CHAPTER II

MIGRATION: A REVIEW AND APPRAISAL

Having introduced the problem which is being analysed in the research reported here in all necessary details, including the procedures to be followed, in the previous chapter, we now turn to a review of literature and its appraisal in the context of the study.

The review and appraisal relates to migration in general, rural-urban and internal migration in particular. The focus however is on three major areas of interest within the realm of migration research: the first is on general migrational aspects of population in local and regional contexts, the second is on the theories and models of migration, and the third is on the specific aspects dealt with in the present research. These include causes and consequences, decisions and perceptions and social ties. It is important to indicate that the focus of the present research has emerged from a careful appraisal of literature on migration.

Migration Research

Migration is an adaptation to changing social, cultural, economic, political and ecological environments. While being shaped by these factors, migration has also induced change in each of these aspects of human life (Dasgupta, 1982; FAO, 1980; Greenwood, 1971, 1973).

Migration has taken so many forms that it is now known by the general term Population Movement. The forms are so numerous that it has become difficult to
define or retain any one specific definition to any of the forms. That all migrations involve movement but that not all movements involve migration is certain. In explaining migration, various levels of explanation has been given. Some of them have even been posed as alternative hypothetical models when actually they have been focussing on different aspects of an inherently complex process (Kim, 1981; Stouffer, 1940).

It is essential, therefore, before we proceed further, to differentiate migration from mobility in the context of migration studies. The term migration refers to the relocation process which involves an individual or household shifting geographic location from an origin to a destination. The term is also used in a wider sense to refer to aggregate levels of migration flows from one country to another, from one city to another and so on. The term mobility is used in the context of migration studies, to refer to the propensity of an individual or household to change residential location in a given period of time. It sometimes refers to the actual number of moves, relative to some bench mark by an individual or a household over a given period of time regardless of scale (Massey, 1988).

Some social scientists have explained migration as a matter of psychological differences between movers and non-movers, while others have stated it either as individual expressions to changing life conditions or as a result of changing socio-economic structural characteristics of different areas. Of the social scientists, the geographers have focussed their attention on the geographical and natural resource factors (Sonis, 1980; Schwind, 1975).

Kirk (1960) describes the study of migration as the step child of demography, but we have come a long way from that kind of treatment, although many authors still
reiterate the meagre attention that migration research receives. It is also true that because of this that there is still a lag between our knowledge of migration and knowledge of other demographic phenomena, particularly fertility and mortality. Others, notably, Abu Lughod (1964), Friedlander (1969) and Zelinsky (1971) have emphasized the inability of the theory of demographic transition to guide research on population change, and its relation to a more general process of social change, precisely because that pseudo-theory disregarded both internal and international migration.

More recently, Rogers and Willekens (1976) have noted the severe restrictions that the body of theoretical mathematical demography developed under the assumption of closed populations, imposes on the advance of new models of population dynamics, that include migration.

To sum up, until a short time ago, both the development of knowledge and the attention given to migration were relatively meagre.

If we review today the extensive and varied literature on migration, or say spatial movements produced during the last decade or so, and if we consider the opinions on migration and spatial distribution of population expressed by the majority of the governments, we can affirm that migration, or more generally, mobility and territorial distribution of population has attained the status of a problem that can no longer take second place to other population questions (Oberai, 1981). Furthermore, the territorial mobility of persons is truly a multi-faceted phenomenon, that is fully intertwined with the essential issues related to development and to inter-relations between people (Peek, 1979).
There are at least four known positions in the explanation of rural-urban migration. They are, to be brief: irrational, social particular, rational economic and reductionist. The irrational view implies that the movement of people from villages to the towns is somehow not in the real interest of those who move. On the contrary, the other three appear to be generally well defined and perfectly rational in their own ways.

A number of other explanations have emerged on the tautological side: people move because they perceive it is better for them to move and we know they perceive it to be better because they move. All we can state with some conviction is that the migration analysts must necessarily focus on the objective factors that shape perceptions and opportunities, that is, the social and economic constraints to mobility and conditions facilitating different forms of migration (Peterson, 1958).

In doing so however the social scientists must maintain a rigorous theoretical framework, describing the process of migration in terms of a general process of social and economic change and development (Collier, 1975). It appears that a list of push and pull factors based on an ad hoc inductive reasoning is a recipe for theoretical chaos and analytical confusion. Moreover, explanations based on push-pull formations presume that people are inherently sedentary, which is no more fashionable than the presumption that they are by nature migratory (Fuguitt, 1958; Goldstein, 1981; Hogan and Berlink, 1975).

