

RURAL-URBAN MIGRATION: NECESSARY FOR DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES

***DR.AMIT BHOWMICK**

**Assistant Professor & HOD, Dept. of Sociology, Nur Mohammad Smriti Mahavidyalaya, Murshidabad, West Bengal*

INTRODUCTION

India is a land of villages which houses are nearly 80% of its population. It is reasonable to say that villagers in India manifest a deep loyalty to their village, identifying themselves to strangers as residents of a particular village, connecting back to family residence in the village that typically extends into the distant past. A family rooted in a particular village does not easily move to another location. But today, the scenario has changed, as migration has obliterated this factor of life from villages and this new trend of urbanization has created a profound social, environmental, political and economic dilemma for all segments of the society. The rural to urban migration and the urbanization are associated with a vertical shift in the labour force from the agricultural sector to the urbanized-industrial sector (Chelladuari: 2009). The UN says that if urbanization continues at the present rate, then 46% of the total population I.e. 634 million people will be in urban regions of India by 2030(UN:1998).

DEFINITION OF MIGRATION:

Donal G.Bogue in his book *Principle of Demography* said that “Migration may occur as a search for opportunity to improve one’s lot in life”. According to Evertts Lee’s, “Many a time decisions taken about migration are not rational and based on emotions, though in a large number of causes such decisions are well thought out are planned”. Peterson said, “Migration can be primitive when it is due to maladjustment e.g. due to change in environments of migrations which took place in the primitive societies when the people were nomads and did not lead a settled life”. According to United Nations, “Migration is a form of geographical mobility or spatial mobility between one geographical unit to another”. Migration occurs when the place of utility in a few locations

becomes better than that of the present location. Migration is infact, a boon for industrial advancement. It is also a blessing for jobless persons who spend their valuable time uselessly.

CAUSES OF MIGRATION:

Migration is caused due to various reasons which may vary from country to country and it can vary from place to place, state to state within a country on the basis of socio-economic and cultural status of the demography. Migration primarily occurs due to disparities in regional development. The causes of migration are usually explained by using two broad categories, namely, push and pull factors. Studies conducted in the sphere of migration in India- found that poverty, job searching and family influence have been the main push factors for out-migration, while availability of better employment opportunity, prior migrants and availability of better educational facilities have been identified as the key pull factors behind migration. To be more specific, for rural India, poverty is still considered to be the main push factor for illiterates and moderately educated migrants (Hazra: 2012). The factors which largely contribute to rural to urban migration are poverty and starvation, unemployment, low agricultural productivity, failure of crop, landlessness, poor education and medical care, lack of credit facilities mainly found in rural areas in one hand and better scope of employment, better gender equality, prospect for better life (education, health and drinking water etc.), wage differentials, bright city lights cause attraction in the urban areas on other hand(Mohapatra:2014). There are numerous causes for migration from rural to urban centers and vice versa or from one region to another. Notable among these are (Gupta: 2009):

- (01) Social conflicts and social tension;
- (02) Gap in civilization or culture;
- (03) Law and order situation;
- (04) Inequalities in the available social and economic opportunities and other amenities of life between groups of people and or sectors;
- (05) Income maximization;
- (06) Inequitable distribution of benefits of economic development;
- (07) Social mobility and social status aspirations;
- (08) Residential satisfaction;
- (09) Friend and family influences;
- (10) Desire to attaining lifestyle, performance and enjoyment;
- (11) Development of some sort of complex.

Distribution (per 1000) of migrants by reason for migration during 1993, 1999-2000 and 2007-2008				
Reasons for Migration (01)	Migrated in			
	Rural Areas		Urban Areas	
	Male (02)	Female (03)	Male (04)	Female (05)
49th Round(1993)				
Employment related reason	47.7	8.3	41.5	4.9
Studies	4.1	1.1	18.0	7.0
Marriage	2.3	61.6	0.9	31.7
Movement of parents or earning member	20.8	23.7	28.3	49.5
Other reasons	25.1	5.3	11.3	6.9
All	100	100	100	100
55th Round(1999-2000)				
Employment related reason	30.3	1.0	51.9	3.0
Studies	5.3	0.4	6.2	1.3
Marriage	9.4	88.8	1.6	58.5
Movement of parents or earning member	26.0	6.3	27.0	31.0
Other reasons	29.0	3.5	13.0	6.2
All	100	100	100	100
64th Round(2007-2008)				
Employment related reason	28.6	0.7	55.7	2.7
Studies	10.7	0.5	6.8	2.2
Marriage	9.4	91.2	1.4	60.8
Movement of parents or earning member	22.1	4.4	25.2	29.4
Other reasons	29.2	3.2	10.9	4.9
All	100	100	100	100

