REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The United Nations multilingual demographic dictionary has defined migration as a form of geographical mobility or spatial mobilities between one geographic unit and another, generally involving a change in residence from the place of origin or place of departure to the place of destination or the place of arrival.

Population movement or migration responds much faster to economic changes than do aggregate population size or growth. Migration is not a biological or genetic variable as fertility and mortality are, rather it is an outcome of social, cultural, structural and political forces which exercise their supremacy on it. It is sometimes referred to as an outer symptom of the relationship between the socio-economic structure, society and individuals. Migration has been divided into two water-tight compartments by the scholars, as internal and international migration. Internal migration refers to mobility or movement within the national boundaries, whereas international migration refers to mobility across international boundaries.

Internal migration, is mostly studied in three forms. That is, rural to rural, rural to urban, urban to urban. Rural - urban migration has played an important role in the growth of cities in the developing and developed world. Whether migration is made across the international boundaries or within the national boundaries, it is the result of socio-economic forces acting at the place of origin and destination.
THEORIES OF MIGRATION:

Several theories have been advanced to explain the migration process. Brief account of some of the important theories of migration such as Ravenstein, Lewis-Fei-Ranis, Todaro and Lee are given here.

LAWS OF RAVENSTEIN:

Ravenstein was the first to theorise about migration. He offered the first ever theoretical explanation for rural-urban migration. His first paper of March 17, 1885 was based on the British census of 1881. His second paper published four years later drew upon data gathered from more than twenty countries. A summary of Ravenstein’s laws as expounded in the first paper and extended or amended in the second, is given below.

(i) Migration and Distance:

   (a) The great body of migrants only proceed to a short distance. The number of migrants enumerated in a certain centre of absorption will diminish as the distance from the centre increases.

   (b) Migrants Proceeding to a distant place generally go by preference to one of the great centres of commerce and industry.

(ii) Migration by Stages:

   (a) Consequently, there is a universal shifting or displacement of the population which produces "currents of migration" setting in the direction of the great centres of commerce and industry which absorb them.
(b) The inhabitants of rural areas immediately surrounding a town of rapid growth flock into it; the gaps thus left in the rural population are filled up by migrants from more remote districts, until the attractive force of one of the rapidly growing cities makes its influence felt, step by step, to the most remote corners of the country.

(c) The process of dispersion is the inverse of that of absorption, and exhibits similar features.

(iii) Current and counter current: Each main current of migration produces a compensating counter current. In modern terminology, stream and counter-stream have been substituted for Ravenstein's current and counter-current.

(iv) Urban-rural difference in propensity to migrate: The natives of towns are less migratory than those of the rural parts of a country.


(vi) Technology and migration: An increase in the means of locomotion and in the development of manufacture and commerce has led to an increase in migration.

(vii) Dominance of the Economic Motive: Bad or oppressive laws, heavy taxation, an unattractive climate, uncongenial social surroundings, and even compulsion (slave trade, transportation) all have produced and are still producing currents of migration. But none of these currents can compare in volume with that which arises from the desire inherent in most men to better themselves in material respects.
EVALUATION OF RAVENSTEIN'S LAW:

As Everett Lee remarks, in spite of several criticisms, Ravenstein's laws have stood the test of time and remain the starting point for work in migration theory. Though some of his laws have been challenged or discovered to have exceptions, many of his generalisations still hold true.

Some of his laws have been found to be not applicable to some countries. For instance, it was noted that his law that females predominate among short-distance migrants appears not to be valid in many parts of Africa and Asia. Further a number of studies have found that there is not enough evidence to support Ravenstein's generalisation that migration proceeds step by step. However, there is sufficient evidence to support some of the other important laws enunciated by Ravenstein viz., that migration is predominantly short distance, that the volume of migration diminishes as the distance from the centre of absorption increases, and that most of long distance migration is in the direction of great centres of commerce and industry. For instance, the census data reveal that, in India, more than two-thirds of the total migrants move a short distance (i.e., within the district) more than one-fifth move a medium distance (i.e., within the state) while long-distance (between states) migrants constitute only a little over one-tenth of the total migrants. In India, Ravenstein's law that females predominate among short-distance migrants has been found to be true (though, as noted earlier, it is not valid in many parts of Africa and Asia). According to the census statistics in India females account for nearly 67% of the total short-distance migrants, and 61% of the medium-distance migrants, but they are only less than half of the long-distance migrants. It has also been found in support of Ravenstein that large cities, especially the modern industrial cities, have a comparatively longer proportion of long-distance
migrants. His proposition that the volume of migrants diminished as the distances from the centre of migration increases has also been found to be generally true.

