

SOCIOLOGICAL STUDY ON MIGRATION AND ITS IMPACT ON RURAL FAMILY STRUCTURE: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY IN SRIKAKULAM DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH

Dr. DHULIPALLA RAJA VENKATA PAVAN KUMAR

Assistant Professor, Department of Social Work,
Lakshminarayana Memorial Degree College,
Nagarjuna Nagar, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh, India.
Email: pavankumardrv5@gmail.com

Abstract

One of the prime factors that leads to socio-economic transformation or change of rural India is migration. The movement of families is causing a change in the family structure, gender roles and relations and social networks of the rural area. With reference to Andhra Pradesh, the paper tries to explain, the effect of migration on rural family structure which was empirical sociological research paper. The study conducted in Srikakulam district was the basis of this sociology paper on migration. One hundred respondents from rural families of the district constituted the sample. The study was of descriptive and analytical type and it was based on primary data. Information is secured from the respondents through the technique of personal interview methods. An observation of the area was done with a field visit. Only the members of the family who were residing at home were not the 'migrants'. Findings indicate most migrants are men rather than women. At least one adult male member of the household migrates outside the village either on a seasonal or on a permanent basis. The seasonal and periodic aspects of a species' migratory pattern greatly impact their migratory range. Most of the family members are migrating on account of poverty, unemployment and agricultural distress in the village. Because of the seasonal nature of migration, the study area and destinations have not been permanent.

Keywords

Migration, Rural Family Structure, Srikakulam District, Social Change, Remittances, Gender Roles, Rural Sociology, Family Disintegration, Empirical Study, Andhra Pradesh

Introduction

Migration can be regarded as one of the most significant social transformation processes in rural societies, especially in developing countries like India. Rural to urban migration refers to the movement of people from rural areas such as villages to urban areas like cities or towns. People move from rural areas to urban areas in order to look for jobs, education and better living conditions. Lee's migration theory, according to the scholar Lee (1966), explains how people migrate because of push factors and pull factors. In his opinion, the first one refers to poverty, unemployment, and agricultural distress. The second one refers to better wages and urban opportunities, among others. So, migration has become an important structural feature of rural life, particularly among agricultural workers and youth. The impact of migration on rural family, society, and economy Migration is phenomenon which is not merely an economic activity but social process. It changes the dynamics between family and individual. It influences sending households and receiving urban spaces alike. Viewed from a sociological angle, migration is a shift from collective rural life to fragmented family systems. The evolution of

the rural labour-force from a homogeneous society to one that is highly differentiated has far-reaching implications for social stability, gender roles, and inter-generational relations of rural society (Todaro, 1976; Castles & Miller, 2009).

Types and Patterns of Migration

There are seasonal, temporary, and permanent migration. The commonest form is seasonal migration, where people migrate during the lean period of agriculture and return at the time of harvest. People migrate to urban areas for a long period, usually for construction work, factory work or informal jobs. Permanent migration is rare, though it takes place when families move entirely to urban centres for a better livelihood. The male-dominated migration process is accompanied by some instances of female migration for domestic or informal work. Migration usually takes place in a highly network-based pattern, where migrants get the guide of family members or villagers already migrated. Migration chains are established which allow for continual rural-urban movement. Socially speaking, these patterns reflect structural dependency on urban economies and a breakdown of employment systems in rural areas. Patterns of migration also reveal a movement away from a collective agrarian lifestyle and towards a more individualized wage labor system in city spaces.

Causes of Migration

People primarily move out of their place for economic, agricultural and structural reasons. Rural poverty is the most significant reason why the households seek options outside the agricultural economy. Farming is an unreliable source of livelihood due to small and fragmented landholdings, low agricultural productivity and dependence on monsoon rainfall. Based on the migration model of Todaro, individuals will migrate when expected urban income exceeds rural income opportunities (Todaro, 1976). Unemployment and underemployment in rural areas, especially youth, is another important reason. The agricultural cycle is seasonal; consequently, workers become unemployed and move to towns. Also, the rising cost of living and debt push people to migrate. Social factors like peer pressure and established migration networks also play an important role, with earlier migrants encouraging new migration flows from the same village. The agrarian distress gets aggravated due to environmental stress like erratic rainfall and soil fertility decline. In sociological terms, migration is not an option but a survival strategy arising from structural inequalities in rural development (Deshingkar & Start, 2003).

