CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A study of migration is of key importance in social sciences, particularly in population studies. Migration is not new to the human race. The direction of people's movement has always been guided by the specific needs of their time, e.g. during the hunting stage when the people led more or less nomadic life, human beings migrated constantly in search of rich hunting grounds. In the pre-transitional stage of development of a country where settled living became the way of life, migratory movement assumed a definite and regular path and migration of people took place from rural to rural areas in search of rich pastures and fertile land for cultivation. With the advent of modern transport and communication, as the country entered early transitional stage of development, the movements of people were directed from rural to urban areas. This urban ward migration was in response to the destruction of employment opportunity in rural areas coupled with the creation of new employment opportunities in secondary and service sectors which tended to be spatially located in cities and towns. In the later transitional stage of development of a country, the rapid growth of industrialization, transport and communication and other economic and social overheads in urban areas encouraged people to migrate in large number from smaller towns to big and specialized metropolitan cities in search of better employment opportunities (Singh 2001).

Millions of people all over the world move out of their normal place of residence to seek their fortune elsewhere. If military oppression or political oppression or religious persecution were the major causes of exodus of people on various occasions in the past, it is by and large economic factors that induce people to migrate in the modern period. However, the exact circumstances under which people migrate from time to time and place to place vary considerably (Joseph 1988). Migration is having far-reaching impact not only on the migrants but also on the society at large both in the place of origin and destination. Migration has naturally become a lively topic for serious studies and discussions.

As the importance of migration affecting the socio-economic and political life is pervasive, no one can ignore this phenomenon. The importance emerges not only from the movements of people between places but also from its influence on the lives of
individuals and urban growth. Generally, in developing nations, rural outmigration dominates the domain of research and planning as its role in changing the lives of migrant families at the place of origin and destination is well accepted (Hossain, 2001). If the problem of human fertility were not so critical at the present time, it is almost certain that the human migration and the plight of migrants (especially in the developing countries) would be listed as a top priority problem for research and action (Bogue, 1969: 3-13).

Migration along with fertility and mortality is considered to be one of the vital population processes influencing the size, composition and distribution of population. Migration can depopulate or overpopulate an area depending upon the level of economic activities and is an important process of urbanization and social change. According to International Migration Report 2002, 175 billion people (2.9 percent) of the world's population currently live outside the country of their birth. The number of migrants has more than doubled since 1975, and sixty percent of the world's migrants currently reside in the more developed regions, with forty percent living in the less developed regions. Yet aggregate figures on international migration fail to capture the vast scale of migration that also takes place within the countries. For instance, there are estimated to be 200 million temporary and seasonal migrants in India and 120 million internal migrants within China (United Nations, International Migration Report 2002).

Urban and rural areas all over the developing world are becoming more closely linked socially, economically and politically. An important manifestation of this is the increasing mobility of rural populations through temporary migration and commuting. Consequent to increase in rural mobility are increase in remittances as a proportion of total household income. The available evidence suggests that remittances from urban, mainly non-farm sources of employment, are gaining in importance and in some locations have overtaken even agriculture as the main source of income although the household continues to reside in a rural area (Deshingkar, 2004).

The importance of migration in affecting the growth and decline of population and in modifying the demographic characteristics of the areas of origin and areas of destination has long been recognized. Migration is an important element in the growth of the population and the labour force of an area. The measurement and analysis of migration are important in the preparation of population estimates and projection for a nation or a part of a nation. Migration affects the migrants as well as the population of the receiving and sending areas socially and psychologically. It is also related to the
business cycle, the supply of skilled and unskilled labour, the growth of industry, and the occupational and employment status of the migrants.

Increasing urbanization and the growth of urban poverty are among the most pervasive processes in Third World countries. A common belief is that improved conditions in rural areas will reduce rural outmigration and consequently reduce the growth of urban poverty. Based on this belief, many rural development interventions have been justified partially on the grounds that they will reduce the rural outmigration. At first glance, this justification seems intuitively obvious; however, it is actually a hypothesis in need of testing. The overall purpose of this study is to investigate the hypothesis that rural development interventions reduce rural outmigration. Rural development interventions are defined as action taken by national or international agencies which are explicitly designed to increase production or improve the quality of life in rural areas. The rural intervention generally contains agricultural development, off farm employment and provision of rural social services. Integrated rural development projects may include several types of rural improvements such as education, health services, agriculture credit accessibility, employment generation etc (Rhoda 1983). The study's focus on factors in rural areas which influence rural outmigration is not meant to suggest that these are the only factors or the most important factors in rural outmigration. Certainly, economic opportunities and availability of friends, relatives and kins in destination areas (mostly urban areas) are extremely important.

In India, temporary, circular, and seasonal migration, with people moving in response to opportunities for agricultural work, or for farm off rural employment in construction and services, has long been part of poor people's lives. A primary impact of migration on sending regions is conceived in terms of remittances. Remittances are considered the major link between migration and development at origin.

Migration is one of the most important factors contributing to the growth of urban population. The total urban population of the country, excluding Jammu and Kashmir increased from 217.6 million in 1991 to 283.6 million in 2001 registering a growth rate of 30.3 percent, while total growth rate of population was 21.34 percent between the said periods. The migration data of 2001 indicates that 20.5 million people enumerated in urban areas are migrants from rural areas who moved in within last 10 years. So, outmigration from rural areas is contributing largely to rapid urbanization in India. There have been major flows of migration in India. For example, a large
proportion of migrants have flown from Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and many states of Southern India to Mumbai. Similarly, substantial proportion of migrants from Orissa, Eastern Madhya Pradesh, Bihar and other places have migrated to Kolkata. Such flows of migration are always selective and depend on factors of origin, destination and the intervening distance.