(NSSO Reports: 49th, 55th & 64th Round)

Distribution(per 1000) of migrants by reason for migration during 2007-08										
All India										
Sl. No.	Reason for Migration	Rural			Urban			Rural + Urban		
		(M)	(F)	(P)	(M)	(F)	(P)	(M)	(F)	(P)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Employment related reasons:										
1.	In search of Employment	46	01	06	151	06	61	112	03	24
2.	In search of better Employment	97	02	12	165	06	66	139	03	30
3.	Business	17	00	02	30	01	12	25	00	05
4.	To take up employment or	81	02	10	133	09	56	114	03	25

	better employment									
5.	Transfer of service or contract	36	01	04	68	03	28	56	01	12
6.	Proximity to place of work	10	01	02	10	02	05	10	01	03
7.	Sub-total (Srl. 1 to 6)	286	07	36	557	27	228	456	11	99
8.	Studies	107	05	16	68	22	40	82	10	24
Forced Migration										
9.	Natural Disaster	12	01	02	02	01	01	06	01	02
10.	Social or Political Problem	24	02	05	07	03	04	13	02	05
11.	Displacement by Development Projects	06	00	01	04	01	02	05	01	01
12.	Sub-total (Srl. 9 to 11)	42	03	08	13	05	07	24	04	08
13.	Acquisition of own house or flat	42	03	07	34	09	18	37	04	11
14.	Housing Problems	39	03	07	16	06	10	24	04	08
15.	Health Care	11	01	02	04	02	02	07	01	02
16.	Post Retirement	26	00	03	07	00	03	14	00	03
17.	Marriage	94	912	825	14	608	383	44	836	681
18.	Migration of parent or earning member of the family	221	44	63	252	294	278	241	107	134
19.	Others	122	17	28	34	22	26	66	18	27
20.	Sub-total (Srl. 13 to 19)	555	980	935	361	941	720	433	970	866
21.	All (incl. n.r.)	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000

(M)-Male, (F)-Female, (P)-Person

(NSSO Report No. 533; Migration in India, July 2007-June 2008)

The 64th NSSO Report on Rural Migration:

The major findings of the 64th National Sample Survey Office (NSSO) released Report No. 533 entitled 'Migration in India, 2007-2008' are as following:

- ❖ In India, nearly 29% of the persons were migrants with significant rural-urban and male-female differentials.
- ❖ The migration rate in the urban areas (35%) was far higher than the migration rate in the rural areas (26%).
- ❖ Magnitude of male migration rate was far lower than female migration rate, in both rural and urban areas.

- ❖ Migration rate in rural areas was lowest among the Scheduled Tribe (ST), nearly 24%, and it was highest among those classified in the social group ‘others’, nearly 28%.
- ❖ In urban areas, migration rate was lowest among Other Backward Class (OBC) nearly 33%, and it was highest among those classified in the social group ‘others’, nearly 38%.
- ❖ Nearly 60% of urban male migrants and 59% of urban female migrants had migrated from rural areas.
- ❖ The most prominent reason for female migration in both the rural and urban areas was marriage; for 91% of rural female migrants and 61% of the urban female migrants the reason was marriage.
- ❖ The reason for migration for male migrant, was dominated by employment related reasons, in both rural and urban areas. Nearly 29% of rural male migrants and 56% of urban male migrants had migrated due to employment related reasons.
- ❖ For rural males, self-employment had emerged as main recourse to employment after migration. The share of self-employment in total migrants increased from 16% before migration to 27% after migration, while the shares of regular employees and casual labours remained almost stable, in both before and after migration.
- ❖ In rural areas, for both males and females short-term migrants, more than half were casual workers in their usual principal activity status.
- ❖ Out-migration rate for males was nearly 9% from rural areas and 5% from urban areas. The rates for females were much higher compared to males in both the rural and urban areas.
- ❖ A relatively higher percentage of female out-migrants, from both the rural and urban areas, took up residence within the State; nearly 89% for rural female out-migrants and 80% for urban female out-migrants had residence within the State.
- ❖ Nearly 50% of urban male out-migrants were concentrated within the State from and 33% of them had residence in a State different from the one from which they had out-migrated.
- ❖ For female out-migrants from both rural and urban areas, the reason for out-migration was predominantly for marriage, which accounted for nearly 84% of female out-migrants from both the rural and urban areas.
- ❖ Among male migrants from the urban areas, nearly 69% of those residing abroad had sent remittances compared to only 41% of those residing in India.

