HHs who have less land endowments and are in labour work. Except those HHs whose main occupation is self-cultivation by hired labour, all other HHs involved in agriculture and allied activities as their main occupation reported more income than non-migrating HHs in the same categories. Only those non-migrant HHs, who are in petty business or work as contractor locally or have salaried job locally, reported more income than those of migrant HHs. The reason seems to be additional income coming to those HHs from multiple sources such as agriculture and allied activities.

Temporary Migrants’ Destination according to Rural and Urban

The survey enumerated 650 temporary migrants in the village. Migration from the village to urban centres accounts for more than 60 per cent of all temporary migration during last one year while migration to rural areas is little more than one third of all such migration. A handful of migrants reported working in both areas.

Table 21: Migrants’ Destination according to Rural and Urban

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural/Urban</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural &amp; Urban Both</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Migrants’ Destination according to Destination State and Occupation

Punjab was the destination for little more than one third of all migrant workers followed by Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and Delhi. A few workers also migrate to West Bengal, Uttrakhand, Maharashtra, Jammu and Kashmir, Madhya Pradesh, Nepal, and other places within Bihar. Two-third of those
migrating to Punjab works in agriculture. In fact, Punjab was the only destination where majority workers migrated to work in agriculture. In case of Haryana, Himachal, UP and Delhi, migrants mostly engage in non-agricultural labour. Two migrating workers to Delhi work in vegetable cultivation. Petty business is fairly distributed across all these states. Some of the workers who migrate to UP actually work in the National Capital Region (NCR), adjoining Delhi city. Himachal was a surprise destination to us as the state is hardly known in Bihar as a receiving state and that too for non-agricultural work.

**Table 22: Destination of Migration according to Occupation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Labourer In Agriculture</th>
<th>Labourer In Non-Agriculture</th>
<th>Petty Business</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haryana</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himachal</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>223</strong></td>
<td><strong>329</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>650</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Row %**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Labourer In Agriculture</th>
<th>Labourer In Non-Agriculture</th>
<th>Petty Business</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haryana</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himachal</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Column %**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Labourer In Agriculture</th>
<th>Labourer In Non-Agriculture</th>
<th>Petty Business</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haryana</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himachal</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Total** | **100.0**               | **100.0**                  | **100.0**     | **100.0** | **100.0** |
Migration According to Caste and Occupation at Destination

Caste-wise, there seems to be a pattern in selection of destination. For musahar and godhi, Punjab and Haryana are the main destinations while Punjab is the main destination for yadav and Santhal. For nonia and kewat, Himachal is a prominent destination along with Punjab and Haryana. Delhi is the top destination for baniya and dhuniya who engage in only non-agricultural work. For brahmin, UP is also a destination along with Punjab and Haryana.

Table 23: Main Destination of Migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste/ Community</th>
<th>Main Destination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brahmín</td>
<td>Punjab, Haryana and UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonia</td>
<td>Himachal, Haryana and Punjab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godhi</td>
<td>Haryana and Punjab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kewat</td>
<td>Punjab and Himachal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhuniya</td>
<td>UP and Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baniya</td>
<td>Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santhals</td>
<td>Punjab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yadav</td>
<td>Punjab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musahar</td>
<td>Punjab and Haryana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table below (Table 24) gives further break-up of occupations at destination for migrants belonging to different caste. Only in case of musahar and kewat migrants, agricultural labour is occupation of more than 90 per cent works. For migrants belonging to other castes, non-agricultural work is the predominant occupation. Baniyas do not engage in agricultural labour at all. Brahmín, nonia, godhi and dhuniya migrant workers also do petty business at destination.

Table 24: No. of Temporary Migrants According to Caste and Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brahmín</td>
<td>Labourer In Agriculture</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labourer In Non - Agriculture</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Petty Business</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonia</td>
<td>Labourer In Agriculture</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labourer In Non - Agriculture</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Petty Business</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godhi</td>
<td>Labourer In Agriculture</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labourer In Non - Agriculture</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Petty Business</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agrarian Transition and Migration in a Village of Bihar

Temporary Migration and Remittances

We found several first-time migrants. One aged migrant was reported to have been migrating for last 40 years. The mean year of migration was nine. On an average they travel two times a year though some migrants travel frequently up to four times. Some spend as short as one month at the destination while some stay up to nine months. Average period of stay at destination is six months. Average remittance sent by individual migrants is Rs. 14 thousand per annum, with maximum being Rs. 45 thousand per annum.