LEWIS-FEI-RANIS MODEL:

The famous economist, Arthur Lewis, formulated, in 1954, a simple two-sector model of the economics of labour transfer between the subsistence rural sector and modern urban industrial sector, and this was extended in 1961 by Gustav Ranks and John Fei.

The Lewis-Fei-Ranis model is concerned with the process of transfer of labour from the traditional low productivity sector to the modern high productivity sector of the economy consequent upon the acceleration of economic activities in the modern industrial sector which is brought about by investment expansion. The model conceives an underdeveloped economy as consisting of two-sectors.

(i) A traditional agricultural subsistence sector characterised by zero or very low productivity "Surplus" labour; and

(ii) A high productivity modern urban industrial sector.

The Lewis-Fei-Ranis model obviously endorses the Nurksian thesis that the agricultural sector of an under developed economy is characterised by the existence of surplus labour. Lewis says that, in many economics, an unlimited supply of labour is available at a subsistence wage. The main sources from which workers come, as economic development proceeds, are subsistence agriculture, casual labour, petty trade, domestic service, wives and daughters in the household, and an increase in the population. In most but not all of these sectors if the country is over
populated relatively to its natural resources, the marginal productivity of labour is negligible, zero, or even negative. The subsistence wage at which this surplus labour is available for employment may be determined by the conventional view of the minimum required for subsistence; or it may be equal to the average products per man in subsistence agriculture plus a margin.

According to this model, the modern urban industrial sector is the dynamic sector of the economy. Investment and output expansion and the concomitant expansion of employment opportunities are the characteristics of the urban industrial sector. The expansion of the employment sector and the existence of higher wages in the modern sector result in the transfer of labour from rural sector to the urban sector.

**TODARO MODEL:**

In all industrial countries large scale migration took place invariably from rural to urban area. Even today the trend of migration has been from rural to urban, especially in the less developed and developing countries. But the situation has become far more complex than before, for in the urban areas of these countries, there is vast unemployment. Therefore a prospective migrant who leaves a rural economy for an urban economy with the hope of obtaining a better job, faces the double risk, of not only not getting the hope for urban job but also of losing at the same time his old employment in his rural home. A rational migrant should therefore take into account, besides the wage differential and the prospects, the probability of getting the urban job. The particular merit of Todaro's model lies in the incorporation of this "probability" in the
income-differential model of migration. It postulates that migration proceeds in response to urban-rural differences in expected rather than actual earnings.

The basic behavioural assumption of the model is that migrants consider the various labour market opportunities available to them, as between the rural and urban sectors, and choose the one which maximizes their expected gains from migration. The expected gains are a function of the existing rural-urban real wage differential that prevails for different skills and educational categories of workers, and the degree of probability of a new migrant obtaining an urban job.

Todaro argues that, without introducing the probability variable, it would be extremely difficult to explain the continued and often accelerated rate of migration in the face of sizeable and growing pools of the urban unemployed. He points out that indiscriminate migration of rural peasants, to urban areas, may cause and even aggravate the already widespread unemployment.

LEE'S THEORY:

The next theory to be briefly considered is that of Everett S. Lee. According to Lee the decision to migrate and the process of migration are influenced by four important sets of factors. They are:

(i) Factors associated with the area of origin.

(ii) Factors associated with the area of destination.

(iii) Intervening factors.

(iv) Personal factors.
In every area, there are usually two or three sets of factors that influence the decision to migrate. One set of factors attracts people to it, the other set of factors, on the other hand, tends to repel people from the area. There may also be another set of factors to which people are usually indifferent. Migration is influenced by these sets of factors in combination with two other sets, intervening obstacles and personal factors.

The first three factors (factors associated with the areas of origin and destination and intervening factors) are the factors that attract people to an area and are represented by `+` sign and the factors that repel are represented by `-` sign. "O" s represent factors to which people are indifferent. While migration may result from the comparative strengths of the plus and minus factors at the origin and at the destination, a simple calculus of the `+` s and `-` s does not decide the act of migration. The balance in favour of the move must be enough to overcome the intervening obstacles and the natural inertia.

The pivotal problem associated with migration in developing countries is the rapid growth of urban slums as a result of a large-scale movement of impoverished population from the villages and small towns to urban slums in search of survival. Most of such migrants find abode in the slums. Studies on migration available to the researcher are reviewed under different migration-influencing factors as outlined below.
RURAL - URBAN MIGRATION:

The literature on migration and urbanization especially in developing countries has focused attention largely on the analysis of rural to urban migration. Economists have suggested various models to explain the volume and direction of labour mobility (Lewis, 1954; Ranis and Fei, 1961; Todaro, 1968; 1969; 1971; 1975; 1976; Harris and Todaro, 1970; Greenwood, 1971; Johnson, 1971; Fields, 1972). They have generally assumed that developing countries have experienced mostly rural to urban and possibly some urban to urban migration.

