A number of studies have been conducted on different aspects of rural urban migration. The topic has been of interest to sociologist, geographers and economists who examine social, cultural and economic aspects related to rural-urban migration. Sociologists’ main concern has been to examine the factor affecting the decision of migration by an individual or household. They study demographic, geographic, social, psychological, economic, attitudinal factors to explain the flow of rural-urban migration flow. Geographers are mostly concerned with movement of people from one place to another. They usually conduct the studies on spatial pattern and distribution of population. However, they quite often ignore the aspects related to the causes and consequences of migration that are mostly examined by the economists. Since, the present study focuses on examination the patterns, determinants and trends in rural-urban migration and suggests for some policy options to abate the undesirable flow of rural area to urban area, the literature reviewed in this chapter is restricted to only some relevant studies related to socio-economic aspects of rural-urban migration. The literature is reviewed as follows:

Lewis¹ (1954) shows that migration is an equilibrating factor, which causes transfer of labour from the labour surplus sector to labour deficit sector

and brings about equality between the two sectors. His study is based on the concept of dual economy comprising of subsistence agricultural sector characterized by high incidence of disguised and under-employment and a modern industrial sector characterized by high level of employment where capitalist reinvest the full amount of their profit. According to Lewis’s theory, rural-urban migration is caused by geographic differences in the supply and demand for labour. Migration is possible due to assumptions of wage differentials between rural and urban areas, a reserve army of ‘underemployed’ labour in agriculture, full unemployment, zero transfer costs and reinvestment of urban enterprise profits into production. Thus, Lewis’s study considered the migration of rural workforce to the urban area as an important source of capital formation and industrial development.

Gupta\(^2\) (1961) shows that the propensity to migrate varies inversely with the family status. According to his study, the intensity of migration is higher among educated persons from family having small or no agricultural land. He further observes that higher the status of a particular family, lesser is the tendency among its members to migrate from the village.

Schultz (1961) finds that the internal migration to take advantage of better job opportunities has the same nature as an investment in education and health. Accordingly cost of migration must be compared with the returns from

migration. He suggests a method of computation of present value of earning differentials between locations and comparing these with estimated value of cost of migration.

Herrick\(^3\) (1965) shows that the nature of migration is affected by the educational policy-decision. If educated youths do not have employment opportunities available in the area, they will feel the urge to migrate, while vocational education to imparting skills related to education in rural area and small towns would have the opposite effect.

Lee\(^4\) (1966) observes that each individual is constantly exposed to a set of factors at origin and destination, a set of intervening obstacles and a series of personal consideration. According to him, decision to migrate or not to migrate stems from the evaluation of all these factors. These factors can be positive or negative as well as neutral at the place of origin and destination.

Greenwood\(^5\) (1969) examines the push-pull hypotheses in Egypt through including variables, such as, population size, distance between area of origin and destination, level of urbanization, education level etc. His study finds that educational facilities available at the origin act as a hindrance in out-migration while such facilities at the destination attract the in-migration.


Todaro$^6$ (1969) formulates a rural-urban migration model which represents a realistic modification and extension of simple wage differential approach commonly found in the literature. He argues that when analyzing the determinants of urban labour supplies one must not look at the prevailing income differential as such but rather at the rural-urban expected income differential i.e., the income differential adjusted for probability of finding an urban job.

Shaw$^7$ (1974) in his study of rural-urban migration finds that in the countries where the structure of land tenure is characterized by a large portion of rural-urban populations belonging to small land owners and landless working class, and where a large portion of agricultural land is owned by big landlords, the existence of high rate of population growth causes and increases high rate of rural out-migration.

Petersen$^8$ (1975) concludes that migration changes the size of population and rate of growth of two areas involved. He further finds that most migrants are young adults and their out-migration changes the age structure and also the demographic patterns of both the areas. The migration affects the socio-economic determinants of fertility and mortality.

---


Bose\(^9\) (1978) finds that there is a push back factor in urban areas. In India, for example, urban workforce is sizable and there is high incidence of urban employment. These factors, together, work as deterrents in further flow of rural workforce to urban area. He terms this phenomenon as push-back factor. According to him, if new employment opportunities are created in the urban area, the first persons to offer themselves for employment are the marginally employed person already residing in urban area unless, of course, specific skill is required for the job. Thus, a rapid urban population growth becomes a factor in slowing down the rate of rural-urban migration.

