

Chapter 3

Literature and Citation

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

Lewis (1954) shows that migration is an equilibrating factor, which causes transfer of labour from the labour surplus sector to labour deficit sector and brings about equality between the two sectors. His

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

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

Schultz (1961) finds that the internal migration to take advantage of better job opportunities has the same nature as an investment in education and health. Accordingly cost of migration must be compared with the returns from migration. He suggests a method of computation of present value of earning differentials between locations and comparing these with estimated value of cost of migration.

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

to education in rural area and small towns would have the opposite effect.

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

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

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

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

Dasgupta and Laishley (1975) have tried to identify the social, economic and demographic factors in village life associated with

migratory movements and who really are the migrants. Their work reveals that factors related to both village base and urban relations induce migration. The factors that they identify at the village base are land shortage and low fertility and skewed distribution of land, and the resulting high proportion of landless agricultural workers. The two major urban related factors that they identify are commercialization of agriculture and access to towns.

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

A major study on migration has been that of Connell *et al.* (1976), which tries to understand migration as an imbalance in access to resources that exists between regions, families and villages. It examines the conditions that influence the decision to migrate, the destination, occupations pursued, income from migration and other socio-economic characteristics of the migrants. The study shows that it is inadequate access to income generating land in the village and the hope of improving living conditions in the village that encourage households or individuals to migrate. The migration that they document is seasonal, circular and permanent in nature. The study also documents in detail the benefits of remittances, the expenditure pattern of the migrants and their preferences over the use of the remittances. According to the study, the expenditure pattern of remittances reflects the poverty and resultant lack of investment opportunities that migrants are faced with. They observe that remittances are utilized mainly for meeting everyday household needs, and when basic requirements are met, remittances often flow into conspicuous consumption. It was observed among several

agricultural labour migrants from Eastern Uttar Pradesh to Punjab in 1973 that income from remittances is mainly used to defray consumer debt in their home villages so as to avoid the need to sell land. In many villages the level of investment in agriculture was found to be very low. The pattern of investment shows that some households invested their remittances in education, thus stimulating further migration. Another major use of remittances is for payment of bride price, which exists in some villages. The study also revealed that remittances are not an economic phenomenon alone but also involve a social angle in that they become an instrument for migrant households to seek a continued stake in the village economy and social hierarchy.

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

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

Alternatively, inter-temporal family contract models of migration also have been constructed (Stark 1980; Stark and Bloom 1985; Stark and Lucas 1988). These emphasise risk spreading (Stark and Levari 1982) by families in the presence of imperfections in rural capital markets (Stark 1982) as a strategy to overcome constraints on production and investment activities as a result of missing or incomplete credit and insurance markets in rural areas. The basic premise of these alternative models, which are based on household utility maximization, is that the decision to migrate is not taken by an individual; the family members also have a role to play.

In India seems to have focused on determining the relative importance of push and pull factors in inducing migration. Income differentials are seen as the major pull factors, while seasonality risk, market failures, erosion of assets and landlessness are seen as push factors. Most of these studies have also tried to address the demographic aspects of migration (Gupta 1984, Kundu 1986, and Oberai and Singh 1980). Their analysis is based on NSS and Census data at regional as well as national levels, depicting the extent and magnitude of rural-urban migration. However, a major limitation of studies based on secondary data is that they do not throw any light on changes in economic conditions, including consumption and lifestyle, which migrants undergo in urban areas in adapting to their new environment. Besides, such studies also fail to capture the problems that migrants face in leaving the security provided by the family, the community, well-established work patterns, economic and social relationships, to live and work in a harsh and hostile environment and among people most of whom are strangers.

Stark and Levari (1982), and Taylor (1986) also argue that migration plays a risk-reducing and insurance-enhancing role in production and investment decisions. Stark and Lucas (1988) suggest that labour migration by one or more family members can be an

effective mechanism to self-finance local production activities and acts as self-insurance against local income risks.

In case of female migrants, the level of education is polarized; there are migrants, literate and employed in modern occupations and also illiterate migrants who are mostly found in occupations with generally low status (Singh, 1984).