Rural migrants usually move to the closest urban areas and they mainly originate from densely populated areas (Choudhury, 1976). Rural to urban migration in Bangladesh presumably is due to a combination of push factors in rural areas and pull factors in urban areas. The poorest people move due to the push factors while the rich persons have been attracted by higher social opportunities, better health and better living standard of urban areas (Choudhury, 1978). Similar results (of pull on the rich and push for the poor) have been found by Connell et al. (1976) in studies of Indian villages. Sovani (1965), in a survey of migrants from two districts in Bihar, India, found that households with the highest propensity to migrate were in the lowest and highest income groups. Briggs (1973) found that people tend to move from poorer to wealthier areas for economic gains, promoting a massive exodus from rural to urban areas. But in the third world countries it is not merely economic gains which promote the movement from rural to urban areas, rather it is inequality in land ownership, hunger and unemployment which play significant roles. Majumdar (1980) rightly studied migration in relation to the absorption of migrants in the informal sector. Oberai, Prasad and Sardana (1989) referred to rural-urban migration as a
AGE SELECTIVITY:

The migration differentials by age have several implications in terms of the socio-economic and demographic impact on the place of origin and destination. Simmons et al., (1977) summarized the characteristics of migrants in Asian countries. They observed that because of greater employment opportunities available for the 15-24 age group, migrants to urban areas are most likely to be young adults eligible for work. Such migrants are frequently underemployed in the rural homestead but believe that they are likely to find jobs in urban areas.

A universal finding of researchers is that migrants are mostly people falling in the age group of 15 to 30 years (Findley, 1977; P. Brigg, 1977; Simmons, et al., 1977). This makes sense in economic terms since the discounted value of future earnings would be higher for the younger people. Both Schultz and Sahota (1971) found that the significance of rural-urban wage differential in promoting migration declines as one moves up the age scale. Socially, younger people are likely to be less integrated with the village life, and being less encumbered with various family and other social responsibilities, are comparatively free to move (Bodford, 1973). Migration is often associated with a phase in one's social life, almost a passport to adulthood and respectability in some societies.

Studying migration in southern Maharashtra in 1965, Narain (1972) reported about 68 per cent male migrants to be in the 15-34 years of age-group at the time of migration. Based on a sample survey of 52 villages in Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh, in 1969, the average age of male migrants was found to be about 23 years (Yadava, 1971). In a later survey of migration differentials
conducted after a decade in 1978 in 19 villages of Varanasi, Singh (1985) found that the majority of the migrants were in 15 to 30 years age-group. Kamble (1982), studying the characteristics of migrants in the Indian metropolis Madras, based on census data of 1961-71, found the overwhelming majority of male migrants to be in the younger age-group. Studies on rural-urban migration in Rajasthan by Kothari (1980), migrants to Ludhiana and Punjab by Oberai and Singh (1980), migrants to Vellore city, Tamil Nadu by Selvaraj et al., (1986), all based on sample surveys, have also reported a more or less similar pattern of migration differentials by age.

Migration in India is selective of a very wide range of age groups from 15 to 49 years. Age selectivity in migration tends to differ markedly by sex. In general, female migrants are younger than male migrants, and female migrants in west Bengal are still younger than those in Kerala. Since marriage plays an inevitable role in migration of women, they tend to be more migratory than men (Singh, 1988).

Many studies have shown that migrants to cities concentrate on younger age groups (Zachariah, 1968, Narain & Gotpagar, 1982, Gupta 1987). The International institute for population sciences undertook a survey of the migrants in the slums of Thane city (1990) which revealed that the highest proportion of male and female migrants belonged to 20-24 and 15-19 years of age groups respectively when they out migrated. In the case of both males and females there was a clear-cut preponderance in the age-group 15-29. There was a continuous decline in the proportion of male migrants in the later age group.
Kamaljit Singh's (1991) study reveals that three-fourths (78.48 Per cent) of the in-migrants were below the age of 30 years at the time of in-migration and an insignificant proportion (1.27 per cent) between 50 and 59 years. A striking feature of the data is the presence of child labour which accounts for more than a fourth of the in-migrants.

**SEX SELECTIVITY:**

In many parts of Asia migration patterns tend to be particularly sex-selective, with men dominating the migratory flow. The reasons for this pattern are manifold. In rural - urban migration flows, women are generally left behind as openings for women are few in towns. Their relative educational backwardness and family responsibilities are additional factors working against them (Guler, 1969). The major exceptions to this are the Latin American countries where women actually dominate the flow of migrants. In these countries a big source of employment for women is as maids in the catering or hotel industries (Hart, 1971).

