



Rural - Urban Migration: Selectivity, Determinants and Destination

* Mahendra P. Agasty ** Dr. Rabi N. Patra

* Asst. Professor, Silicon Institute of Technology, Bhubaneswar

** Reader in Economics, Govt. Science College, Chatrapur, Odisha

ABSTRACT

Massive rural outmigration is a common phenomenon especially in the developing countries of the world. This paper is an attempt to examine the different determinants of migration in a coastal region of Orissa state, India. Migration is not the outcome of single factor. It is essentially selective and propensity to migrate is influenced by both micro and macro variables.

Keywords: Rural outmigration, Migrants, Non-Migrants, Land Holding,

Introduction

Internal migration is an important aspect human mobility which defines the magnitude and dynamics of spatial distribution of population, especially workers, in a country over time. It is a complex phenomenon having demographic, geographic, economic and sociological dimensions and requires a deeper understanding of the various issues concerning the movement of workers from one geographic location to another. Migration is essentially selective and the propensity to migrate is influenced by some micro variables which define the broad demographic characteristics of the individual migrants. These characteristics differ among individuals, involve a kind of stratification of people and help to explain how they respond to varying opportunities in the source and destination areas or why only some workers move out while others do not.

Migration is not the outcome of any single factor nor is the influence of a factor on migration decision uniform for all individual migrants and migrant households. Personal factors such as a person's educational attainment and skill, his knowledge of a potential destination and the receiving population, family burden and family ties and the family size and dependents; economic and spatial characteristics like household income, employment opportunities and wage rates in the areas of origin and destination, ownership of farm land and business motives can be the important motivations or impediments for migration to urban locations. In this back drop this micro study is focused on selectivity and the determinants of migration in Kendrapara district of Orissa.

Objectives of the study:

The main objectives of this paper are to know who the migrants are. (Characteristics), why the workers migrate (determinants) and where do they migrate (destination).

Data and Methods

A four stage random sampling procedure was followed in the study. Out of 30 districts one district was selected in the first stage. In stage II three blocks were selected from the districts. From each block 8 villages were selected in the third stage. Households were selected from these villages in the final stage. Following this process of selection and elimination 100 households having sent 139 migrants and 50 non-migrant households and 50 return migrant households were considered for in-depth investigation on the selected villages in Pattamundai, Rajnagar and Marshaghai blocks of Kendrapara. Simple analytical tools like multiple regression analysis have been used to analyze data.

Review of the literature

Migration flows are affected by two broad sets of variables viz. the macro variables or individual characteristics which influence migrant selectivity and macro variables or spatial characteristics of places of origin and destination which influence their relative attractiveness to push out or pull in people.

Age is a significant variable affecting migration (Sjaastad, 1962). Migrants tend to be disproportionately young (Todaro, 1980), because family strategies involve sending them off to the urban sector to harness better employment (Lucas and Stark, 1985). People at the younger age group are more likely to migrate (Dubey et al. 2004) than persons in other age classes. Hossain's (2001) study on rural-urban migration Bangladesh shows that the migrants are usually younger people and migration remarkably decreases with increase in age. Majority of rural out migrants belong to the 20-24 age groups. A study by Prasad et al. (2009) on migration to greater Mumbai reveals that 68 per cent of the migrants migrated when they were below 25 years of age

Education, skill and work experience of persons are important factors determining migrant selectivity. Male migrants are better educated compared to the population to which they belong (Rele, 1969). Migrants tend to be better educated and less risk averse (Todaro, 1980). While the positive association between educational attainment and migration has been well conceived in the literature some cases of negative and weak association between the two have also been reported.

A good number of empirical works on determinants of rural-urban migration focus on the characteristics of the sending (rural) and receiving (urban) areas which define their relative advantages in inducing people towards them. The size and density of population, extent and operation of the labour market, employment and other economic opportunities, social capital and networks, and environmental variables in the two locations as well as the distance between them are some of the important factors which influence the movement of labour from the rural to the urban areas. These factors can be grouped under the following four heads. Large population creates pressure and is a push factor in migration (Narayan et al 2002) because it means higher average size of households that is an inciting force for migration i.e. big size households have more migrants (Zahanogo, 2011).