Although, the level of urbanization in India is 27.78 percent (2001), it is highly centralized. Concentration of migration in few urban centres is alarming. This internal migration is not mainly because of pull factors but largely due to push factors creating substantial outmigration from rural areas. Rural outmigration, as pointed out by Arthur Lewis, is mainly due to excessive population growth in rural areas and lack of non-farm employment opportunities in rural areas. In the present study, therefore, an attempt has been made to understand the mechanism of outmigration and factors behind it in one of the major out-migrating regions of India.

It has been remarked that unexplored and exciting opportunities for migration research lie in the study of the process of accommodation and adjustment of migrants to the new community (Bogue, 1969). Migration, internal as well as international whatever it may be, occurs in the response to the gap between economic opportunities at place of origin and place of destination. Migration helps in easing the pressure of population. In the whole process, generally both the communities at origin and destination are benefited up to a stage when the resources at place of destination become highly scarce. In such cases there is a political backlash. The study of understanding the mechanism of out migration will, therefore, help in understanding the role of migration in the economic development of an area.

1.1. Statement of the Problem

The present study aims to understand the relationship between rural development and rural outmigration in general and the nature of rural outmigration in particular. The study also seeks to find the relationship between rural outmigration and socio-economic and demographic characteristics of the study area. It also aims to examine the consequences of outmigration at the place of origin. Out migration has been unique phenomenon in some of the states of India where pulling factors like employment, education etc. attract the migrants. Among the states which are experiencing high rate of out migration, the most important are Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Kerala, Assam, Orissa,
Tamil Nadu and Chattisgarh. Percentage of net out migration to total population in Bihar is 2.7 percent, followed by Uttar Pradesh (2.0 percent), Assam (0.7 percent), Orissa (0.7 percent) and Kerala (0.6 percent). Other states, which show a net out migration, are Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, smaller states of North-East e.g. Sikkim, Mizoram and Manipur (Map 1.1).

The unique phenomenon of outmigration is very much attributed by rural areas. Of the total migration, 78.1 percent is constituted by rural outmigration as per census 2001. The reasons are very much obvious. The agricultural economy, without any significant improvement is incapable of sustaining rapidly growing population in the rural areas. The other important reason is that many peasants have been dispossessed steadily and impoverishment of rural artisans whose work was connected with agriculture, created a large number of landless and marginally employed persons. These people, therefore, find it easier to respond to the pull factors that operate from the neighbouring and distant urban centres with high employment potential. The rural areas, on their part, get a continuous set back from this exodus as they are deprived of their workforce which if absorbed in the source areas may save the rural economy from stagnation (Khan, 1981).

An analysis of growth of population shows that rural areas still have much more population than they need for an efficient tillage thus there are chances of further increase in the rate of outmigration from rural areas. However, if we want to restrict the rapid rural outmigration rate, erratic growth of primate cities, and to absorb the outmigrating workforce into the rural economy, it becomes extremely essential that process and pattern of rural outmigration should be thoroughly studied with the help of intensive field work in chronically outmigrating regions. In most of the cases the cause of rural outmigration is very much related to the level of rural development, therefore, various socio-economic conditions of villagers, infrastructural facilities and agricultural development of the villages should be investigated. Government has formulated many programmes and policies for rural development to provide all basic amenities and infrastructure facilities at the village level itself. But despite this, the pace of rural outmigration is very high. So, exact knowledge should be gathered about the level of rural development in the chronically outmigrating regions, the persons who migrate, the causes of their movement, where they go and the socio-economic and demographic consequences of outmigration in the region. Consequently, the steps could be taken to
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slow down the pace of rural outmigration or to divert these streams to other small and medium sized towns.

Studies on migration are very few in India because, historically speaking, migration has never been considered an important demographic issue on account of the small volume of internal migration as compared to the total size of population. The perception of internal migration has been mostly in terms of rural to urban migration and especially migration to big cities. In other words, internal migration has been viewed almost wholly as a concomitant of urbanization (Bose, 1983). It is also true that our knowledge in this field is very less as scholars in India have concentrated either on the analysis of place of birth data or they have studied immigration in urban areas. Studies on rural outmigration are scarce and most of them cover one or two aspects of rural outmigration - mostly causes and characteristics. These studies are inadequate in covering the spatial pattern in detail and the migrants' contact with his/her native place and their impact on the community of origin. The objective of this study is to bridge the existing gap in the study of the outmigration.

1.2. Review of the Literatures

There has been substantial theoretical literature concerned with migration. We can divide these literatures in to two broad categories for our convenience:

(I) Review of Theories And Models Related to Migration
(II) Review of Other Works Related to Migration

1.2.1. Review of the Theories and Models Related to Migration

Many approaches developed in the past for analyzing factors of migration are in existence. Here, we will present a brief account of these approaches. Although, the genesis of migration as a significant development can be traced to the closing days of the Mercantilist era during the latter half of the 18th century, systematic analysis of migration is of recent origin. The Mercantilists who dominated economic thinking for over a century had preached the utility of poverty and frowned upon migration of all categories (Theodore et al. 1978: 3). The Classical economists who succeeded them did not favour external migration either. Further, they did not formulate any theory on migration though different patterns of migration took shape during the period of their intellectual domination. They were rather preoccupied with free trade and competition
unfettered by state interference. The implications of internal mobility of the factors of production as a concomitant of competition were the only theme which they could project as an analytical tool for migration. Even the so called free mobility was confined to the members within each stratum of society and not between “non competing groups” (Cairness 1874: 66-68). Nevertheless, some among them advocated Colonialism as a remedy to the impending law of the diminishing returns. It became a handy weapon in the hands of Marx for his attack on Capitalism. The Neo-classical economists too did not formulate any theory of migration.

Ravenstein (1889) was the first to start the ball rolling by providing a theoretical analysis of migration for the first time. According to him migration between two points will inversely be related to the distance and migrants will move by stages from nearby towns to distant lands. Movement is mainly towards centres of commerce and trade which accelerates overtime as a result of “the increase in the means of locomotion”. He maintained that each stream of migration would produce a counter stream. The propensity to migrate would be more with the inhabitants of rural areas than with those of towns. Among the different motives, the inherent desire in men “to better themselves in material respects” is the most important in influencing the decision to migrate.