The less developed a country is, the more dominant males would be in migration streams, as migration reflects a response to employment opportunities (Simmon et al., 1977). This is explained by the assumption that females would be more restricted in their movements in traditional societies. Most south-east Asian data show a majority of male migrants. The distorted sex-ratio found by Eames (1969) in India that biased the population of urban centres in favour of males is a representative finding. There are exceptions, however, chief among these are the data for the Philippines which showed that females are more migratory than males, no matter
what the distance. For Thailand, Sternstein (1974) argued that there was a heavily male-dominated trend toward the urban employment opportunities.

In India and in other south Asian countries, males dominate in rural-urban migration (Gould, 1974; Nelson, 1976; Abeysekera, 1981; Singh and Yadava, 1981; Singh, 1984; Nagda, 1986). In most cases, when males migrate the women are left behind in the villages. Although this is true of the whole country, it is true more of North than of South India (Rowe, 1973; Singh, 1988). The propensity of female migration is higher in India particularly in rural to rural migration streams on account of marriage migration (Sharma, 1984; Nagada, 1986; Singh, 1986). Hamazah Sendut (1966), studying the urbanisation pattern in south-east Asia, found that about 90 per cent females in the rural-urban migration process come mainly to join their husbands. Males, on the other hand, are allowed by the members of their family to travel a longer distance for the purpose of obtaining jobs, business or higher education (Singh, 1984).

LITERACY AND EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT:

Education is not found to be a good predictor of migration differentials for short distance movement but it becomes an increasingly important factor in the long distance move (Pryor, 1969; Long, 1973) on an average, an individual migrant is usually educationally more advanced than the population in his place of origin. A great deal of migration is undertaken by students for purposes of education in the urban areas. According to a study by the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) (Connel et al., 1976), about one-third of the total migration in India is accounted for by this type of movement. Better educational opportunities exist in the urban areas. Moreover, the
propensity to migrate increases with the educational level because of the type of education offered and also because of differential rewards in the urban areas for jobs for which migrants become qualified. In fact, in some cases parents give education to their children with the explicit objective of preparing them for life outside the village (Connel et al., 1976).

All this should not give the impression that migrants are always drawn from the ranks of the educated or would-be-educated. A large number of poor and uneducated people leave the village in organised migration or in migration prompted by natural economic disasters. They also figure prominently in rural-rural, seasonal and temporary migration. Moreover, despite educational selectivity of migrants at the rural end, their degree of literacy tends to be lower than that of the urban dwellers as a whole (Caldwell, 1969).

A number of rural-urban migration studies in South Asia, in general, and India, in particular, have shown a positive relationship between the rate of rural-urban migration and the level of education attained by the migrants (Bogue and Zachariah, 1962; Eassag and Mabawonku, 1974; Yadava, 1977; Kothari, 1980; Oberai and Singh, 1980; Premi, 1980; Singh and Yadava, 1981; Singh, 1985; Benerjee, 1986). Selvaraj et al., (1986), pointed out that the propensity to migrate to an urban area in India as for elsewhere is much higher among the literate and educated than among the illiterate. A number of Indian studies dealing with internal migration have shown that migrants are less educated than non-migrants with respect to the place of destination but are of higher educational attainment than non-migrants when compared to the place of origin (Connel et al., 1976; Kothari, 1980; Singh, 1985).
Kothari (1980), studying four villages in Rajasthan, reported about 19 per cent illiterate, 51 per cent primary or middle and 24 percent secondary and above standard of migrants, the literacy levels of whom were relatively higher than the non-migrants. Several other studies (Sharma, 1984; Premi and Tom, 1985) have also reported educationally better migrants than non-migrants at the place of origin. An educated person takes least interest in the manual agricultural work in the village as he feels his standard would be lowered by doing such jobs (Yadava, 1988). According to Ranga Rao and Murthy (1974), the urban-ward migration of educated people causes "de-intellectualisation" of rural areas in India.

DISTANCE AND MIGRATION:

Distance is the most obvious obstacle. Many studies reveal the negative relationship between distance and migration (Stouffer, 1940). Physical distance is related to the time and cost of initial moves as well as visits to urban areas. Socio-cultural distance includes differences between origins and destinations with respect to language, degree of modernity, religion, values and attitudes. Lack of information concerning opportunities and characteristics of potential destinations are related to socio-cultural distance.