In the context of such competing confusion, we have to clarify five sets of conceptual issues:

1. Need to define territorial mobility.
2. Need to agree on a taxonomy of mobility and a typology of migration patterns.

3. Need to classify levels of causes of territorial mobility.

4. Need to consider psychological factors and to integrate the process of individual reasoning with socio-economic explanation of mobility.

5. Need to delineate the impact and functions of mobility, at the individual and community and national and international levels.

Various lines of enquiry are evident in migration research. In geographical studies, Shaw (1975) for example, has identified six aspects of enquiry. They are:

1. Migration in which the principal explanatory variables are age, sex, marital status, education, occupation, career and lifestyle.

2. Economic aspects of migration in which the principal explanation variables are wages and salaries and employment opportunities and in which cost-benefit and factor allocation techniques are used.

3. Spatial aspects of migration in which the explanatory variables are distance, directional bias and information flows and in which intervening opportunities and gravity models are used.

4. Behavioural aspects of the decision to migrate in which migration is related to place utilities, preference, stresses and residential complaints.
5. Migration probabilities and mover-stayer continuum in which migrational expectancy is the focus in the analysis of intra-regional and inter-regional flows.

6. Stochastic processes in which migration histories and cumulative inertia are explained.

One particular aspect of migration is that of the terms for people migrating or moving. This has also added to the confusion. The very heterogeneity of the process of mobility makes such terminological confusion easily understandable, especially as forms of movement have combined different forms of change in space, time, residence and activity. There are various categories of individuals classified by their mobility and status and the overlapping terms are scattered in literature. Five principal categories are dominant, although there is almost a bewildering number and range of terms coexisting without any apparent cohesive tendency for a commonly accepted terminology to emerge.

Permanent Migrants and Transilients. The permanent migrants and transilients are those who change their activity space, but who could not be validly classified as having changed their residence space, because they do not have any usual residence. Nomads persistently change their activity space, they move at regular intervals, perhaps seasonally or in some cyclical fashion, or they may move irregularly without necessarily retracing any traditional routes. Peterson (1958) classified such movement as primitive migration and the forms of mobility adopted by the nomads as collective social movement, rather than an individual act of migration. Some observers have described the migrating labourers as transilent migrants denoting a lack of permanent settlement in any location. Analytically and in policy terms, the two categories raise major questions about changes in the tempo of movement and increases or decreases in the
propensity to move as well as the question of changing directions of movement and patterns of activities pursued by those involved.

Temporary Migrants and Sojourners. These mobility status categories consist of those who move for activity and not for residence. The first category consists of circular migrants who have been blessed with a rich array of names. The terms include turn over migrants (Bose, 1980), pendular migrants (Skeldon, 1977), target migrants and more simply and more generally short term migrants. The essence of this type of moves is that the move is made for a short period with the intention of returning to a place of usual residence. It should not however be defined by expected duration, though for some purposes it may be desirable to divide the category but not the duration of the stay (Breman, 1978).

An important group of circular migrants consists of seasonal migrants who combine activities in several places according to the seasonal labour requirements and the availability of seasonal work opportunities. They should perhaps be distinguished from compensatory migrants. These are those who go elsewhere in search of income when the need arises but not necessarily at regular intervals or at particular times of the calendar. A second subcategory of those who change activity but not their usual residence consists of life cycle stage migrants. In many pre-industrial societies, youths leave their home village on approaching adulthood in order to gain experience and to ensure their social status in the village after their return (ESCAP, 1980). Such migration has been performed as a rite of passage as unlike the case of circular migrants. Such migrants are unlikely to leave their home area for more than one period and that may last a relatively long time (Richard, 1983; Simmons, 1977; Simmons, A.B., 1983; Skeldon, 1986).
Commuters. A category by itself, this consists of commuters who move to take up a specific activity usually economic and they retain their residence elsewhere. It has been correctly noted that commuting may be a substitute for residential movement, or it may be a complement to another form of migration (Chapman and Prothero, 1977; Colfer, 1982).

Migration Research and Social Science Disciplines. The study of migration has traditionally been a domain of sociologists rather than specialists from other disciplines. Research on migration in sociology dates back to the early works of Ravenstein (1885, 1889). Among useful surveys of literature are those of Bogue (1959), Eliza (1972), Balan et al (1973), United Nations (1973), Ritchey (1976), IDRC (1977), Findley (1977) and DeJong and Gardner (1981). Sociologists have considered a wide range of factors influencing individual and household migration decisions including demographic factors such as age, sex, education, race, household size and composition. There are geographic factors such as distance and socio-psychological factors such as a desire for so called amenities (the bright light effect). There are economic factors such as income and occupation and attitudinal factors such as aspirations for improving one's economic status and income, being close to friends and relatives and so on. While the field of sociology has clear ties to geography in its recognition of the importance of distance, and to economics in its recognition of the primacy of economic factors in determining migration, its very professionals have made an attempt to develop a coherent theory of migration (Goldstein, 1978).