W.J. Reilly (1929) had already postulated in 1909 (The Gravity Model) that the movement of persons between two urban centres would be proportional to the product of their population and inversely proportional to the square of the distance between them.

\[ MI = K \times \frac{P_1 \times P_2}{d} \]

Where MI is the Migration Index, K is the proportionality constant, P1 is the population size of the settlement 1 and P2 is the population size of settlement 2 and d is the distance between the two settlements.

Several attempts have been made in migration research to formulate a specific population size and distance relationship. Zipf (1946: 680) regarded the movement of goods, information and people within the social system as an expression of his ‘Principle of Least Effort’, whereby inter-community movement is such as to minimize the total work of the system. According to Zipf, the magnitude of migration between the two cities is the function of distance separating them, where greater distance required greater effort to overcome the hurdles, and hence reduced the number of migrants.
Afterwards S.A. Stouffer (1940: 846) introduced his concept of intervening opportunities in an attempt to improve upon Zipf's principle of least effort. According to him, linear distance was less important as a determinant of migration the nature of space, and the distance should be considered in socio-economic rather than geometric terms. Thus, distance per se was not as important as the number of opportunities available. His basic hypotheses was that the number of persons moving for a given distance was directly proportional to the number of opportunities at that distance and inversely proportional to the number of intervening opportunities i.e. the number of opportunities offered by places located in between the two places in question. It may be expressed as under:

\[ Y = K \cdot \frac{X^*}{X} \]

Where \( Y \) is expected number of migrants from a place to a particular concentric zone or distance band around the place, \( X^* \) is the number of opportunities within this band and \( X \) is the number of opportunities intervening between origin and mid-way into the band in question and \( K \) is the proportionality constant.

The famous Sociologist Everett Lee (1966: 47) propounded another theory of migration. He generalized four factors which influence the decision of a migrant. The factors are:

i. Factors operating in the area of origin.

ii. Factors operating at the destination.

iii. Factors that act as intervening obstacles.

iv. Personal factors those are specific to individuals.

The potential migrant is influenced by positive and negative factors associated with both the place of origin and the possible destination. Lee (1966: 55) suggested that the potential migrant weighs the known and expected advantages and disadvantages of the destination in comparison with the situation at the place of origin. For a move to result, the attraction of the destination must be great enough to outweigh the advantages of staying and to overcome any intervening obstacles, such as distance, cost of relocation, and the disruption of established pattern of life. Personal factors also affect the evaluation process. For example, a family with children in school, college or a couple without children, may not consider the quality of public schools, colleges and universities at either the point of origin or destination, but these educational institutions
may be an important factor in the balance sheet of a family with children who are in the education stage (Lee 1966: 47-57).

---

Zelinsky (1971: 78) proposed that changes in migration behaviour have been paralleled by the stages of the demographic transition model. In the first stage of mobility transition, when population growth was negligible because of high death rates canceled out high birth rates, little migration occurred at any scale. The second stage when population increased rapidly because the death rate dropped while the birth rate remained high was a time of great migration. Mounting population pressure on the land, better transportation system, and a widening sphere of exploration and trade, bringing knowledge of other places, gave rise in the past to increased population movements at all scales. Zelinsky's third stage is transitional, matching the third stage of the demographic transition model when the gap between the birth rate and the death rate narrowed down and population growth declined. International migration lessened and agricultural frontiers closed. But in the same time, rural to urban migration and movements within and between cities became more important. By the fourth and fifth stage, when low birth and death rates brought little population growth to the newly developed society, migration was predominantly inter-urban and intra-urban. The rural to urban movement virtually ceased because the percentage of farming population, and hence potential movers was very low (Zelinsky 1971: 78-89).

The first comprehensive theory of development related to the process of rural-urban labour transfer was the one developed by W.A. Lewis (1954:140) and later extended by John Fei and Gustav Ranis. The combined theory is known as L.F.R. Model (Ranis and Fei 1961: 533-565). It is based on a concept of dual economy, comprising a subsistence agricultural sector (rural) characterized by unemployment and
under employment and a modern industrial sector (urban) characterized by full employment where capitalists reinvest the full amount of their profit. This concept considers migration as an equilibrium mechanism, which, through transfer of labour from the traditional labour surplus sector to modern labour deficient sector, eventually brings about wage equality in the two sectors. The marginal productivity of labour in the subsistence sector is zero or very low and the wages paid to the workers are equal to their cost of subsistence, so wage rates exceeds marginal products. Contrary to this, wage rates in the modern urban sector are much higher mainly due to the high productivity-oriented activities. Migration of workers from rural to urban areas is caused by differences in those wage rates. This in turn increases industrial production and profits as well as possibilities of reinvestment, which in turn increase the demand for labour from the subsistence sector. This process will continue as long as surplus labour exists in rural areas.

In spite of the simplicity of this theory, many scholars have differences of opinion from the viewpoint of analyzing the causes and consequences of migration in developing countries. Firstly, migration is not induced solely by unemployment or under employment in the rural areas although there is no doubt that this is an important factor in the decision to migrate. Secondly, the assumption of zero marginal productivity in agriculture has not been confirmed empirically. Thirdly, the rate of growth of modern industrial sector has been lately too low in many developing countries to permit such development as formulated by Lewis-Fei-Ranis (Oberai and Manmohan Singh 1983: 27).