Majumdar and Majumdar\(^{10}\) (1978) examine the factors affecting rural-urban migration. They find that expanding employment opportunities in the growing city, encouragement by close relatives in the city, offer of employment by the labour contractor in the city, social injustice suffered by the marginalized group in the rural area, expectation of better life in urban area are the main motivating factors in rural-urban migration.

Banerjee\(^{11}\) (1986) observes that reasons for migration articulated by the migrants in do not support the common belief that push factors are mainly responsible for rural-urban migration. He states that two notable motives were to obtain cash or to repay debt, dislike the agriculture work or desire for

---


different jobs. There are some evidences that the cash motive was largely for expenditure on life cycle ceremony. As prevailing social values and attitudes are responsible to a greater extent for rural resident being extravagant in ceremonial expenditure, migration with this motive can be reduced through a programme of social education. He further argues that dislike of agriculture work was reported mainly by migrant who had studied beyond the mid-school level. He concludes that unless curriculum is change expansion of education is likely to increase migration.

Pande\textsuperscript{12} (1986) finds that the expanding employment opportunity and higher wages in urban area and declining employment opportunities and relatively low wages in the villages are respectively the pull and push factors in the rural-urban migration. The income differential between cities and villages is basically the most vital factor in the operating economic environment that provides a continuous stimulus to potential migrants from among the rural areas.

Prabhakara’s\textsuperscript{13} study (1986) shows that migration from rural to urban area is higher among males compared to females in those areas where more job opportunities and educational facilities are available. His study also finds that females mainly migrate in connection with family and other social reasons rather than for employment. Economic factor is found more dominating in the rural-urban migration.

\textsuperscript{13} Prabhakara N.R. (1986), \textit{Internal Migration and Population Redistribution in India}, Concept Publication, New Delhi
Williamson\textsuperscript{14} (1988) mentions that wage differentials alone matter, but also important is the incorporation of the rate of return to migration and the elasticity estimation of the response of migrants to wage differentials in migration models. Since the development of Harris-Todaro model, many other researchers have extended the model by incorporating new factors that will increase the choices of individuals to migrate.

Rosenzweig and Stark \textsuperscript{15} (1989) find evidence supporting the proposition that inter-villages marriages that explain a large proportion of rural to rural migratory movements within India enable households to reduce variation in food consumption in the face of spatially covariant risk. More vulnerable households, as measured by those with greater profit variance and smaller asset holdings are significantly more likely to send migrants.

Oberai\textsuperscript{16}, et al. (1989) examine the determinants of migration in three states in India—Bihar, Kerala, and Uttar Pradesh. Their findings were consistent with the ideas that migrants often have a history of chronic underemployment before they migrate only as a measure of desperation, and with the expectation of participating in the informal urban sector even in the long run. Remittances were found to be substantial and considerable levels of return-migration were also documented, among other evidence of continued close ties of migrants to their home villages.

\textsuperscript{14} Williamson, Jeffrey (1988), 'Migration and Urbanization' in Hollis Chenery and T.N. Srinavasan (eds), \textit{Handbook of Development Economics}, Vol. I. Elsevier, Ch. 11: 426-465
Mehta\(^{17}\) (1991) finds in his study that the migration of people from rural area to urban area is mainly determined by the factors like socio economic conditions of households, transport and communication infrastructure, education level of the population and several other geographical and physical conditions. His study further examines that although the pattern of migration across different income groups is almost similar, however the percentage of migration is high among low income groups. The study emphasize that the poor economic conditions of rural households, high dependence of population on agricultural activities and lack of employment activities in rural non-farm sector force the rural workforce to migrate to the urban areas.

Singh\(^{18}\) (1991) observes that due to high concentration of agricultural land in few hands and mechanization of farming, the small farmers find it difficult to support their families throughout the year and hence they migrate to the urban areas for the part of year or for the entire year to earn extra income. He further observes that in most of the countries, the rural areas have been starved of investment and there are urban bias in public investment that compel the rural youths to move to the cities where they have better access to education and employment opportunities.