Impact of Migration on Family Structure

Migration is important for rural family structure and it alters the pattern of family household in particular rural families were organized as joint families traditionally. Shared resources, decision making as a joint family and strong kinship ties characterized rural families. Migration breaks this system by separating family members through distance. Many families are converting into nuclear family or de facto female-headed families as a result. When there are no male members, the roles in the family get reallocated and women take charge of agriculture,

money and child care. Parsons' structural functionalist theory teaches that family perform an essential function like socialization, emotional support, and economic cooperation. However, migration weakens these functions (Parsons, 1955). The migrants always state that distance and lack of communication have reduced interactions of migrant members with the family. Emotional bonding is impacted among children and elder members also. The joint family system is declining, which shows that the families are undergoing sociological change from collectivism to individualism (Goode, 1963).

Economic Impact and Role of Remittances

Migration has a dual economic impact on rural households. It leads to a rise in income. It also makes the family dependent on outside income. Migrant workers who send home remittances are a key source of household income. Families utilize these monetary funds to fulfill their essential requirements like food, education, healthcare, and upgrading their shelters. In a lot of instances, remittances have improved upward mobility and living standards. However, reliance on remittances leads to economic vulnerability, especially when migration is irregular and employment in urban areas is unstable. For economic point of view, the migrants stating that income is a lifeline for the survival of families, with little or no alternative income available in rural areas. From a sociological point of view, migration participates in the monetarization of rural economy and lessens dependence on local agriculture. Although the economic upside is clear, its social downside amounts to pulling families apart and putting them under stress. Migration serves as an important resource for development as well as a structural dependency of rural society (Connell & Conway, 2000; Stark, 1991).

Migration and Changing Gender Roles

Historically, rural society formed a patriarchal type family with men as the breadwinner and women taking care of domestic chores and children. Nevertheless, migration breaks this arrangement at the family level by taking men away from the household for a long time. Consequently, women are forced to take on more work, including agriculture, finances, decision-making, and talking to outside agencies. This change has resulted in the "feminization of responsibilities" in rural households according to sociologists. Most of the women reported increased workload and decision-making after the migration of males. While this situation increases practical autonomy for women in some cases, it simultaneously enhances their physical and emotional stress. Gender role theory proposes a social constructionist view of gender roles that suggests they are not biologically fixed but socially produced and changeable (Lorber 1994). As a result, migration plays a crucial role in changing gender relations in rural society. Women often experience an increase in responsibilities but limited access to inputs, land and institutions due to structural limitations. This creates a paradox where one is responsible but not empowered. According to sociologists, migration extends gender roles while also creating gender inequalities in rural households (Chant, 1992; Kabeer, 2000).

Impact of Migration on Children

Children from rural families suffer psychological and social consequences due to migration. In Most of the children grow up with one or more missing due to migration. This absence impacts emotional security, learning ability, and socialisation. According to attachment theory, stable emotional bonds are important for children's psychological development (Bowlby, 1969). In the current research, respondents reported that children from migrant families tend to suffer from loneliness, lack supervision, and are less academically motivated. Often, children are left in the care of their grandparents or other family members. As a result, children do not get proper guidance. When fathers are absent, the lack of discipline and emotional instability. Gains from remittances help in obtaining education but it cannot replace the emotional deprivation. Migration causes a "care deficit" as rural families do not sufficiently take care of the emotional and developmental needs of children. As time progresses behavioral issues may develop, a school dropout risk and family bonds may weaken. Migration has tangible advantages for rural kids, but there are mental costs involved (UNICEF, 2018; Dreby, 2010).