Sjaastad (1962) postulated that decision to migrate is an investment decision which incorporates costs and returns distributed over time. He says that the returns are divided into financial and non-financial components. Non-financial returns include changes in “psychic benefit” as a result of location preferences. In the same way, cost includes cost of transport of disposal movables and immovable property, shift of a residence. There are psychic costs too like leaving a familiar environment, giving up one’s language and culture, adopting new habits and social customs etc. He assumes that in deciding to move, migrants tend to maximize their natural life span incomes and they have at least a range idea of what their life span income streams would be in the present place of residence as well as in the destination area and of the cost involved in migration (Sjaastad 1962: 80-93).
Todaro’s (1976) model of rural urban migration assumes that migration is based primarily on privately rationalized economic calculations, for the individual migrants despite the existence of high urban unemployment. He postulates that migration proceeds in response to urban-rural differences in expected rather than actual earnings. Expected earnings are measured by “the differences in real income between rural and urban job opportunities” and “the probability of a new migrant obtaining an urban job” (Todaro 1976: 28-29). Todaro’s (1985) model has four basic characteristics:

(i) Migration is stimulated primarily by rational economic consideration of relative benefits and costs, mostly financial but also psychological.

(ii) Decision to migrate depends on “expected” rather than actual urban rural real wage differential. Expected gain on differential is determined by the interaction of two variables, the actual urban rural wage differential and probability of successfully obtaining employment in urban sector.

(iii) The Probability of obtaining an urban job is inversely related to the urban unemployment rate.

(iv) Migration rates in excess urban job opportunity growth rates are not only possible but rational and even likely in the face wide urban rural expected income differentials (Todaro 1985: 258-61).

Harris and Todaro in an article “Migration, Unemployment and Development: A Two Sector Analysis” in 1970 presented a model on rural urban migration in underdeveloped countries. The main idea of the Harris-Todaro model is that labour migration in underdeveloped countries is due to rural urban differences in average expected wages rather than actual wages. The migrants consider the various opportunities of employment available to them in rural and urban sectors and choose the one that maximizes their expected wages from migration. The minimum urban wage is substantially higher the rural wage. If more employment opportunities are created in the urban sector at the minimum wage, the expected wage will rise and rural urban migration will increase. Expected wages are measured by the difference in real urban income and rural agricultural income and the probability of migrants getting an urban job. In fact, a migrant compares his expected income for a given time horizon in the
urban sector with his prevailing average rural income and migrates if the former is more
than the latter. Thus migration in the Harris-Todaro model is viewed as the wage or
income gap between the urban and rural sectors. But all migrants cannot be absorbed in
the urban sector at high wages. Many fail to find a job and get employment in the
informal urban sector at wages which are even lower than in the rural sector. Thus they
join the queue of the underemployed or disguised unemployed in the urban sector
(Jhingam et al. 2004: 41)

The neoclassical theories (e.g. Lewis, Ranis and Fei, Harris, Todaro and
Sjaastad) have certain implicit propositions and assumptions. According to them the
migration of people is caused by differences in the wage rates from region to region.
Aggregate migration flows between regions are simple sums of individual moves
undertaken on the basis of individual cost benefit calculations. Migration will not occur
in the absence of differences in earnings and employment rates between regions and
will occur until expected earnings have been equalized. Migration decisions starts from
disequilibrium or discontinuities between labour markets, other markets do not directly
influence the decision to migrate. The way for governments control migration flows is
to regulate or influence labour markets in the sending and the receiving regions (Cohen
1976: 10).

Wolpert (1975) proposed a model of migration based upon behaviour theory. A
migratory pattern is a composite expression of human aspirations, needs and
perceptions. Wolpert saw human mobility behaviour as one of the several means by
which the individual can seek maximization of utility or well being. He suggested that
in-migration models, the focus should be on the behaviour of individuals rather than on
the characteristics of places and population. Thus he shifted his emphasis from distance
and economic motives to the human behavior (Wolpert 1975: 16).

Different migration theories have stressed on different aspects of migration­
economic (wages, vacancies, unemployment), social (social mobility, social status),
environmental (residential satisfaction) etc. Despite the many different approaches to
the analysis of migration there is consensus about one point; all researchers seem to
agree that people or households migrate to improve their situation, or, more precisely, to
be better off in the new location in the future than they would be in the old.
1.2.2. Review of Other Works Related to Migration

The literature available on migration will be classified into the following themes for their review:

Outmigration and Distance of Destination

According to Lee (1966), migrants tend to make to areas where their income (largely from wages and salaries) is maximized. In the “A Theory of Migration”, Lee has emphasized pull factors are those associated with the destination areas, push factors are those associated with the areas of origin, intervening obstacles such as ethnic barriers, distance and cost, and personal factors.

Stouffer (1940) developed the hypotheses of migration streams and intervening opportunities. He said that degree of migration would be inversely related to the distance between the two places as also the extent of intervening opportunities in the two places.

Outmigration and Unemployment

Parr (1966) has found out migration as a means of easing the difficulties faced by depressed areas, particularly the difficulties created by unemployment. He says that out migration of labour and of the population, generally is one of the most common adjustments of social and economic changes, often it is the most desirable one. However, in the case of depressed areas there exists a great resistance to movement. To say that outmigration of labour might solve the unemployment problem of a depressed area is a dangerous over simplification since this can be the indirect cause of unemployment. One adverse feature of out migration is selective character of the out migrants and, because of this, the area is sapped of its vital, more needed, elements, such losses tend to make the area less attractive for prospective, incoming industry in addition to creating obstacles to the expansion of existing industries (Parr 1966: 149-59).

Davis (1951) analysed the 1931 Census migration data and concluded that Indian population predominantly moved towards east and west, due to the industrial and urban development of Bengal and the growth of tea states in Assam in the east; and the development of Bombay urban centre and agricultural development of the Wetem Ghats in the west (Davis 1951: 110-112).
Zachariah (1964: 82-87) analysed interstate migration from 1901-31. His study includes present Pakistan, Bangladesh and Burma (Myanmar) as they were parts of British India at that time. He concludes that during 1901-1931, the eastern part of the country including the east zone and the south western part including the whole of Bombay (Mumbai) gained population through net Migration.