Economists have of course focussed on economic factors influencing migration, beginning with studies of causes and consequences of international migration in the 19th century and continuing with the studies of the effects of labour market conditions on the migration rates between states and districts in various countries. The focus has
traditionally been on aggregate factors influencing migration, especially wage and income levels and levels of unemployment (Byerlee, 1974; Greenwood, 1975; Todaro, 1976; Bilsborrow, 1987; Gaude, 1976; Stark, 1982; Cebula, 1979 and DaVanzo, 1972). It has had a clear policy orientation from the beginning, which in retrospect appears to have often been exaggerated because of the exclusion of non-economic variables. There is also the failure to analyse migration at the individual and household level, at which migration decisions are usually made. But more recently economists have begun to focus on factors influencing individual migration decisions. Despite the focus on economic variables, age, sex, education and even the presence of relatives can be considered as factors influencing migration within this framework.

The field of human geography is concerned with the movement of people in space. Reviews of the geographical literature are found in Kosinski and Prothero (1975), Brown (1970), Mabogunje (1970), de Castro Lopo (1975), Shaw (1975), Courgeau (1976) and Bennett and Gade (1979). The focus is not so much on who migrates, or why, or on the consequences of migration, but on identifying spatial patterns and directions of movement. A significant part of human geography is referred to as economic geography, which examines economic determinants of migration at the areal or ecological level.

Aggregate movements of population are seen to occur as a consequence of the relative attractiveness of place (place utility) and are considered to be inversely related to the distance between them. The distance factor is inherent in geographic research and figures prominently in the well known gravity model, in which migration between places is directly proportional to their mass and inversely proportional to the distance between them. In this context, the importance of the accessibility and availability of transportation and communication networks to facilitate and encourage movement is
readily seen. The close linkage between the geographic and economic approaches are also seen in the focus of geographic research on the role of differences in economic opportunities and government investments, and on population redistribution across regions.

There are numerous, valuable studies on migration in India which have underlined 'the elements of selectivity which determine who migrates to the cities' (Rao, 1983). More rare, however, are studies which raise explicitly the issues of non-migration and retention of rural population in the context of change. Breman (1979) studies these issues in rural Gujarat of India and draws attention to the 'inadequacy of some standard explanations' of rural migration, placing side by side mobility and immobility and distinguishing circulation from migration. Gupta (1970) in his study places emphasis on 'informal security systems' contributing to population retention in rural India, while the question 'to migrate or not?' is raised by Racine (1976) while investigating rural dynamics in the dry farming district of Dharmapuri of Tamil Nadu.

Some Specific Theories of Migration. Models of migration relevant to the objectives of this study can be grouped conveniently into social and economic models. The different social models which are relevant can be incorporated into a general social theory of migration. On the other hand, for the purpose of this study, it is useful to discuss each relevant economic model separately.

A General Theory of Migration

The general theory has it that in every area, there are some factors which tend to hold people in the area while others repel them. Such factors may be thought of as push and pull forces. Rural development inventories are designed to increase
production and improve the quality of life in the rural areas, and consequently reduce the propensity for out migration (Bach 1977). The relatively obvious impact is probably the basis for the common belief that rural development reduces rural-urban migration. Factors at the destination are very important to rural-urban migration (Dasgupta, 1981).

The simplest summation of the push and pull factors at origins and potential destinations does not itself dictate migration decisions. Consideration must be given also to ever present natural inertia and obstacles between origins and potential destinations (ESCAP, 1981; FAO 1980).

Distance is the most obvious obstacle. Countless studies reveal the negative relationship between distance and migration (Stewart 1960). Both physical distance and socio-cultural distance are important. Physical distance is related to the time and cost of travelling to urban areas. Socio-cultural distance includes the differences between origins and destinations with respect to language, degrees of modernity, religion, values and social behavioural systems (Tobler, 1981). Lack of information on intervening opportunities and characteristics of potential destinations is related to socio-cultural distances. In some cases, physical barriers and enforced migration restrictions act as intervening obstacles to migration (Symanski, 1975).

Generally, rural development interventions tend to reduce intervening obstacles to rural-urban migration. Physical distance is reduced by road and highway improvements in transportation services (Gibson, 1975). Interventions which increase rural income enable people to overcome financial obstacles to rural-urban migrations. Perhaps more important than the reduction in physical distance is the impact that development has on socio-cultural distance. The most obvious example is the
development of formal education in rural areas. Education enables rural youths to acquire literacy and other skills as well as urban attitudes and aspirations (Ginsberg, 1978). Formal education greatly reduces socio-cultural distances and therefore results in considerable rural-urban migration (Vidyasakar, 1978; Mukherji, 1981; Meijer and Heins, 1985).