The volume and trend of migration from a village/locality have also been found to be influenced by its distance from the nearest urban centre. Caldwell's (1968) study on the determinants of rural-urban migration in Ghana, had reported that the propensity to migrate declines with increasing distance from the nearest large city. Essang and Mabawonku (1979) reported that nearer the rural area to urban centre the quicker the flow and lower the cost of
information on job prospects in the urban areas. Singh (1984), studying the pattern of rural-urban migration in three states, Bihar, West Bengal and Kerala, found an inverse relationship between distance and the volume of rural to urban migration in Kerala while dissimilar patterns were observed in the case of West Bengal and Bihar.

**LANDHOLDINGS** :

A number of field studies indicate that rural areas with high out-migration rates tend to have high population densities or high ratios of labour to arable land, (Findley, 1977; Connell et al., 1976; Lipton, 1978). The positive correlation between out-migration and lack of land is generally true for rural areas in Africa, Asia and Latin America. However, a few studies indicate a negative correlation (Findley, 1977), thus, making causal inferences from studies correlating out-migration and land availability problematical. Distribution of available land is also a factor determining migration. Evidence from India and Latin America suggests a positive correlation between high rates of rural out-migration and unequal distribution of land (Shaw, 1975; Connell et al., 1976).

A positive relationship exists between the proportion of no land households and the rate of out-migration. It is seen that persons having no land in the village do not take interest in agriculture and usually move out. On the other hand, those having little land do not hesitate to be agricultural labourers and some times they cultivate a bigger land size by leasing land from landlords (Connel et al., 1976; Banerjee, 1986; Yadava, 1987). In some other studies a higher
migration rate has been found from the households having a large amount of land for cul
(Hoshi, 1966; Sharma, 1984).

Banerjee (1986) studying the motives for migration among in-migrants to Delhi from Punjab, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh, found that in all three states the migration propensity from households owning less than half an acre (less than 1 bigha) was least in comparison to landless and others.

Several village and urban studies conducted in India show that small cultivators and landless labourers migrate to cities (Prabhu, 1956; Deshmukh, 1956; Rowe, 1973; Connell et al., 1975) but those with prior contacts and acquaintances (in the cities) have greater propensity to migrate (Epstein, 1973; Connell et al., 1976).

INCOME DIFFERENTIALS:

A number of studies indicate that rural-urban migration is positively correlated with the level of family income (Joshi, 1973; Connel et al, 1976; Boer, 1981; Oberai and Singh, 1982). The correlation appears to imply that as rural family's income increases, it experiences higher rates of rural-urban migration. This implication is in direct contradiction to the expected income theory of migration. The theory suggests that rural-urban migration is positively related to the size of the rural-urban income differences; therefore, as a rural family's income grows, it should experience lower rates of migration.
Much of the literature on rural out-migration appears to suggest that rural out-migrants are generally not so well off as compared to rural non-migrants because the predominant reasons for out-migration are 'rural poverty', 'luck of land' or 'rural unemployment' (Romero and Willian Flinn, 1976).

However, a number of empirical studies support Lee's theory by indicating that rural out-migration is bi-modal, i.e., out-migration rates are the highest for those at the medium-low and medium-high levels of the rural income distribution. (Sovani, 1968; Caldwell, 1969; Joshi, 1973; Todaro, 1975; Connel et al., 1976; Lipton, 1978). Further more, those from medium-low income groups tends to move, to nearby rural areas or perhaps small towns, while those from the medium-high groups are more apt to move greater distances into larger urban areas. This type of migration flows has been observed in countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

The main reason migrants give for moving is the availability of higher paying jobs at the urban places of destination. Studying internal migration in India, Greenwood (1971) found that the difference between discounted present values of income between areas of origin and destination were particularly significant in long-term migration, although distance was found to be an important intervening variable.

Out-migration has been found to be closely associated with the economic conditions prevalent at the place of origin particularly in developing nations. Caldwell (1968), reports strong association between economic well-being and migration. He argued that people in economically
advance localities may send their children for advanced study to the better schools, which are mainly in the urban areas. On the other hand, other studies confirmed greater mobility from economically worse of regions than from those which are economically advanced (Greenwood, 1971; Mukherjee, 1979). Nevertheless, it has been noted that areas with a high level of living tend to be areas of immigration and areas with a low level of living tend to be areas of out-migration (Singh, 1986). In the light of the evidence from the studies reviewed, migration is supposed to accelerate with increase in poverty or worsening of the economic condition of the village/locality.