Premi (1986) analyses the pattern of migration and characteristics in all the cities. He analysed the census data of migrants in all the cities having more than one lakh population. He finds migration as the single major factor in growth of cities. Premi also discusses the pattern of migration, its trends and the social demographic features of migrants and non-migrants. The study shows that there were rich internal variations in regard to the characteristics of migrants in terms of the different types of cities.

Narayan's (1987) treatment of million plus cities is both historical as well as demographic. He traces the growth of twelve metropolitan cities (1981) over three periods pre-colonial, colonial and post-independence. He says that the metropolises have grown in size due to the influx of refugee migrants and location of industries and commerce. Many of them also became capitals of new linguistic states. All these economic and administrative activities attracted migrants of different kinds. It is seen in the study that the bigger metropolitan cities attracted more of interstate migrants than the smaller areas. The study also shows that while the main reason for migration is economic, there are also non-economic factors such as education and urban facilities. Study reflects that there are two major consequences of uncontrolled migration, namely unemployment and poverty, which are reflected in the sprawling slums. Narayan pleads for controlled migration and for a planned and balanced urban development.

Yadava (1987: 1-20) examines the determinants of rural-to-urban migration in India. Findings indicate that rural out-migration is most affected by the number of persons who had previously migrated from the same village, the distance from the village to the nearest large city or town and main road, the sex ratio of the village, and the educational level of its inhabitants.

Raju (1987: 145) analysed associational and developmental rural-rural migration concerning a group of migrants from a village in the West Godavari District of Andhra Pradesh to Tungabhadra region of Karnataka state. After a quick theoretical review of the migration, he makes an in-depth analysis of the village of origin and compares the migrants with the non-migrants on different aspects at the point of origin. He again examines in details not only the factor leading to migration but also the adjustment
pattern of the migrants at the point of destination. This is followed by a probe into the causes and consequences of return migration which aspect is rarely touched by migrant analysts. Ultimately, he concludes with a note on various issues concerning migration in general and developmental migration in particular.

Sundaram (1987) examines the relevance and applicability of Todaro’s Model to India. He builds up his arguments on the basis of a number of useful observations. First, rural-urban migration is not very significant when compared to rural–rural migration. Secondly, there is a bunching of migrants in larger metropolitan centres. Thirdly, the unemployment rate in urban areas is significantly high at 30 percent irrespective of their levels of education. Fourthly, migrants have 25 percent chances of getting into the informal sector where the expected income is lower than that in the formal sector.

Joseph (1988) regarded Keralites as a highly mobile class of people in recent years. However, migration among Keralites cannot claim a long history. Till the closing decades of the nineteenth century some sort of a subsistence economy prevailed in Kerala, with the bulk of the people content in meeting their bare needs of life. In the early decades of the twentieth century, however, signs of development began to appear with a shift in the attitude of the people in favour of better material comforts. Different patterns of migration emerged in close succession. Among them peasant migration from Travancore to Malabar was one of the important ones. Migration for employment to distant lands was another pattern, of which labour migration to the gulf region forms an important component.

Oberoi, Prasad and Sardana (1989) studied the outmigration from Kerala, Uttar Pradesh and Bihar. They concluded that rural migration flow in all the three states is dominated by outmigration. Kerala has a higher level of economic diversification. That is why Kerala has higher return migrants than Bihar and Uttar Pradesh. They showed through data that outmigration of women for reasons other than marriage is higher in Kerala. For this they gave the reason that Christian population constitute a significant proportion of the Kerala population and the proportion of the females working is generally higher among this community which might led to relatively higher outmigration.

Junming (1995) presented a contextual analysis of migration based on a baseline survey in the rural areas of Guangdong province, China in 1995 to evaluate the impacts of migration policy, rural community development, individual and household characteristics on rural outmigration. The results suggest that the decision to migrate is
highly related to individual education levels, marital status, and household registration status, household dependency ratio and income level, and community development level. Finally, the policy implications on migration and development policies in China were discussed.

Sundari and Geetha (2000) inferred that the main cause of male migration is employment, while that of female migration is marriage. The second most important reason for both male and female migration is movements of parents/earning members of the households. People are likely to go alone rather than with their families to place where there are greater employment potentialities for manual work on the big cities where the cost of living is relatively higher than smaller towns or cities based mainly on industries. That is why all the class I towns and urban agglomerations in general contain more masculine population than other lower class towns.

Zachariah, Prakash and Rajan (2002) studied the emigration from Kerala to Gulf nations. They describe the deteriorating situations of job conditions therein. The emigrants had to work more than 8 hours a day and even many of them (about one tenth) worked between 10 to 14 hours. Moreover, emigrants also faced problems like nonpayment of salaries, denial of wages and non-wage benefits stipulated in work contracts, refusal to release passport and non-payment of air tickets for return to Kerala. About one third of the emigrants stay in worker's camps and in most of the cases the number of persons per room ranges from four to six. They also have very less savings from their income. It directly affects the remittances sent to home by them.

Belwal (2002) inferred that the movement of people from one place to another is caused by a number of factors. As a consequence of underdeveloped economy in the rural areas a large number of people leave their villages and to urban industrial centers in search of job. He further said that, in a state like Uttrakhand infrastructure facilities are very limited. Due to geographical and climatic limitations the expansion and mechanization of the cultivated land is not possible. These are the important factors which promote the migration. 92% migrants were literate and 87% of them were formally educated. Most of migrations were in their prime of working age. Thus the hill region is losing its creative energetic able work due to this phenomenon. Development policies are also highly affected with this phenomenon.

Deshingkar (2004) observes that temporary migration and commuting are now a routine part of the livelihood strategies of the rural poor across a wide range of developing country context. The driving forces for outmigration are location specific
and include improved communication and roads, new economic opportunities arising from urbanization as well as the changing market context as economies become more globalised and liberalized. According to him, the relative importance of migration is highly context specific as are its effect on the local agricultural economy and poverty reduction. He further analyses that apart from smoothing income flows, remittances increase disposable income which is then invested in a variety of production and consumption uses. The available data on remittance investment patterns seem to suggest that the bulk is spent on consumption, both conspicuous and for subsistence.