The literature on determinants of migration flows speak more of economic than of other variables (Rele, 1969, Greenwood,

1997; Sundari, 2005). The importance of economic factors in influencing migration is clearly recognized by Ravenstein (1885) in his first law which states that the great centres of commerce and industry absorb the migrants. The study by Moose et al (2005) on seasonal labour migration in western India reveals that people migrate with a view to maximizing their income earnings

Results and discussions

There are several functional models available in migration literature to measure the impact of various factors on migration. But the application of all these models depends upon the objective of the study and the nature of data available in the analysis. Broadly we can use two methodological methods to measure the impact of these factors on migration behavior. In order to know the controlling effects of various factors on migration we have given special emphasis on linear regression approach. This method is used to isolate contribution of various factors resulting in shift of rural labor force to urban areas.

The functional form adopted in our analysis is

$$Y = a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n b_i x_i$$

On the basis of considered variables the linear regression equation applied is:

$$Y_m = b_0 + b_1 I + b_2 FS + b_3 ED + b_4 AG + b_5 M + b_6 LH + b_7 EWD + e$$

Where we have taken

Y_m = No of Migrants from individual household

I = Income

FS = Family size

ED = Education level of the migrants

AG = Age of the migrants

M = Marital status of the migrant

LH = Land holdings of the migrant family

EWD = Expected wage difference

e = error term

The model is estimated by using the ordinary least square method. Migration (Y_m) has been taken as the dependent variable and Income; household size, level of education, age of the migrants, marital status, size of landholdings and expected wage difference have been used as independent explanatory variable

Results of the functional approach

Estimated Coefficient is given in the table below.

Table 1
Simple Linear Regression

Explanatory Variables and Important statistics	Coefficient	t-value
Income	-0.066	-2.933
FS	.0.017	1.063
ED	0.003	0.290
AGE	-0.009	-2.127
MS	-0.160	-2.231
LH	-0.034	-1.786
EDW	0.004	14.703
Intercept	1.028	4.904
F-Ratio	93.834	
R ²	0.774	
N=200		

If we analyze the above table it is found that farm Income, Age, marital status and land Holding have an inverse relationship with the migration behavior. All these variables bear expected sign. Family size has a direct and positive relationship with the migration. It shows if the family size increases the migration increases. The result is as usual. A large family is likely to have more members in the working age group and can afford more out-migration to supplement household earning and ease its economic burden as well as have required members to work to work on own farms, do other jobs and look after the elderly and family affairs. The analysis also reveals if the land holding increases the migration decreases. So yield from land and the land holding are more important factors than the income from any other source in the study area. Land being

the most important productive resource in the rural areas and household income in the village being derived mostly from land, availability of adequate amount of good quality land is said to lower the need of migration. Of course, given the hesitation of the people to work in agriculture, this relation can be debated upon. But it is equally true that with large agricultural land holdings, households may go for greater diversification favoring high value crops and commercial farming practices thereby reducing the tendency towards migration.

Age and marital status have inverse relationship with the migration. From the earlier discussion in this chapter it is found the average age of the migrants is 20.07. The young people migrate more because of their risk taking ability and more earning capability. As many of the migrants are young their marital status result shows as usual.

We find the explained variability is to the extent of 77.4 per cent by the considered independent variables with respect to the dependent variables. A high value of R² shows the appropriateness of the regression equation for exploring the movement of dependent variables. R² is determined basically by the nature of dependent and independent variable and the equation of best fit depends upon the well accepted and well defined variables. In our analysis we have taken many social and economic variables which affect the migration. But the factors which we have taken here all are quantifiable.

F-ratio is also highly significant in our analysis. This shows all our Null hypotheses are rejected and the alternative hypothesis is selected.