Table 25: Duration of Migration and Remittances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Years Since Migrated First</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Visits to the Destination</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of Migration in One year (in months)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earning at Destination in a Year</td>
<td>23769</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>25000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remittances Received</td>
<td>14252</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>14000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Remittances depend on a number of factors – duration of stay, occupation at destination, skill of the migrating person, and wages at destination. Remittances do not differ much across landholding size-classes. Those migrating within the state bring meagre amount as remittances. This is the case with Santhals. Migrants who are involved in petty-business and who also hold larger landholding (5 to 10 acres) in the village contribute more in terms of remittances. Musahar, chamar, nai, halwai and Santhals are amongst the lowest remittance groups. In case of those who are involved in petty business or in non-agricultural work, they tend to invest part of their income rather than bring back home. Agricultural workers try to maximise their return by exerting their own body to the hilt by taking sowing or harvesting on contract basis. Table 26 is based on data collected for 632 temporary migrants, belonging to 495 households, who had brought/ sent remittances.

Table 26: Average Remittance per hh According to Location, Occupation, Landholding and Caste.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Rural / Urban</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>13308</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>40000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>15282</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>45000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural &amp; Urban Both</td>
<td>14250</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>21000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Occupation at Destination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer In Agriculture</td>
<td>13138</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>32000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer In Non – Agriculture</td>
<td>14611</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>45000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Business</td>
<td>19232</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>32000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Landholding Size-class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landless</td>
<td>15011</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>45000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 Acre</td>
<td>14043</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>36000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 - 2.50 Acres</td>
<td>13730</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>40000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50 - 5.00 Acres</td>
<td>12688</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>22000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00 - 10.00 Acres</td>
<td>21500</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>25000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Caste Category</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>11836</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>26000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>5314</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>18000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBC-I</td>
<td>14638</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>45000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBC-II</td>
<td>15846</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>33000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>16391</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>40000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>14792</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>32000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Caste/Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmin</td>
<td>14792</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>32000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonia</td>
<td>15678</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>45000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godhi</td>
<td>13399</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>33000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kewat</td>
<td>14237</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>30000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhuniya</td>
<td>16391</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>40000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baniya</td>
<td>11643</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>25000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudhi</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>15000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamar</td>
<td>10838</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>26000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nai</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barhai</td>
<td>17667</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>22000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yadav</td>
<td>18429</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>33000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santhal</td>
<td>5314</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>18000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musahar</td>
<td>11992</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>24500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halwai</td>
<td>6500</td>
<td>6500</td>
<td>6500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Duration of Temporary Migration and Availability of Employment

Table 27 shows that on an average a migrant stays outside the village for 5.7 months (171-173 days) in a year. However, there are significant differences in terms of duration of migration across occupations, castes and communities. Those engaged in agricultural labour work at destination migrate for the lowest period, 4.9 months, in a year whereas those in petty business migrate for the highest duration, 6.6 months, in a year followed by non-agricultural workers who migrate for approx. 6 months in a year. Scheduled Caste migrants work for the lowest duration of 4.9 months whereas Muslims stay at destination for 6.7 months and OBC II and General Castes (brahmin) stay for 6.1 months and 6.0 months a year. Scheduled Tribes (Santhals) out-migrate for the lowest average duration of 2.4 months. The total employment made available to 650 temporary migrants for whom we have detailed data is equivalent to 3676 months. If we assume that a worker gets on an average 20 days of work in a month (including the travel time), then an average temporary migrant would be getting 113 days employment a year through migration.