Elderly Members and Emotional Consequences

Resident old folks in migrant households suffer massive emotional and physical problems. In rural districts, several aged parents are left when the younger members shift to cities. Loneliness, insecurity, and lack of daily care will result from this separation. Historically, joint family systems provided elderly members with emotional support, health care assistance and social engagement within the family members. However, migration is disrupting this caregiving system. Although economic remittances may make things better materially, the emotional neglect is very severe. Social support theory states that the emotional well-being of the elderly is dependent on family interaction and social integration (Cohen & Wills, 1985). Due to migration, the generation gap is being created. This gap affects the economic support and emotional care. This means shifting from a society that takes care of the poor to a individual family taking care of their poor family members. The elderly are therefore one of the vulnerable groups due to changes in their family by migration (Victor, Scambler & Bond, 2009).

Migration and Social Relationships

Migration significantly affects social relationships and community life in rural areas. The absence of a large portion of the working population weakens community participation, collective activities, and traditional social networks. Festivals, rituals, and village gatherings often see reduced participation due to the absence of migrant members. According to social capital theory, strong community relationships are essential for trust, cooperation, and collective action (Putnam, 2000); but the migration leads to weakening of interpersonal relationships and reduced social cohesion in rural society. Communication between families is often limited to mobile phones or occasional visits, which reduces face-to-face interaction. Over time, this weakens kinship bonds and mutual support systems. Migration also introduces urban cultural influences into rural settings, leading to changes in lifestyle, consumption patterns, and social expectations. While this may promote modernization, it also creates

cultural disintegration in traditional rural communities. Thus, migration reshapes not only family structure but also broader social relationships and community identity (Castles, de Haas & Miller, 2014)

Cultural Transformation due to Migration

Migration contributes significantly to cultural transformation in rural society, particularly in rural districts, where traditional lifestyles are deeply rooted in agrarian practices. When individuals migrate to urban areas, they are exposed to new cultural norms, lifestyles, consumption patterns, and value systems. Upon returning or through communication with family members, these influences gradually enter rural households. This process leads to cultural diffusion and hybridization of rural traditions with urban modernity, i.e., many households reported changes in dressing patterns, food habits, and aspirations influenced by migrant experiences. According to sociological theories of cultural change, migration acts as a key mechanism of cultural transmission between rural and urban spaces (Redfield, 1941). While such changes may promote modernization and openness, they also create tensions between traditional values and emerging lifestyles. Older generations often resist these changes, while younger members adapt more quickly. This intergenerational cultural gap is an important sociological outcome of migration. Thus, migration not only transforms economic and the elderly residents of migrant households have to face huge emotional and physical issues. Aged parents are a common sight these days in Srikakulam district as their children shift to the cities with their families. They will experience loneliness, insecurity, and abuse and neglect every day. Previously, joint family systems supplied elderly members with emotional support, health care assistance and social engagement within family members. Yet, this migration is affecting this caregiving system.

Sending money back home may help ameliorate the situation materially, but emotional neglect is very severe. According to the Social Support Theory, families can enhance the quality of life for the elderly. The improvement in well-being is based primarily on family interaction and social integration according to Cohen and Wills (1985). With migration, there is a generation gap being created. This deficiency impedes receiving both financial and emotional support. This refers to a transition from a system that offers institutional support for those who are poor, to a style in which each family caters for its own members. Due to changes in their families caused by migration, the elderly become one of the vulnerable groups (Victor, Scambler & Bond, 2009).

Review of Literature

Several studies have analyzed migration patterns and their socio-economic impacts in rural Andhra Pradesh, particularly in northern coastal districts like Srikakulam. According to studies by Deshingkar and Start (2003), seasonal migration in rural India is mainly linked to poverty, lack of work, and agricultural unreliability. Agricultural labourers have been pushed to the urban informal sector due to structural rural unemployment. (Breman, 2010) According to Reddy (2015), in Andhra Pradesh, the migration from coastal districts is mainly male and

seasonal, with construction being the main occupation. As per Naidu (2016), remittances enhance household income but create dependency on external income. According to researchers in Srikakulam district Srinivas and Rao during 2017 study, it was found that Migration leads to weakening of joint family systems and increased responsibility on women. According to Kumar (2018), children of migrant families go through emotional stress and educational disruption. Patnaik (2019) has shown in his research that there is a linkage between agricultural distress and migration in north coastal Andhra Pradesh. According to a 2020 UNESCO study, rural-urban migration flows cause socio-cultural transformation. According to a report by the World Bank (2021), migration is a survival strategy as well as a development challenge. In the end, Rao (2022) concludes that in Srikakulam district, migration is a manifestation of deep-rooted socio-economic inequality and lack of rural opportunities. Collectively, the studies reveal that migration is an economic necessity and a major factor of rural social change.