Breman (1985) concludes that seasonal migration is a matter of survival or, at best, of consolidation, and hardly ever results in accumulation or reinvestment in the home area. Breman (1985), based on his study of seasonal migrants in South Gujarat, observes that for the tribal population, seasonal migration is more of a 'holding operation,' which enables them by and large to maintain their relative position in the village and to avoid alienation of land as far as possible. The continued migration for the past few decades has hardly improved the quality of tribal life, particularly for the large and growing underprivileged. Yet the cash income derived from labour outside the home area is not in itself enough protection from social and economic deterioration.

Banerjee (1986) observes that reasons for migration articulated by the migrants in do not support the common belief that push factors are mainly responsible for rural-urban migration. He states that two notable motives were to obtain cash or to repay debt, dislike the agriculture work or desire for different jobs. There are some evidences that the cash motive was largely for expenditure on life cycle ceremony. As prevailing social values and attitudes are responsible to a greater extent for rural resident being extravagant in ceremonial expenditure, migration with this motive can be reduced through a programme of social education. He further argues that dislike of agriculture work was reported mainly by migrant who had studied beyond the mid-school level. He concludes that unless

curriculum is change expansion of education is likely to increase migration.

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

It has been widely observed that the propensity to migrate increases with education (Connell *et.al* 1976, Banerjee, 1986). Banerjee (1986) observed on his study that the inter state migrants in Delhi finds the share of matriculated and graduates among migrants in the sample were many times higher than that among the population from which they originated (in this case, Punjab, Rajasthan and UP). If we compare the educational level of migrants and non-migrants at the place of destination, broad-based information is rather limited.

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

Williamson (1988) mentions that wage differentials alone matter, but also important is the incorporation of the rate of return to migration and the elasticity estimation of the response of migrants to wage differentials in migration models.

Population in the urban areas expands due to the following three factors: natural growth of population, rural to urban migration and reclassification of rural areas as urban in course of time. Around two-fifth of the total urban growth in the Third World is accounted by the rural-to-urban migration (Gugler, 1988). The process can be identified as 'over-urbanization' as long as (1) rural-urban migration leads to a misallocation of labour between rural and urban sectors in the sense that it raises urban unemployment, underemployment and poverty, and (2) rural-urban migration increases the social cost for providing for a country's growing population (Gugler, 1988).

Arup Mitra and Mayumi Murayama attempts have been made to explain rapid city growth in developing countries primarily by two major hypotheses (Williamson, 1988): (1) unusually rapid rates of population growth pressing on limited farm acreage and pushing landless labour into cities, and (2) migrants being pulled into the cities by the economic forces such as domestic terms of trade squeezing agriculture, the diffusion of technology from the Developed world favoring modern large scale urban industries, foreign capital flows into urban infrastructure, housing, power, transportation, and large scale manufacturing. As per the first view, the main cause of rapid urban growth is traced to the increasing pressure of population on farmland in densely populated agrarian economies. Deficiency of reproducible tangible capital relative to labour in the face of a high-population density exacerbates the problem of rural unemployment and underemployment, which in turn fosters the rural-urban population movement. In the face of limited demand for labour in the formal sector, in particular the organized industrial sector, excess supplies in the urban labour market force them to be engaged in the informal service sector. The low rate of growth of industrial employment and the high rate of rural-to-urban migration make for excessive, even explosive

urbanization involving a transition from rural unemployment to excessive urban unemployment and underemployment. In explaining migration across space, income differentials are taken as motivating factor in moving people from low-income areas to relatively high-income areas (Harris and Todaro, 1970). In the rural areas, sluggish agricultural growth and limited development of the rural non-farm sector raises the incidence of rural poverty, unemployment and underemployment. Given the fact that most of the high productivity activities are located in the urban areas, the rural-urban income differentials, particularly for the poor and unemployed, are enormous. Thus, many of them migrate to the urban areas in search of jobs. Even when jobs in the high productivity activities are limited in number relative to the supply, and often they are not accessible, population still flows to the urban areas in search of opportunities in the 'informal sector.' Caste-kinship bonds and other kinds of village networks help rural job seekers to arrange such urban-based jobs. In the face of a high natural growth of population, rural-urban migration aggravates the situation of excess supplies of labour in the urban areas. Within the urban informal sector this tends to reduce the level of earnings and get manifested in a high incidence of urban poverty. Thus in the process rural poverty gets transformed into urban poverty – the phenomenon is also described as 'urbanization of poverty'.