The most intensive study of internal migration in West Bengal in a historical perspective was done by Chattopadhyaya (19871, who dealt with the causes of migration in a rigorous manner. A few more studies have dealt with the causes of migration in India based on census data. Vaidyanathan (1967) had observed that the net balance of migration tends to be positive for the states with relatively higher per capita incomes and negative for states with relatively low incomes. Giridhar (1978) had suggested that the people move away from places where jobs are scarce to places where labour is scarce. Dhar's (1980) econometric analysis of migration in India noted that the rate of migration depends on several factors besides variation in wages and employment opportunities between the places of origin and destination. Supporting the above view Kadi and Sivamurthy (1988) have added, "The states with large industrial and urban bases, those experiencing agricultural development, and those which are favoured by government policies experienced significant in-migration during the decade".
resultant of rural - urban income differentials, but they did not discuss the factors contributing to rural-urban income differentials.

Mc Gee (1971) in the study on the 'urbanization process in the third world countries found that migration takes place because they are dissatisfied with traditional environs in agriculture sector. Most of the poor migrants in cities all over the third world are predominantly employed in the informal sector of the urban economy which includes transport, construction, service, etc., (Safa and Du Toit, 1975; Joshi and Joshi, 1976; Radhakrishna et al., 1977, Sethuraman, 1978). Joshi and Joshi (1976) state that those who fail to secure employment in the organised sector are forced into the un-organised sector which has capacity to absorb them as casual labourers and low wage employees. The studies of Deshmukh (1956), Woodruff (1960), Lynch (1977), Desai and Pillai (1972) and Rao et al., (1977) on Indian slums show that poor migrants are employed both in the organised and unorganised sectors of the urban economy.

Dandekar and Rath (1971) point out that the consequence of the continuous migration of the rural poor into the urban areas in search of a livelihood and their failure to find adequate means to support themselves is the growth of road side slums and slum life in the cities and a general deterioration in the standard of urban living. Several experts have highlighted problems of slums as a consequence of uncontrolled rural to urban migration in India (Desai and Pillai, 1970; Lynch, 1974; Wiebe, 1975; Ranga Rao et al, 1977; A singh and D'souza, 1980; Arup Mitra, 1988).
OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY:

Multi-caste analysis of occupational mobility (Jain, 1966; Dube, 1967; Kassebaum and Vidya Sagar, 1974; Corwin, 1975; and Sivakumar, 1977) in urban areas shows a considerable amount of mobility from all sections both in educational as well as in occupational fields. The multi-caste category constitutes four broad groups i.e., the upper castes, the upper middle castes, the lower middle castes and the lower castes.

The Thammasat University's social work survey (1971) had an even stronger evidence for employment opportunities. About 80 per cent of those interviewed in the slum area of Klong Toey came to Bangkok to find a job and another 3 per cent were there for job reassignment. Kinship was the next highest migration inducing factor accounting for 9 per cent. Only 1 per cent of the interviewees gave education as the primary reason for moving.

Rural-urban migration in India as elsewhere is very much occupational selective as well. Studying on urban out-migration in India, Premi (1980) observed that migrants from selected small towns to class-I cities comprised 47 per cent of total out-migrants as transfer cases. Pryor (1969) remarked that out-migrants in the developed countries tend to be from the professional or white collar components of the work force, whereas the migrants in developing countries tend to be from the agricultural and rural occupations. Oberai (1975), in Greater Khartoum (Sudan), had reported the occupation of rural migrants before moving to be around 73 per cent in agriculture.
Prachuabmoh and Tirasawat's (1972) found that only 18 per cent of the farmers, but 54 per cent of the government officials were multiple move migrants in Thailand. They came to the conclusion that those in the lower occupational levels were, on the whole, less mobile than those in higher levels. Laquain (1972) in a survey of six Philippine cities, found that the slum and squatter dwellers, although some have no regular source of income, appeared to be more progressive than their relatives who stayed behind.

There have been more detailed studies that narrow down the occupational differentials to specific professions. Stockel and his colleagues (1972) revealed that most migratory professionals in Bangladesh are business people, mill and office workers, the self-employed, and servants. Wenlang (1972) for Taiwan and Visaria (1972) for India agreed with the most commonsensical conclusion that those engaged in the transport industry were the most likely to move. In general, high status personnel are more migratory than low status workers (Gist, 1955). Similarly Hamsaleelavathy's (1970) study has indicated that the skilled and technical workers, including high ranking educated professionals, are more migratory than non-skilled workers and non-technical personnel.

**SKILL LEVELS:**

Studies on migration in Asian region, generally seem to indicate that those who migrate are not the "dregs of society" or the vast pool of illiterate labour. Greenwood's regression study of India (1971) found that the co-efficient for educational level in the region was positive, highly
significant and suggest that in India the propensity to migrate does indeed increase with increased education.