From this simple linear regression we can set the equation of the line of best fit.

$$Y_m = 1.028 - 0.066(I) + 0.017(FS) + 0.003(ED) - 0.009(AGE) - 0.160 (MS) - 0.034(LH) + 0.004(EWD) + 0.389$$

Destination of Migrants

It is found from the study migration in the survey selected area is contact-based and by and large segmented. Not surprisingly, migrants were found to have moved to different urban centers where jobs were available to them in the vicinity of the contact person's place of work. We have identified the locations to which the migrants in the area moved and required information are given in Table-4.18 below

Table 4.18
Destination wise distribution of Migrants

Destination	Frequency	Percentage
Delhi	60	43.165
Mumbai	20	14.388
Bangaluru	16	11.510
Kolkata	11	7.913
Surat	10	7.194
Hyderabad	8	5.755
Bhubaneswar	6	4.316
Others	8	5.755

It can be seen from the table that the highest per cent of migrants (43.165) moved to urban areas of Delhi. The other cities to which the movements were made are, in descending order of number of migrants, Delhi (43.165), Mumbai (14.388), Bangalore (11.510), Kolkata (7.913), Surat (7.194), Bhubaneswar (4.316) and others (5.755). Around 89-90 per cent of the migrant moved outside the state and only 5 per cent migrant moved within the state. Around 2 per cent of the migrant moved outside country particularly to Dubai. Delhi is the most preferred location of the migrants followed by Mumbai and Bangalore. Majority of the migrants are found working in newly construction site of different urban bodies and many of them are engaged in plumbing and other construction activities. Inside the state the migrants are found in Bhubaneswar which is one of the growing cities in Orissa. Most of the plumbing works in the city are done by the migrant of these localities. As Bhubaneswar is 135 km from Kendrapara district and now the people move to Bhubaneswar to work in different emerging sectors.

Conclusion

The following points can be summed up after analyzing the results. The migrants from kendrapara district are young and they migrated at the young age. This confirms there is strong trend in moving at very early ages. It is because at younger age the family attachment are less and the risk taking ability is more. We can correlate it with the marital status of the migrant. Unmarried people migrate more because they have less family burden or family tie. It is also found from the study that most of the migrants belong to the large family. The evidence of our study shows that the migrants in Kendrapara district belong

to the poor and economically disadvantaged family. These households have poor asset base. Regarding reasons for migration, these are overwhelmingly economic and have to do with factors such as low income, poverty unemployment, lack of rural job opportunities. Many of the migrants' family don't have any farming land for which their income is less and it pushes them to migrate. Many of the migrants moved to Delhi (43.16) followed by Mumbai (14.388) and Bangaluru(11.510). Majority of the migrants are found working in newly construction site of different urban bodies and many of them are engaged in plumbing and other construction activities.

REFERENCES

- Dubey Amreash, Richard Palmer-Jones and Kunal Sen (2004) Surplus labor, social structure, and Rural to Urban Migration; Evidence from Indian Data, Conference on the 50th Anniversary of the Lewis Model, July 6-7 | Hossain M.Z. (2001) Rural-Urban Migration in Bangladesh: A micro-level study, IUSSP conference, Brazil, August 20-24 | Mosse David, Sanjeev Gupta, Vidya Shah (2005) On the Margins in the City, Adivasi Seasonal Labour Migration in Western India, Economic and Political Weekly | Narayan D. and P. Petesch (eds) (2002) Voices of the Poor: From Many Lands, Oxford/Washington D.C.: Oxford / Washington D.C.: Oxford University Press / World Bank | Prasad Rjiva, M.N.Singh, K.C Das, Kamal Gupta, R.B Bhagat(2009) Migration to Greater Mumbai Urban Agglomerations: Study of characteristics of Principal Migrants and their Social Linkages, Demography India, Vol 38, No2, PP 319-334 | Ravenstein, E. G. (1885). The Laws of Migration. Journal of the Statistical Society of London, 48(2), 167-235 | Rele J.R (1969) Trends and Significance of Internal Migration in India, The Indian Journal of Statistics, Volume 31, 501-508 | Sjaastad A. Larry (1962) The Costs and Returns of Human Migration, The Journal of Political Economy | Vol.70.No 5, Part 2 pp 80-93 | Sundari S (2005) , Migration as a Livelihood Strategy, A gender Perspective, Economic and Political Weekly, May 28-June 4 pp2295-2303 | Todaro, M. (1969). "A Model of Labor Migration and Urban Unemployment in Less Developed Countries." The American Economic Review 59, 138-148. | Todaro Michael P(1970) A model of Labour Migration and Urban Unemployment in Less Developed Countries, The American Economic Review, Vol.59.No 1, pp 138-148 | Zahongo Pam (2011) Migration and agricultural production in Burkina Faso, African Journal of Agricultural Research, Vol. 6(7), pp 1844-1852