Since the development of Harris-Todaro model, many other researchers have extended the model by incorporating new factors that will increase the choices of individuals to migrate.

Rosenzweig and Stark (1989) find evidence supporting the proposition that inter-villages marriages that explain a large proportion of rural to rural migratory movements within India enable households to reduce variation in food consumption in the face of spatially covariant risk. More vulnerable households, as measured by

those with greater profit variance and smaller asset holdings are significantly more likely to send migrants.

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

A study which canvassed information regarding socio-economic characteristics of in-migrants and non-migrants in three states of Bihar, Kerala and Uttar Pradesh shows that in case of Bihar and Kerala, the educational level of in-migrants is higher than that of non-migrants whereas in UP the pattern was reversed (Oberai, Prasad and Sardana, 1989).

Mehta (1991) finds in his study that the migration of people from rural area to urban area is mainly determined by the factors like socio economic conditions of households, transport and communication infrastructure, education level of the population and several other geographical and physical conditions. His study further examines that although the pattern of migration across different income groups is almost similar, however the percentage of migration is high among low income groups. The study emphasize that the poor economic conditions of rural households, high dependence of population on agricultural activities and lack of employment activities in rural non-farm sector force the rural workforce to migrate to the urban areas.

Singh (1991) observes that due to high concentration of agricultural land in few hands and mechanization of farming, the

small farmers find it difficult to support their families throughout the year and hence they migrate to the urban areas for the part of year or for the entire year to earn extra income. He further observes that in most of the countries, the rural areas have been starved of investment and there are urban bias in public investment that compel the rural youths to move to the cities where they have better access to education and employment opportunities.

Adams (1993) finds evidence for an inverted-U relationship between initial household income and migration probability. However, the result is based on estimates of predicted household income prior to migration obtained by calculating fitted values for migrant households using coefficient estimates from an income regression of the non-migrant sample. In any case, the possible effect of income on migration is outweighed by the negative impact of land farmed, indicating asset poverty to be a more important migration determinant.

Hoddinott (1994) models migration as an outcome of a joint utility maximisation by the prospective migrant and the other family members. These models of behavioural decision-making thus emphasise that circulation of labour is a form of risk reduction by spreading the risk spatially and occupationally while maximizing consumption.

The two foundational studies for the transnational paradigm were Towards a Transnational Perspective on Migration (Glick Schiller et al. 1992) and Nations Unbound (Basch *et.al* 1994); other influential voices include Portes (1999; also Portes *et.al* 1999) and Vertovec (1999, 2004). Portes (1999) offers a much-quoted definition: transnationalism involves migrant activities 'that take place on a recurrent basis across national borders and that require a regular and significant commitment of time by participants... These activities are not limited to economic enterprises [such as sending and receiving

remittances, or setting up a business 'back home'], but include political, cultural and religious activities as well'. There is a danger of exaggerating the importance of the transnational approach to migration and assuming that all international migrants lead 'transnational lives' or occupy 'transnational social spaces' (Faist 2000). Portes (2003) himself points out that this applies only to a minority of migrants, and to give the opposite impression has resulted from 'sampling on the dependent variable', that is, carrying out research only on those migrants who are 'transnational'. If the transnational approach has a value in reformulating migration theory, it is that it questions the linear, push-pull, no-return model; it builds on theories of migration networks; and it also places a big question-mark over the extensive body of literature devoted to the integration/assimilation of migrants in host countries.

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

Dhindsa and Sharma (1996) arrive at the conclusion that most of the migrant workers have two to three acres of un-irrigated land in their villages which is not sufficient to provide them gainful employment throughout the year and therefore they migrate to the other places for earning their livelihood.