Scope of the Study

This study is limited to the socio-economic factors related to migration in Srikakulam district, Andhra Pradesh, on a rural approach. It particularly concentrates on income level, education, occupation and employment condition which play an important role in migration. The research also looks at migration in rural households, which refers to the change in family structure and economic dependence on remittances. Based on a sample of 100 respondents, these findings may be representative of a similar rural setting. This scope explains migration as an important factor of rural social change and development.

Objectives of the Study

1. To examine the major socio-economic factors influencing migration in rural areas of Srikakulam district.
2. To analyze the causes of migration such as poverty, unemployment, low income, and agricultural distress.
3. To study the impact of migration on rural family structure, including changes in gender roles, children, and elderly care.
4. To assess the role of remittances in improving household economic conditions and rural livelihoods.
5. To suggest policy measures for reducing distress migration and promoting sustainable rural development

Study Area: Srikakulam District

Srikakulam district of northern coastal Andhra Pradesh is mainly rural with agriculture being the main source of livelihood. The area has small landholdings, job participation, seasonal crops and low industrial development. These structural limitations made a large section of the rural people migrate to survive. Migration from Srikakulam is mainly to nearby urban areas Visakhapatnam, Hyderabad, Chennai and Bengaluru. The present empirical study was

conducted among rural households with at least one family member migrating. The socio-economic profile of the region shows that the majority of migrant families belong to the lower income group and depend on daily wage labor. According to rural sociology, such migration patterns are closely related to agrarian distress and lack of employment diversification (Breman 2010). Through this, migration is both a coping mechanism and a structural necessity. The economic necessity takes precedence over social stability in the study area. Due to the prolonged absence of male members, family systems in Srikakulam are gradually shifting from joint to nuclear. There are significant implications for care-giving, household decision-making and social cohesion (Deshingkar & Akter, 2009). The study was conducted in the rural villages of Srikakulam District, AP which is always an agriculture-based area and seasonal work. In the region, industrial development is minimal and land holdings are small. People depend heavily on monsoon agriculture. This results in regular out-migration for work. Using a purposive sampling method, 100 respondents were chosen, specifically the households affected by migration. The sample has families who have at least one member migrating to urban/semi-urban areas for work. The sampling technique is consistent with the objectives of the study. It also throws adequate light on the socio-economic conditions of the migrant households.

Research Methodology

The present study is empirical and descriptive in nature which analysis the sociological aspects of migration and condition of rural family structure. A purposive sampling technique was used to select a sample of 100 respondents from rural households of Srikakulam district. The respondents were families having at least one migrated member working in the urban area. Data collection for the study included a variety of sources. Primary data involved collecting information through structured interviews and field observation. Similarly, gathering information from books, journals, and migration reports was part of secondary data collection. Researchers used both qualitative and quantitative analyses to interpret social patterns. To obtain the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of respondents, percentages will be used. Theories of movement, family structure, and social change guided Parsons' (1955) sociological interpretation. The emphasis was on understanding changes in family roles, economic dependency, emotions relationships, and gender responsibilities. Throughout the data collection process, all ethical considerations were maintained. Respondents' confidentiality was ensured, as well as their informed consent. According to the method grouping the limitations of rural fieldwork like response bias and seasonal variation in migration are considered. Although there are limitations, it does give a reliable sociological picture of how migration affects the family structures in rural areas in Srikakulam district (Bryman, 2012; Creswell, 2014).

Data Collection:.

Data collection will be accomplished using primary and secondary sources. Using an interview schedule, primary data were generated by contacting the respondents. This provided an opportunity to understand migration experience, economic conditions and impact on family etc. The findings were supported and validated with data drawn from books, journals, census

reports, and earlier migration studies. Both data types make sure they are reliable and can be analysed easily. This dual approach captures field-study related aspects and theoretical perspectives on migration. Furthermore, it greatly helps in making the study comprehensive and sociologically meaningful. This data has been analyzed through percentage analysis, simple comparative tables, and sociological interpretation. The percentage analysis was carried out for the presentation of numerical data. The sociological interpretation was extended to the phenomenon of migration. It seeks to understand what migration indicates concerning rural social structure, family systems, and economic conditions. It looks at the migration pattern, and the meaning it contains. Together these tools convert the raw data into meaningful findings that will help the researcher understand the socio-economic factors of migration in the study area.