The consequence of large scale migration of unskilled and semi-skilled workers to the cities, especially in metropolitan cities is the development of slums (Rao, 1974). This category of migrants, having little resources to pay for the urban facilities such as housing, sewage, drainage, water and electricity tend to squat on public land and pavements which results in the formation of slums. Sociologists and Anthropologists have shown considerable interest in the problems of slums which mainly consists of migrants (Desai and Pillai, 1970; Wiebe, 1975; Ranga Rao et al., 1977; Ranga Rao and Rao; 1984).

**MARITAL STATUS:**

Migrants are heavily concentrated at marriageable ages and married couples usually move together. Evidence for Bihar showed that among movers there was a higher proportion of currently married than single, widowed, divorced and separated combined (Singh, 1984). Of the total migrants, the married constituted 59 per cent for males and 52 per cent for females. Singh (1985) remarked that married persons having higher responsibilities usually try to move to shorter distances or does not go longer distances with a view to visiting his family easily and frequently. Some studies have also reported that a greater number of the highly educated married migrants are accompanied by their spouses in comparison to less educated (Yadava, 1977; Singh and Yadava, 1981; Sharma, 1984).
Naim (1974) in his study of voluntary migration in Indonesia has reported that about 86 per cent of the male migrants were married at the time of their first move. Non-landowning migrants are more likely than land-owning migrants to bring their wives to cities (Banerjee and Kanbur, 1981). In contrast, Kothari (1980) remarked that the married are relatively immobile compared to single persons because they develop a strong sense of familial bonds and an increasing sense of obligation to the family of origin after their marriage.

In the more developed societies, family structure variables can work in similar ways to create ties that inhibit migration. Long (1972: 371) for example, examines in detail the impact of number and ages of children on residential mobility in the United States. Using data from the Current Population Survey of the Bureau of the census covering 50,000 households in the United States, he found that 'married couples without children are more geographically mobile than those with children. Among those with children the age of the children exercises a mobility differential. "Those couples with children less than six years old were the most mobile".

DECISION - MAKING:

The specific nature of the links between the individual the family, the society, and the environment determines the direction of their impact on the migration decision. Ritchey (1976) has suggested that the family influences migration by creating emotional ties, by providing information, and by providing aid in relocation. Although these are indicative of the way in which family structure and kin ties can influence the migration decision, they are not inclusive. A more
A general approach to the problem is to consider the functions served by various aspects of family structure and then to analyze how these functions affect the motivation to migrate.

Connell and his Co-authors (1976) pointed out that birth order and number of sons in the family may be very important in determining who migrates, depending on inheritance rules. Kasdan (1964), in examining the social and economic structure of a Basque village, remarked that male primogeniture (that is, inheritance by the eldest male) increases the probability that higher parity sons will migrate. Migration is only one of a number of possible responses (or decision outcomes) to a particular structural situation. In the Basque village, alternatives to migration for later-born sons are non-farm careers in the village.

Wyon and Gordon (1971), describing the villages they studied in the Punjab, noted that older sons were kept out of school in apprenticeship for taking over the family holdings while younger sons were encouraged to stay in school as preparation for migration. This study provides an excellent example of differential incentive to migrate by birth order, reinforced by differential up-bringing and training. More specifically, the incentive to migrate for a younger son resulting from lack of access to family land, combined with the increased availability of the migration option and the expectation of returns, greatly increases the probability that the decision will be made to migrate.

Mincer (1978), Polachek and Horvath (1977) discussed family considerations in migration decisions in the context of a nuclear family in which both husband and wife work. Rural-urban
migration in India in a large number of cases does not involve the movement of all members of the family. Sociologists (Gore, 1968; Shaw, 1973; Chekki, 1974; Mukherjee, 1974; Ishwaran, 1974) have argued that the urban households established by such migrants are not autonomous entities but links of the rural households containing the family members the migrants have left behind. The presence of friends and relatives in the place of destination and previous migration experiences influence the decision to migrate. It has been found that significant number of migrants (40 to 50 per cent) lodge and board with their relatives and friends after arriving in town (Begum, 1979; Cus, 1980).

INDIVIDUAL VERSUS FAMILY MIGRATION:

Familial migration is a predominant feature of migration in Kerala. Married women show a higher propensity to migrate in Kerala than in Bihar and West Bengal. To put it directly, male migrants in Kerala are more likely to be accompanied by their wives than those in Bihar and West Bengal. This upholds Rowe's (1973) observation that South Indian migration to the city is a family migration, in contrast to the North Indian pattern of unaccompanied male migration. Singh (1978) had contended that where the wife is a direct income producer at home, she expects and is expected to continue helping her husband in the town and thus the fact that it would be cheaper for her and the children to continue to live in the village is irrelevant. People belonging to a nuclear family are likely to move with their family because there would be nobody to care for the families in the village. Kothari (1980) stated that most married migrants moving independently of their wives were from joint families because women were cared for by non-migrating members of the family who were left in the village home.
McEvoy (1971) indicated that the presence of patrilineally based kinship groups linked by siblings provides a group from which help can be requested when the spouse is absent in sabo society. Eames (1967) had observed that the joint family is a structure especially suited to labour migration of males in North Indian villages. Men typically go by themselves to the urban area, leaving their wives and children in the village.