Dubey, Jones and Sen (2006: 86-104) examined the empirical implications of the Lewis Model with respect to the relationship between the phenomenon of surplus labour in rural areas and outmigration from these areas to urban areas. It does so by using a micro-economic data set of migrants and non-migrants for India. They find strong empirical support for the key prediction of the Lewis Model that rural-urban migration will be influenced by the existence of surplus labour in the rural areas where the migrants originate. They also find that the phenomenon of rural-urban migration is more complex than viewed within a simple Lewis framework. Social structure and the possession of human capital are important determinants of rural-urban migration. Individuals from scheduled castes and scheduled tribes and those with little or no education are less likely to migrate to urban areas. Given that scheduled castes and scheduled tribe households along with households with low levels of educational attainment are more likely to be poor, their findings suggest that the poorer households from the surplus labour regions do not seem to migrate to the same extent as the richer ones.

Outmigration and Rural Development

Gosal and Krishnan (1975) argues that by the heaviest outflows of migrants have been from those regions where per caput agricultural productivity is low due to high population density, small size of agricultural holdings, and overdependence on agriculture. He cited the example of the areas like Ganga Plain in Uttar Pradesh and North Bihar, the North Punjab Plain, north-eastern Rajasthan, and the coastal tracts of Tamilnadu, Orissa and Konkan.

In the context of a predominantly agricultural economy and a consistently fast growing population, the small and declining size of agricultural landholdings has been basic to the process of outmigration, notwithstanding considerable outmigration from
areas like Punjab, where agricultural landholdings are not so small. In both time and space, outmigration was triggered off especially under lean agricultural conditions caused by periodic droughts, floods and low prices of produce.

Davis (1977) gives reasons of male outmigration from the rural areas. He says that in Asian and African countries outmigration from rural areas tends to be more masculine than feminine. The reasons for this are complex and differ somewhat from one region to another. In Asia and North Africa the customary seclusion of women involves prejudice against their migration to the cities on individual basis, but in particular, there is, or has been, great reliance on hoe and hand culture, both of which had to be performed by women. Also high agricultural densities in these continents gives raise to surplus labour in off seasons, thus facilitating migration to cities on seasonal basis, the men being by tradition more mobile. Finally, the extremely high fertility and early marriages prevailing in Asia and Africa burden young women with children to a greater extent than was ever true in west.

Rhoda (1980: 34-64) examined implications of specific rural development activities for rural migration in developing countries. Areas of origin and destination, migrant characteristics, obstacles to migration, and various economic models of migration have been analyzed. He suggested that population growth rather than migration is responsible for urban poverty.

Khan (1981) shows that out-migrants of twelve villages of Eastern Uttar Pradesh are overwhelmingly young workers and proportion of literates among them is higher than illiterates. This tells us that outmigration from these areas depletes the rural community of young persons. There has been a significant change in industrial and occupational composition of migrants. Industrially the major activity of migrants prior to migration was agriculture while after migration they are mainly engaged in secondary and tertiary activities. Occupationally though they still remained predominantly unskilled workers as prior to migration, the proportion of semi-skilled and skilled, and clerical, supervisory and professional increased considerably. This shows that outmigration has been helpful in reducing the dependence on agriculture and helps in diversification of occupation which was not possible in rural areas.

Mukherji and Sita (1982: 76-82) attempted to identify the areas of outmigration in Maharashtra state and assessed the probable causes for it. The analysis is confined to the decade 1961-1971 and based on secondary data, with the taluka as the unit of
analysis. The total number of births and deaths in each taluka for the period of study was compiled and enabled the natural increase of population to be computed. The study revealed that the outmigration talukas were located in 3 areas and that the relative significance of outmigration varied. The analysis indicated that the causes of outmigration were probably unfavorable relief efforts, susceptibility to drought, closure of household industries, and the 'pull' effect of metropolitan centers like Bombay.

Rhoda (1983: 34-64) tested the hypothesis that rural development projects and programs reduce rural-urban migration. The study concluded that the common belief that rural interventions reduce urban migration is not justified. While the migration impact of any specific intervention depends on its characteristics and those of the rural area into which it is introduced, some generalizations can be made. Rural-urban migration may be reduced by interventions which increase cultivatable land, equalize land or income distribution, or decrease fertility. On the other hand, migration appears to be stimulated by interventions which increase access to cities, commercialize agriculture, strengthen rural-urban integration, raise education and skill levels, or increase rural inequalities.

Simmons (1984: 156-92) postulated that there are factors which push and pull; a migrant can be associated with poor quality of land, unequal distribution of land, unequal distribution of land the absence of rural credit facilities. Other push factors include lack of educational facilities, the lack of rural employment opportunities, low rural income or social tension in small communities. The availability of higher paid jobs, better quality education and health services, or the 'bright lights' or urban entertainment can people towards certain areas like urban centres.

Singh and Sharma, (1984: 168-74) presented a regression analysis of the factors affecting outmigration from villages in India. The data concerned 3,514 households in three types of villages, defined as semi-urban, remote, and growth centers, and were primarily collected in Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh, India. The analysis focuses on male migrants only. The results suggested that the main determinant of outmigration is the unequal distribution of resources in the villages concerned. Other factors, including landholding, caste, and distance from nearest town, have also been found to be significant.

Sharma (1985: 63-69) proposed under certain simplifying assumptions an inflated geometric distribution to study the trends in rural out-migration at micro-level. The distribution involves two parameters. A procedure for finding the estimates of
parameters is outlined. Asymptotic expressions for variances and covariances of the estimates have been obtained. An example has been provided using 1978 survey data concerning 3,514 households near Varanasi, India.