Adams\(^{19}\) (1993) finds evidence for an inverted-U relationship between initial household income and migration probability. However, the result is


\(^{19}\) Adams, R.H. (1993), ‘The Economic and Demographic Determinants of International Migration in Rural Egypt’, *Journal of Development Studies* 30 (1): 146-167
based on estimates of predicted household income prior to migration obtained by calculating fitted values for migrant households using coefficient estimates from an income regression of the non-migrant sample. In any case, the possible effect of income on migration is outweighed by the negative impact of land farmed, indicating asset poverty to be a more important migration determinant.

Portes\textsuperscript{20} (1995) has considered migration as a question of long-term economic adaptation. Migrants are viewed not only as individuals carrying their personal skills, but also as members of groups and participants in broader social structures that affect in multiple ways their economic mobility. Migrant networks are sets of interpersonal ties that connect migrants, former migrants and non-migrants in origin and destination areas through ties of kinship, friendship, and share community origin.

Dhindsa and Sharma\textsuperscript{21} (1996) arrive at the conclusion that most of the migrant workers have two to three acres of un-irrigated land in their villages which is not sufficient to provide them gainful employment throughout the year and therefore they migrate to the other places for earning their livelihood. Therefore the government should provide them irrigation facilities, modern agricultural inputs and institutional credits at low interest rate so that they can improve their land productivity and thereby income from the agriculture.
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Yadava\textsuperscript{22} et al. (1996) find that the migration affects a number of socio-economic, cultural, demographic and political factors both at the place of origin and destination. According to them, population mobility is expected to play an important role in bringing out a change in the economic conditions of rural people. The migration provides a network of expansion of ideas, cultural diffusion and social integration apart from environmental and economic changes.

A study by Sensarma\textsuperscript{23} (1997) concludes that imbalances in the economic opportunity between the urban and rural sector should be minimized as it is the main cause migration of workforce from rural to urban areas. In this context, rural development policies and programmes particularly for rural industrialization are quite relevant. The study suggests that apart from promoting small-scale industries, the government should give more policy focus on creating farm and non farm income and employment opportunities in the rural area.

Lucas\textsuperscript{24} (1997) observes that migration decisions are made by rational self-interested individuals looking for higher paid work in urban areas and migration occurs if the economic benefits in terms of expected wages at urban destination – accounting for risk of initial spell of unemployment – exceed

economic costs of moving and of foregone wages at rural origin. Rationality implies that individuals with better education, skills and labour market experience have a comparative advantage in job search at destination labour markets, and therefore are more likely to migrate.

Singh and Aggarwal25 (1998) examine the major ‘push’ and ‘pull’ factors in rural-urban migration. Their study is based on the data collected from 1991 Census for 25 districts of North-Western Uttar Pradesh. The Ordinary Least Square Regression Model is applied to examine the impact of different variables on rural-urban migration. Six factors namely, percentage of rural workforce engaged in non-household manufacturing activities), Percentage of urban workforce engaged in non-household manufacturing and construction activities, Percentage of urban workforce engaged in tertiary sector), Average size of operational holdings), Rural literacy rate, Net Irrigated Area as percentage of Net Sown Area are identified to explain variations rural-urban migration. The paper finds inadequate irrigation facilities, lack of employment opportunities in rural non-household manufacturing activities and decline in the average size of operational holdings as the major ‘push’ factors; and increase in rural literacy and expansion of non-household manufacturing and construction activities in urban areas as the leading ‘pull’ factor in rural-urban migration.

Srivastava26 (1998) points out that there is a contrasting impact of migration on sending and the receiving areas. He concludes that in the sending

area, migration is contributing to a breakdown of the isolated nature of rural labour market and facilitating the development of more generalized market for labour. He observes that there is upward pressure on wages and increased mobility has undoubtedly contributed to the enhancement in the real wages in the backwards regions in India. Whereas in the receiving areas migrant labour operated in a setting in which there is segmentation and fragmentation in the labour market that enables the employers to lower wage cost and exercise greater control over the labour process.

Ellis\textsuperscript{27} (2000) observes that there is a big difference between livelihood diversification out of choice and out of necessity. The implication is that in the latter case migration is likely to exacerbate poverty and vulnerability. Severely destitute people may be unable to make informed choices about destination where they lack knowledge and social capital, and destination choices will be restricted by financial deficiency.