Kaur (1996) has analysed spatial pattern of male rural-to-urban migration based on district-wise data of 1971 census. She has classified the districts into three categories, i.e., areas with relatively

high proportion of rural-urban male migrants among total urban male population (24 percent and above), areas with moderate proportion (16 to 24 percent) and areas with relatively low proportion (below 16 percent). The distribution of 356 districts according to the above classification was 24.4 percent, 36.0 percent and 35.7 percent respectively. The regions having districts with high rural-to-urban male migration rates were described as those witnessed rapid development of mining, industrial activities, service sectors, considerable colonisation, and rapid expansion of administrative and security machinery due to new political and strategic importance accorded to the areas. On the other hand, the group of areas with low proportion of rural-to-urban male migrants was mainly confined to the northern half of the country. There urbanisation in the post-independent era was low due to stagnant agricultural economy and tardy industrial development. As for the differences in distance of migration, Kaur (1996) finds that the areas with relatively high proportion of intra-state rural-urban male migrants were mainly found in areas which experienced low to moderate rate of urbanization in recent decades. In contrast, the regions with high inter-state rural-urban male migration experienced high rate of urbanization in recent decades. They included industrial-mining areas, Assam region, Punjab-Haryana tract and areas with considerable agricultural colonization Kaur's (1996) study gives an overview of spatial distribution of rural-urban migration and its relationship with some urban characteristics. However, she has dealt only male migrants and her attention was directed only on economic factors. Moreover, she did not apply any statistical analysis relating to the districts' socio-economic characteristics, thus her conclusions are more or less descriptive in nature.

Yadava *et.al* (1996) finds that the migration affects a number of socioeconomic, cultural, demographic and political factors both at the place of origin and destination. According to them, population

mobility is expected to play an important role in bringing out a change in the economic conditions of rural people. The migration provides a network of expansion of ideas, cultural diffusion and social integration apart from environmental and economic changes.

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

Lucas (1997) observes that migration decisions are made by rational self-interested individuals looking for higher paid work in urban areas and migration occurs if the economic benefits in terms of expected wages at urban destination – accounting for risk of initial spell of unemployment – exceed economic costs of moving and of foregone wages at rural origin. Rationality implies that individuals with better education, skills and labour market experience have a comparative advantage in job search at destination labour markets, and therefore are more likely to migrate.

Singh and Aggarwal (1998) examine the major 'push' and 'pull' factors in rural-urban migration. Their study is based on the data collected from 1991 Census for 25 districts of North-Western Uttar Pradesh. The Ordinary Least Square Regression Model is applied to examine the impact of different variables on rural-urban migration. Six factors namely, percentage of rural workforce engaged in non-household manufacturing activities), Percentage of urban workforce engaged in non-household manufacturing and construction activities, Percentage of urban workforce engaged in tertiary sector),

Average size of operational holdings), Rural literacy rate, Net Irrigated Area as percentage of Net Sown Area are identified to explain variations rural-urban migration .The study finds inadequate irrigation facilities, lack of employment opportunities in rural non-household manufacturing activities and decline in the average size of operational holdings as the major 'push' factors; and increase in rural literacy and expansion of non-household manufacturing and construction activities in urban areas as the leading 'pull' factor in rural-urban migration.

Srivastava (1998) points out that there is a contrasting impact of migration on sending and the receiving areas. He concludes that in the sending area, migration is contributing to a breakdown of the isolated nature of rural labour market and facilitating the development of more generalized market for labour. He observes that there is upward pressure on wages and increased mobility has undoubtedly contributed to the enhancement in the real wages in the backwards regions in India. Whereas in the receiving areas migrant labour operated in a setting in which there is segmentation and fragmentation in the labour market that enables the employers to lower wage cost and exercise greater control over the labour process.

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

Bhattacharya (2000) finds that states with a relatively high proportion of Scheduled Tribes (ST) in the population have higher rural to rural migration rates, whereas Scheduled Caste (SC)

populations have the opposite effect on migration. He argues that Scheduled Tribes 'are outside the Hindu caste system and therefore are not "ordained" to specialize in certain specific occupations. Further, unlike Scheduled Castes who are dispersed geographically, STs are concentrated in certain areas within states and in which they usually have a sizeable presence and they may therefore feel freer to move within these areas than SCs do generally.