Narayan, Sharma and Singh (1986: 41-45) examined the trends in rural outmigration at the household level for various household size groups using the model developed by Singh et al. (1982), using data from the 1969 Demographic Survey of Varanasi (Rural) of 2200 households.

Premi and Rathore (1986: 27-37) worked on rural male outmigration and explain changing intensity patterns in Uttar Pradesh, since 1961. The sex ratio among non-migrants serves as an indicator of regional variations in rural outmigration. Their paper highlights 2 population divergence zones in the underdeveloped Northern hilly and Eastern plain regions. It inferred that process of infrastructural development combined with cultural factors and inadequate employment opportunities seem to stimulate rural outmigration. Regional imbalance in economic development seems to be working as a suction economic system. The developed regions in India are utilizing the labor force of backward areas. The number of districts of high and moderately high rural male outmigration has increased, reflecting a wider gap between individual income and regional inequality. Unless the process is reversed in favour of rural areas, strategies for development will only work in capitalistic frameworks which serve the interests of developed regions.

Kaistha (1987: 25-36) used a broadened concept of migration, which includes circulatory migration and commuting. He maintained that the patterns of outmigration vary a great deal when the level of development of a rural area is treated as an independent variable. Results showed that less than two fifth of household members neither commute nor have migrated outside the village; using the narrow definition of migration, only fewer males over age 15 migrate, while including commuting in the definition increases the proportion to two fifth of the households. The proportion of out migrating households increases with increasing level of rural development. The similar trend is also followed in case of commuting. However, a permanent change of residence is neither dominant in high rural development area nor in low development areas rather it shows higher proportion of households in moderately developed rural areas. As development accelerates the overall volume of outmigration increases. The flow of migration from rural to rural areas is mostly limited to the moderately developed area, while city-ward migration increasingly occurs on both low developed and high
developed areas. The median age of commuters increases with rising levels of development and most of the migrants from the low developed area are employed in low prestige occupations and most from the high developed areas have higher prestige jobs.

Bilsborrow et al. (1987: 191-221) argue that migration from rural areas is influenced by high rates of rural natural increase, inequitable land distribution, inadequate rural employment opportunities and incomes, and large differences in income and amenity levels between urban and rural areas. They further say that many household are "pushed" by economic conditions to leave the rural sector. Others are attracted by better conditions in urban areas. They inferred that daughters who outmigrate to urban areas are likely to be slightly younger than sons, are less likely to be married, and have significantly lower education (the difference being even greater than that between non migrant daughter and sons). Migrants are in general older than non migrants, suggesting, for this sample of 14-27 year olds, a positive relationship between age and migration; the level of education of migrants is lower than that of non-migrants among daughters and for sons on small farms.

Outmigration and Remittances

Zachariah, Kannan and Rajan (2001) throw light on the beneficial consequences as well as the adverse consequences of Gulf migration of Keralite population, of which a major beneficiary has been the socially and educationally backward. The economists recommend that the government must follow policies that will ensure continuation of migration. Figures cited by them show that the State received from the migrants remittances totaling Rs. 40,000 million in 1998. In that year NRI deposits in Kerala banks amounted to Rs. 127,350 million and they were growing at the rate of 25 percent a year.

Zachariah, Rajan and Mathews (2000) evaluate the consequences of migration on the demography of Kerala, on its elderly population, on women, particularly on wives of emigrants, and on economic aspects including employment. They say that migration has been the single most dynamic factor in the otherwise dreary development scenario of Kerala in the last quarter of the past century. Migration has contributed more to poverty alleviation and reduction in unemployment in Kerala than any other factor. Migration has caused nearly a million married women in Kerala to live away from their husbands in the long run; the transformation of these one million women would have
contributed more to the development of Kerala society than all the temporary euphoria created by foreign remittances and the acquisition of modern gadgetry. They concluded that Kerala workers seem to be losing out in the international competition for jobs in the Gulf market. They feel the need of corrective policies to raise their competitive edge over workers in the competing countries.

Zachariah, Mathews and Rajan (2001: 63-87) report results of the first migration study covering the entire State of Kerala. It encompasses both measurement as well as analysis of the various types and facets of migration. Kerala is approaching the end of the millennium with a little cheer in many people's homes as a result of migration which has contributed more to poverty alleviation than any other factor, including agrarian reforms, trade union activities and social welfare legislation. The study shows that nearly 1.5 million Keralites now live outside India. They send home more than Rs.4000 million a year by way of remittances. Three-quarters of a million former emigrants have come back. They live mostly on savings, work experience, and skills acquired while abroad. More than a million families depend on an internal migrant's earnings for subsistence, children's education and other economic requirements.

1.3. Conceptual Framework

The main issue of the present study is to know the causes of rural out-migration at the point of origin as well as at the point of destination. The eastern part of Uttar Pradesh has been facing the deteriorating condition of its cottage industry as well as agriculture for quite some time, which has directly resulted into the stagnation of rural economy of the region. This particular region was once called as the sugar bowl of India, is now facing reducing acreage in sugarcane production as peasants are not getting the profit they deserve.

We know that this region has been a big population bulk, which also causes pressure on land. Many people do not get employment within the boundaries of villages and they have to migrate due to increasing population pressure. Increasing population pressure on land also causes decreasing per capita land availability which results into landless labourers. These people have no other options except to migrate for their livelihood.

Besides this, socio-economic and demographic characteristics of a household also affect the migration behaviour of people and vice versa. Infrastructure amenities at the point of destination in cities and towns also attract the people as a pull factor to
migrate from their rural surrounding, although distance between place of origin and destination also play an important role in the outmigration.

Rural development is one of the most important factors which affect the rural out-migration. In present study, emphasis will be on to show the relationship between rural development and rural out-migration and how the level of rural development affects the rural out-migration. Rural development includes over all socio-economic, infrastructure and agricultural development of a village. Many indicators have been taken for the present study from the above mentioned three heads of the rural development.