Bhattacharya\textsuperscript{28} (2000) finds that states with a relatively high proportion of Scheduled Tribes in the population have higher rural to rural migration rates, whereas Scheduled Caste populations have the opposite effect on migration. He argues that Scheduled Tribes ‘are outside the Hindu caste system and therefore are not “ordained” to specialize in certain specific occupations. Further, unlike Scheduled Castes who are dispersed geographically, STs are concentrated in

\textsuperscript{27} Ellis, Frank 2000. ‘The Determinants of Rural Livelihood Diversification in Developing Countries’, \textit{Journal of Agricultural Economics} 51 (2): 289-302

certain areas within states and in which they usually have a sizeable presence and they may therefore feel freer to move within these areas than SCs do generally.

Kothari29 (2002) examines how poor people’s migration choices are impaired by different forms of social exclusion, which result from inequitable access to different capital resources and institutions. These include economic assets (e.g. land ownership, savings), human capital (e.g. education, skills, age), social capital (e.g. kinship networks), cultural capital (e.g. ethnicity, caste, gender, language), geography (e.g. natural environment, rural remoteness) and political capital (e.g. political participation and citizenship). Furthermore, the various types of exclusion that result from lack of control over these different types of resources interact and reinforce one another, further constraining livelihood choices for the poorest.

Mosse30 et al. (2002) study opportunities and experiences of seasonal rural to urban migration among Scheduled Tribe populations in western India. Urban informal sector work is highly ‘ethnically’ differentiated with tribes people limited to low pay, unskilled, less secure work at destination. However, within the tribal group, the poor and better off have different experiences of migration. Whereas migration among the better off is used to manage risk and

build assets, migration is more common among poorer people and often leads to labour ‘bondage’ or sale of assets. The poorer are more likely to undertake long-term migration of entire households to service debt accumulated at high interest rates for subsistence purposes. Because of this, migration often serves to increase intra-community inequality among Scheduled Tribe communities.

Rani and Shylendra\textsuperscript{31} (2002) review some of the existing theoretical and empirical studies on occupational diversification and rural-urban migration. Theoretically, the changing occupational structure has come to be explained from both the developmental and the distress angles. Empirical studies suggest that forces of development and distress are influencing rural occupational structure simultaneously. However, the extent of their influence is difficult to judge from the available evidence. Their paper stresses the need for a new focus in diversification studies to explain the phenomenon not only in terms of the micro-level dynamics but also from a broader perspective considering various macro processes.

Gaffari and Singh\textsuperscript{32} (2004) find that the contributing factors for rural-urban migration may either be "push" or "pull", with the former guided by force of internal circumstances and the latter by lure of external attractions or incentives. Their study identifies the major push and pull factors responsible


for rural out-migration, based on the data collected from 1991 Census for 50 districts of Uttar Pradesh. The OLS regression model has been applied to examine the impact of various determinants on rural-urban migration. It has been found that development of educational facilities as well as irrigation facilities in rural areas and acceleration of industrialization process in these areas are significant variables in abating the flow of rural exodus.

Sharma\textsuperscript{33} (2005) suggests that because of increasing poverty, poor returns from land and rising rent demands, most migration from rural to urban areas in Bihar mainly as unskilled or semiskilled takes place.

Based on sample studies of female migrant workers in Tamil Nadu, Sundari\textsuperscript{34} (2005) finds that the major push factor is lack of employment opportunities at the place of origin caused by drought and the main pull factor is a favourable employment situation at the place of destination.

Gbemiga (2005) examines socio-economic factors influencing movement of people from urban centres to rural areas in Nigeria with particular focus on Oyo State of Nigeria. Purposive sampling technique was used to sample 160 migrants in rural areas for the study. Data were collected from the respondents using interview schedule. The principal results of the study reveal that most of the respondents left the urban centres for the rural areas because of their inability to secure jobs in the towns, transfer to rural areas in their places


of work, retirement and high cost of living in the urban centres. The results show that there is a positive and significant relationship between lengths of stay of migrants in the rural areas and their ages. There are significant differences in the lengths of stay on migration by the single. The study recommends that government should encourage the drift of people to rural areas by making available such amenities that would encourage the stay of the migrants.