Personal factors and characteristics are an important consideration in rural-urban migration. Perceptions of origins and destinations and intervening opportunities are crucial to migration decisions. Perception of the same factor may vary considerably from individual to individual (Sack, 1974). Consequently it is important to distinguish between types of individuals. Though Lee (1966) recognised that two individuals are not the same, he suggested that generalisation can be made about types or classes of migration decision makers. While most theories implicitly assume that migration decisions are made by potential migrants, evidence from developing countries suggests that family heads often make migration decisions for the members of the households.

Ravenstein's Law of Migration. Theoretical explanations of rural-urban migration have a long history dating from at least the 1880s when Ravenstein first proposed his law of migration (Ravenstein, 1885; 1889). According to these laws, migrants move from areas of low opportunity to areas of high opportunity. The choice of destination is regulated by distance, with migrants tending to move to nearby places. Ravenstein further observed that each stream of rural-urban migration produces a counter stream of return migration back to rural areas. He hypothesised that the urban residents are less migratory than rural ones and that migration accelerates with growth and in the means of transport and communications, and with the expansion of trade and industry. Ravenstein's basic laws have since been systematised and expanded by many investigators with the importance of the economic motive in the decision to migrate.
The negative influence of distance and the process of step migration is generally supported by empirical evidence.

Lee's Theory of Migration. Building on Ravenstein's law, Lee developed a general scheme into which a variety of special movements can be placed (Lee, 1966). Lee divided the forces exerting influence on migrant perceptions into push and pull factors. The former are negative factors tending to force migrants to leave places of origin, while the latter are positive factors attracting migrants to places of destination in the expectation of improving their lot. Lee hypothesised that factors associated with conditions of origin would be more important than those associated with areas of destination. The forces associated with the areas of origin and destination are governed by personal factors which affect the individual thresholds and facilitate or retard migration (Lee, 1966).

Lee's approach is reflected in a broad range of studies, particularly sociological studies dealing with migrant selectivity. It is actually not a theory but a conceptual framework classifying facts in migration decisions.

The Dual Economy Model of Development. The first well known economic model of development to include as an integral element, the process of rural-urban labour transfer was that of Lewis (1954), later expanded by Ranis and Fei (1961). This model considers migration as an for equilibriation mechanism. This through the transfer of labour from labour surplus to labour deficit sectors, eventually brings about wage equality in the two sectors. This model is based on the concept of a dual economy, comprising a subsistence agricultural sector characterised by under­employment and modern industrial sector characterised by full employment.
Sjaastad's Human Investment Theory. Sjaastad presented a theory of migration which treats the decision to migrate as an investment decision involving an individual's expected costs and returns over a period of time (Sjaastad, 1962). The return comprises both monetary and non-monetary components, the latter including changes in psychic benefits, as a result of locational preferences. Similarly costs include both monetary and non-monetary costs, such as costs of transportation, disposal of property, wages foregone while in transit and any training for a new job. Psychic costs include those of leaving familiar surroundings, adopting new dietary habits and social customs and so on. Since these are difficult to measure, empirical tests have been limited in general to income variables (Speare, 1971; Mc Devitt, 1977). Sjaastad's approach assumes that the people desire to maximise their net real income over their productive life and can at least roughly compute income for a life-time both in the present place of residence as well as in all possible destinations.

Todaro's Model of Rural-Urban Migration. Todaro suggests that the decision to migrate includes a perception by the potential migrant of an expected stream of income. This depends upon both prevailing urban wages and the subjective estimate of the probability of obtaining the employment in the urban modern sector (Todaro, 1969; 1976) which latter is assumed to be based on the urban unemployment rate. Todaro's model is basically an extension of the human capital approach of Sjaastad.

In the Todaro approach, migration rates in excess of the growth of urban job opportunities are not only possible, but also rational and probable in the face of expected large positive rural-urban income differentials. High rural-urban migration can continue even when a high urban unemployment rate exists and is known to potential migrants. The approach therefore offers a possible explanation of a common paradox. Todaro's basic model and its extension consider the urban labour force as
distributed between the relatively small modern sector and a larger traditional sector (Harris and Todaro, 1970).