1.4. Objectives of the Study

The research questions discussed above are translated into the following objectives:

(i) To study the magnitude, regional patterns and characteristics of rural outmigration from Uttar Pradesh.

(ii) To evaluate the impact of rural development on rural outmigration in the region.

(iii) To analyse the regional pattern of rural outmigration from the Gorakhpur district.
(iv) To assess the socio-economic and demographic characteristics of out-migrants.
(v) To find out the determinants of rural outmigration and show the socio-economic and demographic consequences of rural outmigration on the households of the migrants.

1.5. Hypotheses

The above mentioned objectives are formulated with certain hypotheses in the background which are given below:

(i) Rural outmigration is inversely proportional to the distance between destination and origin.

Rationale: This hypothesis analyses the distance between the origin and destination of the rural outmigration. The regional pattern of rural outmigration in most of the cases have been envisaged by many studies is such that people migrate short distances in order to be in touch with their families and their birthplace so that they can look after the family members. Ravenstien also proposed distance decay model and he favours the step by step migration pattern.

(ii) Higher the level of rural development, lower will be the rural out migration.

Rationale: The positive development in a region provides high level of basic amenities and better socio-economic infrastructure. It provides better living conditions for the rural folks in a rural area and behaves as a pull factor in the region. On contrary, the lower development in an area functions as a push factor for the population of the area and therefore it promotes outmigration. So, it has been envisaged that wherever there is high level of rural development, there will be lesser chances of outmigration from the area.

(iii) Higher the dependency ratio in the households lower will be the outmigration from the households.

Rationale: Many studies have synthesized the fact that there are very few members of the family who are earning. The earning members have big responsibilities on their shoulders. They look after the family in every possible manner. So, if there are fewer members in the households who can earn and most of the members are dependent, it inhibits the outmigration. It happens due
to the reason that the earning members of the family remains stay back at the village and look after the family members.

(iv) Higher the proportion of landless labourers, higher will be the outmigration.

*Rationale:* Rural economy is mostly dependent on the agriculture and the agricultural lands have been the most important resources for villagers in rural areas and have been the major source of income for the households. Those who do not have the land, work as labourers on the farms of other people of the village who have agricultural land. But on farm employment opportunities are seasonal which cannot provide them an all time employment over the whole year. Besides, the daily wages are too low to subsistence in the rural areas of states like Uttar Pradesh. So, it is proposed that these circumstances together work as a push factors for the rural landless labour to out-migrate.

(v) Higher the literacy, higher will be the outmigration.

*Rationale:* The literacy and education is a systemic process of attainment. Generally, most of the villages, in Indian context do not have higher institutions (higher secondary schools and colleges) for further studies. Unavailability of such institutions promotes these rural folks to out-migrate to the areas where they can continue their studies. Those who have attained schooling in a primary and Junior High School at the village, however, raise the level of literacy in the village but like to migrate to continue their studies.

(vi) The households with out-migrants have higher socio-economic status than households with no out-migrants.

*Rationale:* People migrate from the rural areas to attain better living conditions both at the source and at the destination area. The migration occurs mostly due to the comparative advantage in the wages at the destination. The remittances send to the villages will definitely raise the socio-economic conditions of the people. Apart from this exposure to the outer world (mostly urban areas) make the rural folks accessible to the modern tools and technologies.
1.6 The Scheme of Chapters

Keeping in view the objectives of the study and hypotheses set thereon, the whole material of the study have been synthesized into seven chapters. The brief summary of these seven chapters has been given below:

I. Introduction

This chapter primarily deals with the introduction about the topic, statement of the problem, survey of the existing literature on migration issues, objectives of the study. The chapter also sets the hypotheses for the study which have been tested in the subsequent chapters with relevant data base and techniques.

II. Area of the Study, Data Base and Methodology

This chapter incorporates a detailed description of the area under study. A detailed account of the rationale for selecting the study area has been given. Besides this, a broad geographical, demographical and economic description of the study area has also been done. This chapter also deals with the details of the data base used in this study. The chapter also describes the different techniques and methods used in the study.

III. Characteristics and Patterns of Outmigration from Rural Uttar Pradesh

Before going into the details of the phenomena of outmigration at micro level it looks imperative to see the characteristic and regional pattern of rural outmigration from Uttar Pradesh. This chapter provides a broad overview of the inter-state outmigration from rural Uttar Pradesh. It throws light on the characteristics of outmigration from rural Uttar Pradesh. Apart from this, this chapter also includes a brief description about the reasons of inter-state rural outmigration from Uttar Pradesh.

IV. Regional Pattern of Rural Development and Outmigration from Uttar Pradesh: A District Level Analysis

This chapter analyses the level of rural development by using the secondary data for all the districts of Uttar Pradesh. Apart from this, the chapter also incorporates the rate of inter-district and intra-district outmigration among
all the 70 districts of Uttar Pradesh. Afterwards, this chapter assesses the relationship between rural development and rural outmigration at district level by using correlation and regression analysis.

V. Demographic and Socio-economic Characteristics of Rural Outmigrants

Initially the chapter gives a brief description about the magnitude, characteristics and the regional pattern of rural outmigration from the Gorakhpur district. This will provide a correct idea about the intra-district, inter-district, interstate and international outmigration from the study area. The chapter also analyses the socio-economic and demographic characteristics of households with migrants and at occasions compares it with non-migrants households.

VI. Determinants and Consequences of Rural Outmigration:

This chapter finds out the determinants of rural outmigration in the study area. The chapter has also demonstrated that how the socio-economic and demographic characteristics of a family induce outmigration. This chapter also analyses the socio-economic and demographic consequences of rural outmigration from the study area.

VII. Summary and Conclusion:

This last and final chapter summarizes the findings of the whole study and concludes with some suitable and logical solutions.