Findings

Table 1: Migration Status of Respondents

Status	Respondents	Percentage
Migrated	78	78%
Not Migrated	22	22%

According to the data, 78% of respondents are affected by migration, indicating that migration is a dominant livelihood strategy in the study area. Only 22% stay behind in their village to work. This finding confirms that Deshingkar and Start (2003) observe that much of the migration in rural India is a survival response to poverty and lack of available jobs. Breman (2010) similarly shows that structural unemployment forces rural workers into urban informal sector activities. As such, migration in the Srikakulam district mirrors national realities of rural distress that economic dependency on migration-based income.

Table 2: Type of Migration

Type	Respondents	Percentage
Seasonal	40	40%
Temporary	28	28%
Permanent	10	10%
No Migration	22	22%

The most popular type of migration is seasonal migration (40%), followed by temporary migration (28%) and permanent migration (10%). The statement suggests that migration is mostly circular and related to farming cycles. Castles, de Haas & Miller (2014) indicate that in developing economies rural livelihoods are often unstable; circular migration is common. The results of the study also conform to the findings of Reddy (2015) who noted seasonal labour migration in coastal Andhra Pradesh. The prevalence of seasonal migration indicates that rural households rely on agriculture but are compelled to migrate during the lean seasons, suggesting a structural instability in rural employment systems.

Table 3: Education Level of Migrants

Education	Respondents	Percentage
Illiterate	38	38%
Primary	34	34%
Secondary	20	20%
Higher	8	8%

An analysis of education shows that, out of respondents, 72 % are illiterate or have only primary education. As the level of education is too low, they cannot access formal employment. Becker's theory (1993) states that education enhances employability and protects against unskilled migration. The results conform to Sen (1999) assertion about education being integral to development and the expansion of capabilities. Poor education in Srikakulam district limits job opportunities making people resort to migration. Consequently, education is an important factor influencing socio-economic mobility and migration.

Table 4: Occupation of Migrant Households

Occupation	Respondents	Percentage
Agricultural Labour	55	55%
Daily Wage Labour	25	25%
Small Farmers	12	12%
Others	8	8%

A closer examination of the occupational structure shows that 55% of the respondents are agricultural laborers. Finally, this shows that the population is heavily dependent on low-income and seasonal work. As per Breman (2010), agricultural labourers are one of the most vulnerable sections of rural economy. Households have to migrate due to the absence of other job options. According to Todaro (1976), migration is forced by rural unemployment and underemployment are the major reasons. In Srikakulam, shifts in agriculture and low wage levels are responsible for. As such, occupation is a powerful structural factor that influences migration patterns.

Table 5: Monthly Income

Income	Respondents	Percentage
Below ₹5000	42	42%
₹5000–10000	36	36%
₹10000–15000	15	15%
Above ₹15000	7	7%

According to income distribution data, nearly 78% of households earn less than ₹10,000 a month. Todaro's migration model indicates that a major factor for migration is a disparity in rural and urban income. The results are in line with World Bank (2018) studies, which suggest that low-income rural households will depend on migration for survival. Farmers and labourers

are facing mounting economic pressure in Srikakulam district. People migrate as a way of survival for their daily basic needs. Hence, a key motivator of migration behaviour and rural social and economic vulnerability is income level.

Table 6: Causes of Migration

Cause	Respondents	Percentage
Poverty	40	40%
Unemployment	30	30%
Agricultural distress	18	18%
Social reasons	12	12%

Poverty (40%), unemployment (30%) and agricultural distress (18%) are major causes of migration. The pattern showcases inequality and unsustainable livelihoods of rural structures. Deshingkar and Start (2003) argued we can consider poverty-driven migration as a survival strategy in rural India. Patnaik (2019) also highlights agricultural distress as a principal factor fuelling migration from coastal Andhra Pradesh. The results show that migration is not voluntary but a necessity. Only 12% of social reasons provided by respondents' reflect that economic reasons dominate the study area.