**Wage rates in the traditional sector are not considered as a subject to the non-market forces that maintain high wages in the modern sector but are determined competitively. As a result, they are substantially lower than those in the modern sector. Most urban immigrants are assumed to be absorbed by the traditional sector while they seek employment opportunities in the modern urban sector.**

Apart from methodological and conceptual problems of estimating expected incomes and their differentials for particular origin and destination areas, a major weakness of the Todaro model is in its assumption that potential migrants are homogeneous in respect of skills and attitudes, and have complete information for working out the probability of finding a job in the urban modern sector. Moreover, both the Todaro and human investment models do not consider non-economic factors and are abstracted from structural aspects of the economy. A better understanding of the causes of migration requires an analysis of the macro-economic and institutional factors that generate rural-urban differentials. A distinction is needed to be drawn between socio-economic structural factors and the specific mechanism (unemployment, wage differentials, etc) through which structural factors operate.

**Expected Income: Bicao Model.** The word Bicao is taken from the language of a pre-Incan tribe in Ecuador, the Caras. Some historians believe that this tribe migrated from the Caribbean islands to the highlands of Ecuador. Bicao means a place of life and abundance.
Several theoretical models have been created to provide an explanation of the size and composition of the flow of migration (Shaw, 1975). One of these is the Harris-Todaro model (Harris and Todaro, 1970) in which the decision to migrate is largely determined by the individual's expectations of earning a higher income. Expected income is defined as actual urban income multiplied by the probability of obtaining employment.

Essentially, the same basic framework has been adopted for the Bicao model with an introduction into it of the concept of reservation wage, which is defined as the expected rural income plus the opportunity cost of moving. The latter includes transportation costs, those involved in looking for a job, and also the psychic ones associated with changing one's social environment. If the expected urban income exceeds the reservation wage, the individual will be motivated to leave the rural area. By contrast with what happens in the Harris-Todaro Model, an individual will not necessarily move when the expected rural-urban income differential is possible unless the reservation wage is expected as urban income. According to this interpretation, the propensity to migrate depends on rural-urban levels of income and employment.

With regard to the impact of changing urban and rural wage levels on the migration rate, that is, migration elasticity with regard to urban and rural wages, the studies by Rempel (1981) for Kenya and Greenwood (1971) for India, Barnum and Sabot (1976) for Tanzania, provide some initial evidence of the possible values of these differential elasticities. With regard to the relative importance of urban job probabilities compared with urban wage rates, the study estimates that a given percentage increase in urban wage will induce rural-urban migration.
Intersectoral Linkage Model. This approach is based on the idea that different sectors and rural and urban areas are interconnected by systems of backward and forward linkages (Hirschman, 1982; Mellor, 1976). Such linkages help development in rural areas and influence economic activities in urban areas.

Agricultural development is associated with increased demand for farm inputs and this backward linkage results in the growth of such urban activities as production and distribution of farm implements, machinery, fertilizer, credit and agricultural information. Forward linkages include the storage of agricultural commodities, transport, agro-processing activities and the wholesaling and transferring of retail agricultural products. Final demand linkages resulting from increased rural incomes are particularly important. Rural produce however tends to be income inelastic while urban goods and services are generally income elastic. Consequently, as incomes rise, rural consumers are expected to spend a proportion of their income on urban goods and services. To meet this added demand, urban production will increase resulting in employment generation and induce rural-urban migration.

A Family Model of Migration. The family is not only a social unit but also an economic institution. The works of Akin et al (1979) and Mincer (1978) extend the human capital approach to the family migration decision. It is assumed that the family will move as a unit and choose the location that yields the highest discounted return to migration. The study investigates the migration decisions of the extended family in the context of the existence and strength of a common family goal. The degree of numbers identified with that goal can lead to differences in the migration behaviours. The main interest of economics is to explain the market exchange of goods and services between consumers and producers. Production that takes place and is consumed within the family is usually neglected.
For the analysis of the decision of the migration of families however, the production of goods and services by the same for its own consumption must be considered. For example, since family migration decisions may not be individually optimal for some of its members, the losses of these members must be compensated for by the advantages of family membership. There are, of course, psychological benefits such as companionship and a sense of belonging. The family of the Telugu Boya allows for the division of labour among its members in carrying out those activities. The gain in efficiency may be considerable.

A second economic advantage of the family is its ability to pool resources and making them available to family members. By pooling resources, for example, labour and equilibrium, and tools as spades, crowbars and iron bowls, family members may achieve significant gains over what could have been obtained through individual efforts. This will be of particular advantage for credit markets and pooling resources may sometime induce savings and eliminate the need to incur debt to purchase resources outside the family.