Migration by Streams and Administrative Locations(Percentage)				
Migration Streams	Intra-District	Inter-District	Inter-State	All
Census 2001	62.5	24.1	13.2	100
NSS 1999-2000				
Rural to Rural	75.3	20.1	4.6	100
Rural to Urban	43.8	36.5	19.6	100
Urban to Urban	46.5	33.5	20.0	100
Urban to Rural	36.6	43.5	19.9	100
TOTAL	56.1	30.0	13.9	100
NSS 2007-2008				
Rural to Rural	72.4	23.2	4.4	100
Rural to Urban	41.2	33.6	25.2	100
Urban to Urban	48.8	33.8	17.5	100
Urban to Rural	27.9	49.2	22.9	100
TOTAL	53.3	32.0	14.7	100

(Sources: Census of India 2001, NSSO: 2001, 2010)

Distribution (per 1000) of internal migrants by last usual place of residence for each component of rural-urban migration streams during 1999-2000 & 2007-2008				
Migration Stream	Last Usual Place of Residence			
	Within State		Between States	All States
	Same District	Different District		
(01)	(02)	(03)	(04)	(05)
55th Round(1999-2000)				
Rural to Rural	753(75)	201(21)	46(4)	1000(100)
Rural to Urban	438(44)	365(37)	196(20)	1000(100)
Urban to Rural	465(47)	335(34)	200(20)	1000(100)
Urban to Urban	366(37)	435(44)	199(20)	1000(100)
64th Round(2007-2008)				
Rural to Rural	724(72)	232(23)	44(4.4)	1000(100)
Rural to Urban	412(41.2)	336(34)	252(25)	1000(100)
Urban to Rural	488(49)	338(34)	175(18)	1000(100)
Urban to Urban	279(28)	492(49)	229(23)	1000(100)

(Source: Census of India, NSSO Reports)

CONSEQUENCES OF MIGRATION:

Migration is essential for development. It can contribute to the empowerment of women by providing women migrants and women whose husbands have migrated with income and greater status, autonomy and self-esteem. Migration can influence social and political development, with internal labour mobility being seen as essential to

economic growth(Razi:2014).Migration is helping in equalizing social status, income of rural urban settlements, checking fragmentation of land holdings and promotes concept of division of labour and specialization. Migration is the chief mechanism by which all the world's greatest urbanization trends have been accomplished (Kumar: 2014).The consequence of rural out-migration is the change in the value orientation of the migrants and its effects on their families left behind. It has also changed the demographic profile of rural areas. Since migration has a lowering effect on fertility behavior, it has reduced the family size among the migrants as compared with the non-migrants. Social consequences of migration are the change in the occupational status of the migrants (Haq: 2007).Another important social consequence of migration is its effect on the process of acculturation and adjustment and integration of migrants in the receiving areas. In the new urban setting, the migrants get acculturated into the urban ways of life and adjust into it by their ability to participate and perform new roles and activities (Hause: 1965).

DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES:

Over the past four decades, the Government of India has adopted many explicit population distribution policies and programmes to decongest urban areas and facilitate a more balanced spatial development (Chelladuari: 2009).To control rural-urban migration, there is need to policy interventions. It should be managed in such a way that it can play a positive role in the process of economic development and can provide a sound basis for national prosperity. Here are some suggestions (Razi: 2014, Kalkoti: 2014, Mohapatra: 2014):

- Population control measures must be made effective in both urban and rural areas in order to sustain urban situation. Otherwise, even the best of urbanization strategies will fall.
- Rural urban settlements should not be considered as competitive but they should be treated as complementary to each other.
- The problems of metropolitan cities must be looked in a comprehensive manner and on a regional basis.
- The flow of migration may be checked only if they are offered better employment opportunities in rural areas.
- Migrants, outside their home areas, are guaranteed of their entitlements to livelihood support system and Government's welfare schemes.
- Migrants, access to food should be guaranteed under the National Food Security Act and through public distribution system. For this migrants can be organized into Self Help Group.
- A comprehensive social protection programme is necessary for migrants to guarantee minimum wage, no exploitation, proper housing, access to improved sources of drinking water. Sanitation and health services.

- Provision of better and adequate education and health facilities in the rural area is one of the essentials to control the pace and magnitude of migration.
- The Government should encourage other allied sectors to enhance job creation in the villages through high value agriculture like horticulture, floriculture and etc.
- Village Entrepreneurship Programme should be initiated and incentives should be provided to the rural youth to start their new venture with the help of available rural resources.
- Special effort has to be made to preserve the forest and to stop deforestation in the tribal belt which may slow down the pace of migration and help the natives to get their livelihood at their place of origin.

Indicative list of Schemes (Self Employment Programmes & Wage Employment Generating Schemes) implemented by Government of India.

SI No.	Year	Scheme
01	1960-61	Rural Manpower Programme (RMP)
02	1973	Crash Scheme for Rural Employment (CSRE)
03	1972	Draught Prone Area Programme(DPAP)
04	1974-75	Small Farmers Development Agency(SFDA)
05	1977	Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP)
06	1973-74	Marginal Farmers & Agricultural Labour Scheme(MFALS)
07	1979	Training of Rural Youth for Self Employment (TRYSEM)
08	1977-78	Food for Work Programme(FWP)
09	1980	National Rural Employment Programme(NREP)
10	1982	Development of Women and Children in Rural Areas (DWCRA)
11	1983	Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme(RLEGP)
12	1993-94	Jawahar Rozgar Yojana(JRY)
13	1993	Employment Assurance Scheme(EAS)
14	1999	Swarnajayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SJGSY)
15	1999	Jawahar Gram Samridhi Yojana (JGSY)
16	1999-2000	Rural Infrastructure Programme
17	2001	Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana(SGRY)
18	2004	National Food for Work(NFWP)
19	2006	National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS)
20	1977	Maharashtra Employment Guarantee Scheme(MEGS)
21	1977	Maharashtra Employment Guarantee Act (MEGA)
22	2008	Prime Minister Rural Employment
23	2009	Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA)
24	2014	Pradhan Mantri Jan-Dhan Yojana

Migration Rate (per 1000 persons) for each State/U.T. RURAL			
State/U.T./All India	Male	Female	Male + Female
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Andhra Pradesh	88	473	282
Arunachal Pradesh	11	05	08
Assam	26	227	120
Bihar	12	379	189
Chhattisgarh	70	531	295
Delhi	282	407	339
Goa	120	296	212
Gujarat	53	572	299
Haryana	41	593	298
Himachal Pradesh	153	592	378
Jammu & Kashmir	24	329	174
Jharkhand	10	308	156
Karnataka	80	474	273
Kerala	195	459	333
Madhya Pradesh	30	533	268
Maharashtra	98	572	329
Manipur	06	05	06
Meghalaya	38	29	33
Mizoram	107	114	110
Nagaland	62	92	76
Orissa	43	511	280
Punjab	74	571	312
Rajasthan	46	541	288
Sikkim	195	414	300
Tamil Nadu	79	354	220
Tripura	57	163	110
Uttarakhand	151	539	344
Uttar Pradesh	26	501	256
West Bengal	45	512	272
A & N Islands	508	562	533
Chandigarh	710	628	672
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	237	566	372
Daman & Diu	484	536	503
Lakshadweep	320	239	281
Poducherry	139	356	242
All-India	54	477	261

(NSSO Report No. 533; Migration in India, July 2007-June 2008)