Paris\textsuperscript{35} et al. (2005) find that migration has increased women decision making capabilities significantly. In their case study of labour out-migration of rice farming households in three districts of Eastern UP, they observe that the out-migration of workers helped their families to avoid hunger and starvation.

Farooq et al. (2005) examine that the poor economic opportunities, rural inequality and demographic behaviour are the main determinants of migration from rural to urban areas in Pakistan. The study was carried out at Faisalabad city and four tehsils of Faisalabad district (Faisalabad, Jaranwala, Thandlianwala & Samundri). Both the urban and rural areas are consisted of eight circle areas from the city and eight villages from four tehsiles. The analysis of data suggests that high rate of out-migration from a village is intimately associated with unequal distribution of resources (usually land). The result also shows that better economic opportunities in the city centres are the major source of attraction that has fascinated the rural people toward the act of migration.

Mendola\textsuperscript{36} (2006) observes that labour migration is a pervasive feature of economic development. People mobility for temporary or permanent labour purposes is a routine part of agricultural activity. There are very significant migration flows in some developing areas, with considerable impacts on individuals, households and regions at origin. Despite the growing debate about motivations and impacts of recent migration flows, costs and returns of this global phenomenon are still unclear and remain far outside the public policy realm. The paper examines the empirical research that, despite the paucity of data, offers a basis to garner some insights into the migration-development nexus.

Kundu and Sharangi\textsuperscript{37} (2007) found that migration has been a definite instrument of improving economic well-being and escaping from poverty. They observe that probability of being poor is much less among the migrants compared to the local population in the urban centers.

Liu\textsuperscript{38} (2008) examines the determinants of rural–urban migration paying special attention to the role of human capital externalities in the rural sector. Using data from a well-known household survey in China, he finds that in rural areas human capital externalities have a discouraging effect on rural–urban migration. If all other factors are held constant, a rural resident from a county

\textsuperscript{36} Mendola M. (2006), ‘Rural Out-migration and economic Development at Origin: What do We Know?’, Sussex University Migration Working Paper No 40
rich in human capital is less likely to migrate to the city than his counterpart from another county poor in human capital endowment. The study also finds some evidence that human capital exerts positive external effects on the likelihood for a rural resident to choose off-farm employment and on labor income in the rural sector. One important policy implication is that expanding education opportunities in rural areas can help curtail rural–urban migration and therefore alleviate urban unemployment pressure.

Mitra and Murayama\textsuperscript{39} (2008) examine the district level rural to urban migration rates in India among males and females separately. Both the rates are closely associated irrespective of whether the migrants originate from the rural areas within the state or outside the state. This would suggest that women usually migrate as accompanists of the males. The social networks, which play an important role in the context of migration, are prevalent among the short distance migrants and tend to lose their significance with a rise in the distance between the place of origin and destination though there are some exceptions to this phenomenon. As regards the effect of factors at the place of destination, prospects or better job opportunities are a major determinant of male migration.

Molaei\textsuperscript{40} et al. (2008) analyze the impact of earning gains of the rural migrants settled in urban areas in Iran. Primary data has been collected from 400 migrant households based on multistage cluster random sampling.

\textsuperscript{39} Mitra A and M. Murayama (2008), ‘Rural to Urban Migration: A District Level Analysis for India’, IDE Discussion Paper 137, Institute of Developing Economies, Chiba Japan

Regression analysis has been conducted to study the factors determining the migrants’ earning in the urban areas. The findings revealed that migrants’ demographic characteristics, sector of employment and migrants’ network have significant impact on the earning of the migrants.

The literature reviewed above shows that there is no dearth of study on rural-urban migration in India and abroad. However, there are a few studies related to the dimensions, determinants, causes, consequences and policy effectiveness in a densely populated Indian State such as Uttar Pradesh. The present study is an effort in this direction. As migration data related to the Population Census 2001 have been recently released, it would be quite significant to compare the results of two census report—1991 and 2001. The 2001 census report is coincident with the decade of economic reform initiated in the country. A comparison of data of two decades—one before the reform and other after the reform may provide us useful insights for adopting appropriate policy options to abate the undesirable flows of rural workforce to the urban areas.
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