The extended family fulfils insurance functions and it is able to distribute the risk of illness and or loss of income of individual members. The ability and the willingness of the family to share risks may encourage some of its members to engage in more risky activities with higher potential returns than they would otherwise. The family may also look after its old members who are no longer are able to provide fully for themselves.
Migration: Aspects of Our Concern

One of the most common problems in the vast literature that exists on migration of any type is that of the data. The data which is inadequate and scarce, has become the master of the situation. Hugo (1978), a researcher particularly conscious of the problem, provides a noteworthy example of the inadequacy of the census information with regard to 14 towns of the province of West Java. A study of all permanent and non-permanent movements associated with labour and formal education, it reveals that only one-third of the total of such movements conformed to the time criterion of the census and have taken place within the province. They were therefore not migrations in terms of the census of the provincial boundaries. Observations such as these are no novelty, though they abound in the literature, and it is well established that the smaller the geographical units of reference, the greater is the volume of migration. Also, the time specifications, the intention to remain permanently the unit of analysis (which is usually the individual) and the like are just as important as the spatial specifications.

Data and Methods

Social scientists working in countries of the Third World are increasingly questioning not only the uncritical application of concepts and theories developed in the western, advanced countries but also the various schedules, questionnaires and other tools used for data collection. As rightly pointed out in a publication of the Committee on Urbanisation and Population Redistribution (IUSSP, 1980), the relationship between concept and measurement can become distorted: the concepts have in general been adapted to the usually inadequate data, whereas the data should be produced to meet the conceptual requirements. Once defective concepts are established, it becomes difficult to change the situation.
For example, there is the widespread idea that permanence or relative permanence was a condition of the migration phenomenon. This created a vacuum in terms of tools for identifying non-permanent movements and consequently, in several contexts, the securing of the non-existence of temporary, cyclical or non-permanent movements. This finally resulted in a distorted picture of reality. Goldstein (1978) points out in this connection that when more appropriate data are available, we realise that the circulation patterns in Asia in general and in South Asia in particular - until recently little known - are very similar to those observed in Africa and Melanasia. Analysts should mainly think of surveys and field work as sources of data that offer better possibilities and will be able to provide the level of detail necessary for a full interpretation of the phenomenon of migration.

Determinants of Migration. Determinants of migration often are regional and there are rural-urban disparities in economic opportunity. It is useful to distinguish between primary and secondary determinants. The primary determinants are those that directly motivate migration. They include wages, job availability and educational opportunities. Secondary determinants are those contextual forces and development strategies that distribute wages, jobs and schools in different rural regions and urban areas (Simmons et al, 1977; Simmons, 1981).

Consequences of Migration. In recent years, most studies based upon survey data, have observed that migrants have been able to increase their welfare as a result of migration in spite of difficulties of adjustment in newer surroundings and urban unemployment (United Nations, 1973; Findley, 1987; Yap, 1977; White, 1979). Individual migrants and their families not only seem generally better off as a result of migration, but migrants also appear to have assimilated and similarly improved in
socioeconomic status to urban natives in a remarkably brief period of time. This optimistic view is also consistent with micro-economic theory.

The effects of migration on areas of origin and destination depend upon both the volume of migration and types of migrants who dominate the migration flows. These are for example, characteristics affecting labour productivity such as age, education and place of origin as well as intentions to stay and the actual length of stay. The place of origin influences the ability of the migrant to adapt. Migrants who intend to remain in the destination area may exert greater impact on the destination area than those who are not sure (Nelson, 1976). Conversely, those who do not remain may have acquired urban ideas and aspirations that influence socio-economic changes in their origin or communities when they return. The Telugu Boyas’ movements from the rural areas of Dharmapuri to Coimbatore city involves a sizeable transfer of human capital out of the rural sector, which may adversely affect agricultural productivity and incomes.

The effect of migration on destination areas is more complex and to examine it requires comparing the socioeconomic and demographic situation before and after migration, such as population growth, levels of employment and income, occupational structure, savings and capital formation, composition of industry, levels of government revenue and expenditure. However, changes in the situation are influenced by a wide range of factors besides migration. Disentangling them is extremely difficult in practice. Therefore, many studies have attempted to examine the consequences of migration by comparing job and income mobility, unemployment and access to urban services or facilities for urban migrants and urban non-migrants.

If one takes into account the characteristics of the migrants, it can be seen that rural-urban migration may lead to lower rural incomes to the extent rural-urban
migrants are younger and better educated than rural non-migrants. Their movements involve a sizeable transfer of human capital out of rural sector, which may adversely affect agricultural productivity and incomes (Addo, 1974; Hathaway, 1964; Lipton, 1980). The net effect of migration on rural incomes thus depends on the ability of the rural community to adapt and change traditional divisions of labour and on the type of technological change that follow rural out-migration.