Migration Rate (per 1000 persons) for each State/U.T.URBAN			
State/U.T./All India	Male	Female	Male + Female
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Andhra Pradesh	333	467	400
Arunachal Pradesh	38	27	33
Assam	223	327	270
Bihar	208	497	345
Chhattisgarh	330	590	452
Delhi	431	422	427
Goa	323	429	377
Gujarat	276	465	365
Haryana	279	576	417
Himachal Pradesh	455	618	532
Jammu & Kashmir	97	281	186
Jharkhand	178	341	253
Karnataka	265	383	324
Kerala	258	428	348
Madhya Pradesh	160	523	336
Maharashtra	356	493	421
Manipur	10	26	18
Meghalaya	42	47	44
Mizoram	189	223	206
Nagaland	320	329	325
Orissa	324	567	442
Punjab	223	565	379
Rajasthan	240	495	362
Sikkim	536	729	627
Tamil Nadu	176	316	247
Tripura	112	201	156
Uttarakhand	397	594	486
Uttar Pradesh	165	471	310
West Bengal	233	482	353
A & N Islands	513	530	521
Chandigarh	544	521	533
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	528	656	579
Daman & Diu	254	406	323
Lakshadweep	392	215	303
Poducherry	206	402	305
All-India	259	456	354

(NSSO Report No. 533; Migration in India, July 2007-June 2008)

Migration Rate (per 1000 persons) for each State/U.T. RURAL + URBAN			
State/U.T./All India	Male	Female	Male + Female
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Andhra Pradesh	155	471	314
Arunachal Pradesh	17	09	13
Assam	45	236	134
Bihar	31	390	204
Chhattisgarh	112	540	320
Delhi	420	421	4210
Goa	237	370	306
Gujarat	135	533	323
Haryana	106	588	330
Himachal Pradesh	181	594	391
Jammu & Kashmir	37	320	176
Jharkhand	39	313	172
Karnataka	140	443	289
Kerala	210	452	337
Madhya Pradesh	61	531	384
Maharashtra	205	540	367
Manipur	07	10	09
Meghalaya	38	32	35
Mizoram	143	164	153
Nagaland	121	148	134
Orissa	83	519	302
Punjab	124	569	334
Rajasthan	92	531	305
Sikkim	233	448	336
Tamil Nadu	121	338	232
Tripura	66	169	117
Uttarakhand	215	551	379
Uttar Pradesh	55	495	267
West Bengal	90	505	291
A & N Islands	510	552	529
Chandigarh	563	533	549
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	278	578	401
Daman & Diu	419	488	447
Lakshadweep	352	228	291
Poducherry	176	383	277
All-India	109	472	285

(NSSO Report No. 533; Migration in India, July 2007-June 2008)

REFERENCES:

1. Brilliant Tutorials 2000,Chennai
2. Census of India 2001, Government of India
3. Chelladurai,A.(2009):Causes of Rural-Urban Migration, Kurukshetra, Vol.57,No.8,June 2009
4. Gautam,H.R.(2012):Can We Check Migration from Rural Areas?, Kurukshetra, Vol.60,No.4,Feb.2012
5. Gupta,S.K.(2009):Rural-Urban Migration-Need to Stem It, Kurukshetra, Vol.57,No.8,June 2009
6. Haq,E.(2007):Sociology of Population in India, Macmillan India Limited, Delhi
7. Hauser,P.M.(1965): The Study of Population, Chicago Press, Chicago
8. Hazra,A.(2012):Rural India: Still Floating Towards Cities, Kurukshetra, Vol.60,No.4,Feb.2012
9. Kalkoti,G.(2014):Status of Rural Migration-Need for Development Initiatives, Kurukshetra, Vol.62,No.11,Sept.2014
10. Kumar,P.(2014): Consequences of Rural Migration, Kurukshetra, Vol.62,No.11,Sept.2014
11. Mohapatra,A.K.(2014):Rural-Urban Migration in India-A Critical Review, Kurukshetra, Vol.62,No.11,Sept.2014
12. NSSO Report No. 533; Migration in India, July 2007-June 2008
13. Razi,S.(2014): Rural Distress and Rural Migration, Kurukshetra, Vol.62,No.11,Sept.2014
14. Tondon,B.,D.K.Suingh(2007): Rural-Urban Migration in India: Status and Direction, Kurukshetra, Vol.55,No.8,June 2007