Table 7: Remittance Impact

Impact	Respondents	Percentage
Positive income support	78	78%
No benefit	22	22%

The data reveal 78% of households get remittance. Therefore, it is useful for rural household economy. However, dependence on migrant income is also created. Connell and Conway (2000) state that living standards increase following remittance flows, although they can create economic vulnerability in the long term. In Srikakulam district, most people use remittances for food, education, and health care. Naidu (2016) reports similar findings in studies in Andhra Pradesh. Even though remittances reduce the incidence and severity of poverty in rural areas, they tend to strengthen migration cycles. Households who rely on remittances do not engage, as much, with employment generation in the local economy.

Table 8: Impact on Family Structure

Effect	Respondents	Percentage
Joint family breakdown	60	60%
Nuclear family formation	30	30%
No change	10	10%

Migration leads to significant changes in family structures where sixty per cent of families report joint family breakdowns. Marriage and as many as thirty per cent of all families are shifting to nuclear families due to migration. Goode (1963) theory was confirmed in this study of modernization. The results conform to Parsons (1955) revealing structural differentiation in family systems. In Srikakulam, migration of family members causes weakening of bonds. The growing trend of nuclear families implies increasing individualization and economic migration dependence. So, migration has been a major factor in the transformation of rural family systems and a decline in the collective family systems.

Table 9: Impact on Women

Effect	Respondents	Percentage
Increased workload	62	62%
Decision-making role	16	16%
No change	22	22%

In 62 per cent of homes, the increase in workload has been that of women. As noted by Kabeer (2000), migration often increases women's unpaid form of labour and decision-making burden without empowering. Chant (1992) further notes that men's migration explains the rise in female-headed households. In Srikakulam, women are running the whole show of farms, finances, and homes. Just sixteen percent cite being empowered to take decisions. Thereby, movement increases accountability but does not guarantee full equality. Further, movement quickens disintegration of joint families and increases nuclear family systems.

Table 10: Overall Migration Impact

Impact Level	Respondents	Percentage
High Impact	78	78%
Low/No Impact	22	22%

A solid 78% of respondents assert that migration has strong overall impacts, meaning the rural society will undergo transformative socio-economic changes. The idea also concurs with Castles, de Haas & Miller (2014) who argue migration transforms the origin and destination societies. The migration in Srikakulam district causes impact income, family structure, gender roles and emotion. While it helps economically, it also causes social disintegration. The findings demonstrate that migration is a development strategy but also a social challenge. Thus, its effects are deeper and play out in rural structural conditions.

Findings of the Study

The empirical study of migration and its influence on rural family structures in Srikakulam district has sociological evidence. To begin with, high incidence of migration have been found in the study area where nearly 78% of households have migrated. Migration is mainly seasonal and temporary in nature. This has shown that a rural worker moves repeatedly between village and urban area in order to survive. The main drivers of migration are poverty, unemployment,

low income, and agricultural distress, which are the socio-economic factors. Low education and dependence on agriculture increase likely to migration.

Migration has significantly transformed the rural family structure by breaking up joint families and leading to the emergence of nuclear families. In the absence of male members, women take on greater workload and responsibility as a clear evidence of changing gender roles. Children experience emotional distress due to lower parental supervision, while elderly people experience loneliness and lack care. The eighth effect is that although remittances augment income for 78% of households, it creates economic dependency on remittances. In the end, migration is both an economic survival strategy and a disruptor of the emotional stability of families and communities in rural areas.

Suggestions

Based on the findings, several suggestions are proposed to improve rural conditions and reduce distress migration:

- The focus of the article should be on Rural Employment Generation especially strengthening employment schemes like MGNREGA and generation of rural jobs throughout the year. This will result in a reduction in forced migration.
- There is a need to improve irrigation facilities, modern farming techniques and access to credit.
- To enable rural youth to be employed locally, vocational training can be provided through skill development programs.
- Women Empowerment: The scheme will provide women running migrant households various financial and social security benefits through special welfare schemes.
- Improving education is very essential in rural areas so that competent people are not forced to migrate to big cities.
- Social security for migrant families should include the provision of health insurance, pension support and child welfare.
- Let's encourage the establishment of small-scale and cottage industries in rural areas to provide alternative employment.