The relationship between migration and labour force participation in urban areas is theoretically indeterminate. Some observers have argued that migrants to urban areas are likely to have a lower propensity to participate in the labour force than the natives. It is because migrants may be discriminated against in their search for work, because of ethnic, religious and community differences from the urban natives (Peek and Antolínez, 1977, on San Salvador) and their lack of contacts may reduce their chances of finding employment. On the other hand, most empirical evidences suggest that migrants participate in the labour force to a greater extent than natives (Standing, 1978; Oberai and Singh, 1983). This may arise from several reasons: first, migrants are likely to have low support from relatives and friends in their destination areas and are therefore under great pressure to join the urban labour force. Secondly, migrants often have lower levels of aspirations and expectations and are, therefore, likely to take up whatever jobs are available (Herrick, 1965; Standing, 1982). Thirdly, there is the new, not altogether impressionistic - that migrants are an achievement - orient group and therefore have a higher participation rate.

A priori, it is difficult to state unequivocally whether migration worsens or improves rural income distribution. Some studies have concluded that it improves it (Adelman and Robinson, 1977), and others that it worsens it (Singh, 1977). The net effect depends on the period over which an assessment is made and whether indirect as
well as direct effects are considered. It also depends on the relative propensities of migration among different segments of the rural population, on subsequent remittances and return migration (Oberai and Singh, 1980; Rodgers, 1981) and on the effect on factor substitution and changes in productivity and rural labour costs. To the extent that rural wages rise, rural income distribution will improve. To the extent that rural production is monopolistic, however, wages may not rise even with an increase in the demand relative to the supply of rural labour. Thus the distribution of land ownership and of other means of production has an important effect on the distribution of the gains from any reallocation of labour.

In urban areas, the impact of migration on income distribution depends on the relative propensities of different groups of migrants to enter the various segments of the urban labour market as well as all other subsequent mobility (Oberai and Singh, 1981; Rodgers, 1981). To the extent the majority of the migrants enter low-income jobs, this would exert downward pressure on the incomes of the poorer segments of the urban community (Kogut and Langoni, 1975). The longer term inmigration would then be a further shift towards inequality to the extent that there is an urban labour market segmentation.

Informal Activity. Informal activity accounts for about 60 per cent of all economic activities in the less developed world (Sethuraman, 1976; 1978). It is pivotal in our understanding of urbanization issues pertaining to the third world: political economy, rural-urban migration, occupational mobility and the like. Accordingly, it constitutes a central issue in development research as well as in the efforts of practical development. In terms of definitions, informal activity is an umbrella term that includes all those small scale activities in which participants lack permanency of employment, have no set hours of work and no provision for pension and social security.
It includes all the activities carried out by small scale traders and unskilled workers with low or irregular incomes. In other words, the informal sector refers to the amalgam of workers like the earthworkers and subcontractors who secure a livelihood in the urban centres. Effective development needs to be focussed directly on a specific target population and the employment mission considered that perhaps as the most important aspect.

**Family Migration in an Uncertain Environment.** Migration is risky. The expectations that lead an individual to consider moving might be met. The cost of disappointment can be low, particularly in the context of rural-urban labour migrants in our study, where most migrants need to find an occupation quickly to support themselves. When disappointed expectations have potentially disastrous consequences, one expects to observe risk averse behaviour. Risk aversion can of course take the form of risk avoidance. But if the gains from the risky choices are great, then a strategy of risk reduction is more attractive. An individual's ability to reduce the risk associated with migration is limited. The extent to which risk can be spread through diversification is very small: an earthworker can only be at one location at a time. The family, on the other hand, is able to reduce the risk. If its adult members were in different occupations and possibly at different locations, the probability that the family income falls below a critical level is reduced (Shaeffer, 1987).

The superior ability of the family to deal with risk creates an incentive for the individual prospective migrant to coordinate migration decisions within the family (Shaeffer, 1988). Hence the family becomes an appropriate unit of analysis for the study of the migration of rural residents in developing countries. The choice of a location may be regarded as the choice of an asset that yields an assured benefit. Associated with the benefit is the probability of the distribution. From a worker's
perspective, the presence at a particular location opens up job opportunities. Jobs are characterised by a bundle of attributes such as wage rates, proximity to place of residence and the probability of lay-off.

**Emerging Hypotheses/Findings from Migration Research**

A very large number of hypotheses have been formulated and tested in migration research, in the disciplinary approaches to international, national and internal migrations. In many research projects some very general findings are also reported. It is useful to have them listed in one place for they may be appreciated in the context of present research. For want of space, however, only some very important and relevant hypotheses/findings are provided here for perusal and appreciation.