Table 27: Availability of Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Labourer In Agriculture</th>
<th>Labourer In Non - Agriculture</th>
<th>Petty Business</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>All Occupations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration in months</td>
<td>duration in months</td>
<td>duration in months</td>
<td>duration in months</td>
<td>duration in months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBC-I</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBC-II</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Caste / Community</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[HHs = 503; Total Migrants = 650)

As regards, long-term migrants, an average migrant would be getting employment for 111 days to 122 days in a year. Such migrants include those who are salaried and covered under payment for all days in the year (though not all salaried persons are regular/permanent as many of them are employed in informal economy) and also those who are in such petty
business which operates on day basis. But our own study (Pushpendra and Manish K Jha, 2015) shows that a long-term migrant worker gets job for 18 to 20 days a month. This abysmal level of employment and consequently low income explains why there are few females migrating even on long-term basis. Urban employment and livelihoods do not help meet the total cost of social reproduction of labour. Hence, while males migrate for longer duration, females take care of domestic chores in the village and those belonging to labouring classes also participate in agriculture either as wage worker or engage in own agricultural field. Few of them also engage in non-farm activities. Thus, close to two-third of long-term migrants send remittances to family members in the village which are used for subsistence and, in few cases, for acquiring productive assets. Females migrating on long-term basis are mostly family members of salaried persons.

**Migration and Credit**

Migration has made impact on credit relations in the village. As data shows, migrants are gradually emerging as one of the sources of credit. In majority of the cases, this is within the caste group but interest is charged. However, we found several cases where brahmins had taken loan from nonias. A few nonia migrants, who have progressed off as petty contractors at destination are emerging as creditors. The table below also shows that lessor or cultivator-cum-employer are not major source of credit except in case of chamar households who have borrowed mainly from their cultivator-employer.

**Table 28: Sources of Credit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste/Community</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Migrant Labour</th>
<th>Trader</th>
<th>Moneylender</th>
<th>Lessor</th>
<th>Cultivator-Cum-Employer</th>
<th>Other Cultivator</th>
<th>Friend/Relative</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brahmin</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonia</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godhi</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kewat</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhunia</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baniya</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamar</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yadav</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santhal</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musahar</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section IV

In this section, I return to the basic research questions raised in the beginning of the paper that relate to the relation between agrarian transition and migration. In this regard, I underline the following trends based on the data cited in the previous section.

1. Land concentration is not the dominant trend in the village. Whether the lack of concentration of land and the persistence of small-scale cultivation can be interpreted as signs of semi-feudal relations is debatable for three reasons: a) the interlocked land, labour and credit relations in agriculture is no longer at work on a considerable scale; b) extra-economic coercion of labour such as begar (unpaid work), agricultural bondage and attached labour have significantly reduced, if not disappeared, because of migration and rising social consciousness and movements; and c) casual labour employment has increased. There is a peculiar condition of decline of big holdings, prevalence of small holdings and tenancy, and high outmigration – all resulting in petty commodity production in agriculture. The category of households who are neither pure subsistence producers nor pure wage labourers are emerging on a considerable scale. This blurs any direct and near class conflict and class mobilisation, allowing caste mobilisation to dominate. The pure proletariat class does not exist on a considerable scale locally as the monetary wages do not constitute the principal part of the means of subsistence for landless workers. However, if we add wages earned as migrant labourers, they can be said to be proletarianised. Because income derived from wage labour then constitutes a larger share in the household earning.

2. The rise in self-cultivation as well as leasing out agricultural land seems to be happening simultaneously. Tenancy seems to be becoming a strategy of ensuring supply of labour and creating special incentive for the migrants to return to their native village. It is in a way disguised employment. This model cannot be equated with the classic “feudal” model because none of the parties – the lessor and the lessee – depend completely on the rent income. The lessor households are more likely to run on salaries, income from non-agricultural sources or other sources of rent. The lessee households though give priority to the fields of the lessor upon his return, he is no longer solely dependent on the leased-in land, hence is not tied in coercive relationship with the lessor in any significant manner.

3. With agricultural incomes insufficient to provide for the needs of most rural working people and extremely slow growth of regular employment (Bhaduri 2009), most people are being pushed to work in the unregulated informal and unorganised sector which has almost no labour protection but accounts for 93% of the Indian workforce (Harriss-White 2004). The vulnerability, mobility and marginality of this informal sector labour may explain the persistence of small-scale cultivation. Multiple livelihood options are necessary for the reproduction of rural households.