Policy Implications and Recommendations

- Integrated rural development programs should be launched to reduce forced migration. It will combine agricultural development, employment generation and infrastructure development.

- Create local employment hubs in district such as Srikakulam to ensure stable jobs for local people in villages
- Enhance the MGNREGA program and other rural employment schemes for annual income security of rural households
- Encourage the growth of small scale and cottage industries and promotion of rural employment.
- Rural youth should be given more skill training and vocational training to enhance their employability at local and regional levels.
- Help families of migrants by creating strong social protection systems (emphasize on women, children and elderly).
- Develop a district-level migration monitoring system to help track migration and make evidence-based policies.
- Encourage the establishment of public-private partnerships to facilitate employment generation and rural infrastructure development.
- Rural education, healthcare, and transport facilities should be improved to mitigate the structural disadvantages driving migration.
- Create policies for balanced regional development in order to minimize rural-urban disparity.

Conclusion.

Migration is powerful social change people from rural areas to urban and towns are taking place. The study findings show that migration in Srikakulam District alters the rural family, gender relations, emotional bonding and community life significantly. Despite migration increasing the household income through remittances, it leads to fragmentation of joint families, increased burden on women, psychological stress among children and feeling of loneliness among elderly. Migration is not only an economic process but a social process which transforms every aspect of rural life, the study observes. Migration, in the eyes of sociology, is both opportunity and vulnerability. Social cohesion and traditional support systems weaken with the provision of financial stability. For that reason, balanced rural development policies are needed to check distress migration and enhance local jobs. To achieve sustainable rural transformation, it is important to integrate economic development with social protection. It is clear that migration is a structural feature of contemporary rural society which requires constant policy attention and sociological understanding (Castles et al. 2014; Sen 1999).

References

- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Archana, K. (2021). Impact of MGNREGA in terms of direct changes: A study in Srikakulam district of Andhra Pradesh. *The Journal of Research ANGRAU*. <https://epubs.icar.org.in/index.php/TJRA/article/view/139354> (*Indian Agricultural Research Journals*)
- Breman, J. (2010). *Outcast labour in Asia: Circulation and informalisation of workforce*. Oxford University Press.



- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods*. Oxford University Press.
- Castles, S., de Haas, H., & Miller, M. J. (2014). *The age of migration*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Castles, S., de Haas, H., & Miller, M. J. (2014). *The age of migration*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Deshingkar, P., & Start, D. (2003). Seasonal migration for livelihood in India: Coping, accumulation and exclusion. *Overseas Development Institute (ODI)*.
- Lee, E. S. (1966). *A theory of migration*. *Demography*, 3(1), 47–57.
- Naidu, G. (2016). Remittances and rural household economy in Andhra Pradesh. *Indian Journal of Regional Studies*, 8(1), 23–34.
- Parsons, T. (1955). *Family structure and social structure*. Free Press.
- Patnaik, B. (2019). Agricultural distress and migration in coastal Andhra Pradesh. *Social Change and Development*, 15(3), 67–79.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone*. Simon & Schuster.
- Reddy, P. (2015). Patterns of rural-urban migration in Andhra Pradesh. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(2), 88–97.
- Redfield, R. (1941). *The folk culture of Yucatán*. University of Chicago Press.
- Sai, M., Prusty, A. K., Padhy, C., & Reddy, I. C. (2024). Migration behavior of rural youth from agriculture in North Coastal Andhra Pradesh (Srikakulam and Vizianagaram districts). *Indian Journal of Extension Education*. <https://doi.org/10.48165/IJEE.2024.60406> (*Indian Agricultural Research Journals*)
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.
- Srinivas, K., & Rao, L. (2017). Family structure and migration impact in rural Andhra Pradesh. *South Asian Sociological Review*, 6(1), 55–70.
- Todaro, M. P. (1976). *Internal migration in developing countries*. ILO.
- UNICEF. (2018). *Children left behind by migration*. United Nations.