Migration (in the neo-classical tradition) is 'profit maximization' insofar as geographical movements contribute to social mobility of migrants and indirectly to the economic growth of the nation and rural areas (Todaro, 1969; 1976).

Migration (alternatively) is 'risk minimization' rather than 'profit maximization' for it is often a way of diversifying economic options (Stark, 1981).

Migration is a 'household survival strategy' insofar as it is in response to 'poverty' of households resulting from deteriorating employment and income conditions in rural areas, as a result of land concentration, farm mechanisation and low prices for crops (Chapman and Prothero, 1982).
Migration influences three categories of individuals, namely, the migrants themselves, the families of migrants, even while they do not migrate, and other members of the community.

Migration directly influences the size and structure of labour force, including its age, sex and occupational characteristics. It also influences directly the available capital for consumption and investment, since migrants take capital with them and in most circumstances remit capital back home again. Migration can directly influence available technology (DaVanzo and Hosek, 1981).

In regions facing scarcity, land consolidation and mechanisation of agriculture, there is a disproportionate movement outwards of poor and landless farmers (Connell et al., 1976).

The causes and incentives underlying migration to cities form a complex hierarchic system in which the decisive role belongs to economic factors. For example, differences in average income or wage levels between origin and destination are the significant variables affecting migration between the two places.

Migration is gender and age-specific. Young males, both single and married, migrate initially to find urban employment and housing, and even more importantly to save enough money to pay for transport and to support their family members and relatives who will join them later.

The young are more likely to migrate because they expect to enjoy the benefits of migration over a longer life span.
Network formation is the most important structural mechanism supporting cumulative causation in rural-urban migration. Migrants' networks are sets of interpersonal ties that link migrants and non-migrants of origin and destination areas through bonds of kinship, friendship and shared community origin. Networks increase the likelihood of chain migration, chain settlement and chain occupations.

The propelling force for migration usually results from individual rather than family decisions.

Out-migration has, in certain cases, a positive impact on employment without diminishing production while in others it increases employment and reduces production. Morrison (1973) argues that out-migration reduces surplus employment in the short-term, but in the long run, however, the lack of labour, especially skilled labour, may inhibit investment, decrease labour opportunities and lower production.

The magnitude and use of remittances is the litmus test for migration related benefits. If magnitude alone is considered, then remittances easily pass the test. The other part of the litmus test for benefits of migration involves the sizeable amount of income being channelled for debt repayment and agricultural investments in the place of origin.

Remittances appear to be used primarily to supplement current consumption in the home village (Hugo, 1981). On the other hand, they are more likely to be used for investment purposes when rural development is taking place in the home region (Wiest, 1979: 87-90). It is generally found that remittances reduce rural-urban income differentials but might increase income inequality, though (Connell and
Lipton, 1977; Lipton, 1980: 11-13), between villages on the one hand and between households within a given village on the other. Intervillage inequality presumably increases because migrants send remittances home when they plan to return. Inequality within the village is presumably strengthened by the fact that wealthy families do not need remittances for current consumption, but can use them for investments, land purchases and technological innovations.

**Conclusion**

Bringing together all the preceding material on the nature and characteristics of migration models, the methodological issues surrounding the empirical estimation of micro and macro migration functions, the results of available published and unpublished research on migration, from the fields of sociology, geography and econometrics, we may conclude the chapter by formulating a series of general propositions towards strengthening the future research programmes. It appears that the migrants typically do not represent a random sample of the overall population. On the contrary, they tend to be disproportionately young, better educated, less averse to change and more inclined towards achievement. As for unskilled, landless peasant migrations in Asia (Lipton, 1980), the characteristics are that they are young and middle-aged, uneducated and are unable to hold a job unless it be traditional. But many of them possess a will to change for the better and do change eventually, making a worthwhile though hard living.

Territorial mobility is a truly multi-faceted phenomenon. It is fully intertwined with essential issues related to development and to interrelations between people. Hence, the migration analysts must necessarily focus on the objective factors that shape
perceptions and opportunities, the social and economic constraints to mobility and the conditions facilitating different forces of migration.

Human geography is concerned with the movement of people in space. Aggregate movements are seen to occur as a consequence of the relative attractiveness of places (place utility) and are considered to be inversely related to distances between them. However, in geographic research, the causes and consequences, perceptions and decisions do hold sway. As such the present research falls definitely within the purview of geographic research, while at the same time it focuses on the economic geography of migration, considering both remittances and the resulting social ties as well as economic changes in the origin as well as destination as regards the migrant Boyas. So the review has focussed on the models and theories of migration and the major hypotheses and findings relevant to the study in order to place it in a conceptual framework of analysis.