4. The control of local landowners on the labourers has considerably weakened.

5. Workers are increasingly becoming “footloose labour” (Breman 1996). Casualisation is the primary feature of this labour and as Breman, Guérin and Prakash (2009) and others have shown, different degrees of bonded labour
relations are a common condition of this capitalist work relation. While some need the advances which tie them to particular contractors in moments of crisis, others often submit to bondage simply in order to get employed. Breman points out that this neo-bondage (of varying degrees) is significantly different from the forms of agrarian bondage of the past as it comes without the guarantees of provisions of basic needs in slack seasons or when labourers were not able to work.

6. There is an important caste-class-gender-religion-age-education dynamic to this massive labour migration. Dalits, OBCs and Muslims predominate the seasonal casual labour migration. Upper caste dominates in regular and better paid jobs at destination. Circular migration, particularly rural to rural does not seem to be preferred by female members of the labouring households. Younger people constitute the overwhelming majority of the migrant workers. Similarly, the outcome of migration is directly associated with the educational status of the migrant which in turn has relationship with caste and landholding of the household.

7. Even if this migrant labour does not reinvest in agriculture back at home, migration has fostered the increased purchase of clothes, better food, healthcare and schooling, causing fundamental shifts in the agrarian economy. A restudy of villages in Purnia district by Rodgers and Rodgers (2001) stresses the fundamental importance of temporary migration on the marketising and monetising of the rural economy and the decline in the political exactions and social mechanisms of semi-feudalism. Rural areas are being fundamentally transformed through migrant labour.

8. Most petty commodity producers (PCPs) are extremely vulnerable, struggling to survive, sustaining themselves in conditions where they will not be able to grow and any surplus will be accidental. They are, as Harriss-White (2010) points out, easily susceptible to exploitation through exchange on several markets: property, raw materials, money and the finished product, other than that of the classic one of labour for wage work. She argues that “India’s capitalist transition and ongoing transformations have created a complex social formation in which – despite rampant differentiation and the creation of advanced forms of corporate capital … together with a substantial working class – PCP is the most common form of production.” Moreover, she argues that “it is not transitional”.

Section V

Conclusion

Migration is a necessary supplement to subsistence agriculture because of reproduction of the migrant labour force is not possible through the local wage market. The local wage market is underformed and wage rates are low. Time sensitive and capital-labour intensive commercial agriculture in some regions of India has been providing opportunities for seasonal migration of labour. However, the vast reserve of the labour supply to such areas allows the wage rates to be controlled. The seasonal nature of employment also allows the source areas to use the same labour in agriculture. All these lead to the persistence of poverty, availability of cheap labour and stagnation in rural areas slowing down the agrarian transition.

A combination of migration and tenancy does not allow wage relations to become the principal labour relations in the countryside.
At the same time, at agrarian destinations, migration does not allow wage relations to convert into class struggles because a) the migrants are temporary; b) there is over-supply of labour; c) labourers do not have unity as they become from different places and cannot forge unity in a short period of time; and d) wages are decided through bargaining process. There is a peculiar condition of decline of big holdings, prevalence of small holdings and tenancy, and high outmigration – all resulting in petty commodity production in agriculture.

Clearly, Jitwarpur is not a case of classical agrarian transition. People are no longer simple peasants or rural wage labourers, they have complex livelihoods involving both forms of work: tilling their small plots of land and now, dependent on migrant wage labour, on working in the rural non-farm economy and on petty commodity production and trade in the capitalist economy to reproduce their household. This complexity demands new conceptual tools for theorisation. Scholars also need to consider whether India (or at least parts of it) is witnessing a transition from peasant production to petty production in which producers embody micro capital as well as labour and do not lose entire control of the means of production but are compulsively incorporated through circuits of exchange. They also need to think through whether the internal differentiation of labour is losing its relevance and can be replaced by the concept of ‘classes of labour’ encompassing a broad range of rural and urban workers and petty peasant producers? When the process of agrarian transition seems to be protracted and torturous for the workers, will it be more relevant to define the classic agrarian question as the question of labour?
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