**FAMILY SIZE:**

Moving itself may lower fertility by delaying marriages, separation of spouses, reducing the desire for an immediate pregnancy, and creating stresses that perhaps disrupt the functioning of the reproductive system (Goldstein, 1978; Goldstein and Goldstein, 1983; Magnani et al., 1979; Visaria, 1969). As the migration is an age-sex selective phenomenon, it affects the fertility and mortality rates of both the sending and receiving areas (Premi, 1989). Oberai and Singh (1981) and Rastogi (1988) found that those migrating to urban areas tend to experience a lower level of fertility. Studies by Zachariah (1968) and Rele (1972) had shown that metropolitan cities in India have exhibited lower fertility than the countryside because they have a substantial proportion of migrants. Analysing the 1961 census data for Bombay, Zachariah (1969) found a considerable higher average age at marriage and percentage never married among migrant women coming to Bombay compared to those in the place of origin. He estimated about a 12 per cent reduction in the overall fertility of migrants due to delayed marriages, and a 12 per cent further reduction due to husband-wife separation.
Another view is also expressed to explain the lower fertility of migrants. Bulsara (1964), had shown that migrants to an urban area constitute a literate and more enterprising class of population. It may be due to the better level of literacy and socio-economic conditions their fertility is lower than that of the non-migrants. Oberai and Singh (1983) analysing data from the survey of Ludhiana, found that natives in Ludhiana city in Punjab had the lowest fertility while long standing in-migrants had the highest. Recent migrants, however, had lower fertility even after standardization for age and marriage duration. Here it may be noted that studies dealing with the impact of migration on various demographic processes are very much wanting. This can be an important subject of research within migration studies.

CONFLICTS:

In the multi-cultural and arbitrarily bounded nations of Asia, social conflict has always had something to do with the movement of people. Dessaint (1971) discussing the plight of northern Thailand, remarked that social conflict was only the immediate cause of migration. Observing villages there, he found that although the pressure on the land was an ever present factor, it took some social conflict to trigger the movement. Faction can also lead to migration directly. Singh (1958) opined that it would be valued to supplement the accounts of inter and intra-family faction in village India with an enquiry into whether the more faction-ridden villages, Kin-groups and families are more prone to produce migrants.

Hilal (1969) noted how in Libyan villages the household structure is characterised by conflict. Adult males, living in their fathers households are dependent upon them. This
dependence causes friction and is one of the most important reasons for rural-urban migration in these villages.

**KINSHIP AND ETHNICITY:**

Relatives are one of the most important links for the potential migrants. They provide information and material support prior to the move and also play an important supporting role after arrival in the city. Simkins and Wernstedt (1971) noted that many of the Visayan villagers of the central Philippines who moved to the fertile and uncrowded homesteads of Mindanao, did so at the urging of close relatives. Eames (1967) concluded in his study of urban ward migration from a North Indian village that "the joint family system operation in the village enhances rather than hinders the movement of the married male".

Eassang and Mabawonku (1974) in Western Nigeria found that the availability of relatives and friends located in urban centres is positively associated with the rate of rural urban migration.

The issue of ethnicity in urban areas is an important consequence of migration. Studies have shown that migrants belonging to a particular region, language, religion, caste and tribe live together in separate neighbourhoods in cities, forming groups on the basis of shared elements of their culture, ideology and societal conditions. The earlier migrants help the new ones in getting jobs, accommodation and necessary social and economic supports. They run their own housing co-operatives, schools, dispensaries and some times marriage and employment bureaus too (Gore,

Several studies in India too have shown that the current rural-urban migration is highly influenced by the past migration (Singh and Yadava, 1981; Kadi, 1984; Singh, 1985). Migrants in this way becomes an important source of information for potential migrants at their places of origin. Thus, those who initially remain behind are persuaded and motivated by prior migrants to move to urban areas which are generally taken to be superior to rural lifestyle (Yadava, 1987).

Although a number of studies have been made on migration, our knowledge of internal migration particularly migration to slums in the Indian context continues to be inadequate and perfunctory to a great extent. There is a need for intensive research on certain key issues relating to causes and consequences of slum migration. The findings reviewed here have served the basis for formulating the relevant hypotheses and developing the interview schedule for field work in the present study.