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

Mosse *et.al* (2002) reveals in his study that urban informal sector work is highly 'ethnically' differentiated with tribes people limited to low pay, unskilled, less secure work at destination. However, within the tribal group, the poor and better off have different experiences of migration. Whereas migration among the better off is used to manage risk and build assets, migration is more common among poorer people and often leads to labour 'bondage' or sale of assets. The poorer are more likely to undertake long - term migration of entire households to service debt accumulated at high interest rates for subsistence purposes. Because of this, migration often serves to increase intra-community inequality among Scheduled Tribe communities.

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

Gaffari and Singh (2004) find that the contributing factors for rural urban migration may either be "push" or "pull", with the former guided by force of internal circumstances and the latter by lure of external attractions or incentives. Their study identifies the major push and pulls factors responsible for rural out-migration, based on the data collected from 1991 Census for 50 districts of Uttar Pradesh. The OLS regression model has been applied to examine the impact of various determinants on rural-urban migration. It has been found that development of educational facilities as well as irrigation facilities in rural areas and acceleration of industrialization process in these areas are significant variables in abating the flow of rural exodus.

The level of education is again significantly related to regional and ethnic characteristics of migrants. Among the migrant domestic workers studied, the majority of live-out domestics who are mostly married are found to be illiterate whereas live-in workers, largely single are comparatively better educated (Neeta 2004).

Sharma (2005) suggests that because of increasing poverty, poor returns from land and rising rent demands, most migration from

rural to urban areas in Bihar mainly as unskilled or semiskilled takes place.

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

Gbemiga (2005) examines socio-economic factors influencing movement of people from urban centres to rural areas in Nigeria with particular focus on Oyo State of Nigeria. Purposive sampling technique was used to sample 160 migrants in rural areas for the study. Data were collected from the respondents using interview schedule. The principal results of the study reveal that most of the respondents left the urban centres for the rural areas because of their inability to secure jobs in the towns, transfer to rural areas in their places of work, retirement and high cost of living in the urban centres. The results show that there is a positive and significant relationship between lengths of stay of migrants in the rural areas and their ages. There are significant differences in the lengths of stay on migration by the single. The study recommends that government should encourage the drift of people to rural areas by making available such amenities that would encourage the stay of the migrants.

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

Farooq *et.al* (2005) examine that the poor economic opportunities, rural inequality and demographic behaviour are the

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

The paper by Lall, Selod and Shalizi (2006) synthesizes the current state of knowledge concerning internal migration in developing countries. They provide a policy-oriented survey of the research carried out on internal migration in developing countries over the past five decades. Some of the questions around which they summarize the findings relate to how internal migrants behave at different stages of the migration process, how do migrants prepare for migration, how do they migrate, what are the difficulties they face on arriving in urban areas and what links do they maintain with rural areas, Historically it has played a significant role in the urbanization process of several countries and continues to be significant in scale, even though migration rates have slowed down in some countries (Lall, Selod and Shalizi, 2006).

Mendola (2006) observes that labour migration is a pervasive feature of economic development. People mobility for temporary or permanent labour purposes is a routine part of agricultural activity. There are very significant migration flows in some developing areas, with considerable impacts on individuals, households and regions at origin. Despite the growing debate about motivations and impacts of

recent migration flows, costs and returns of this global phenomenon are still unclear and remain far outside the public policy realm. The paper examines the empirical research that, despite the paucity of data, offers a basis to garner some insights into the migration-development nexus.

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

Liu (2008) examines the determinants of rural urban migration paying special attention to the role of human capital externalities in the rural sector. Using data from a well-known household survey in China, he finds that in rural areas human capital externalities have a discouraging effect on rural urban migration. If all other factors are held constant, a rural resident from a county rich in human capital is less likely to migrate to the city than his counterpart from another county poor in human capital endowment. The study also finds some evidence that human capital exerts positive external effects on the likelihood for a rural resident to choose off-farm employment and on labor income in the rural sector. One important policy implication is that expanding education opportunities in rural areas can help curtail rural urban migration and therefore alleviate urban unemployment pressure.

Mitra and Murayama (2008) examine the district level rural to urban migration rates in India among males and females separately. Both the rates are closely associated irrespective of whether the migrants originate from the rural areas within the state or outside the state. This would suggest that women usually migrate as accompanists of the males. The social networks, which play an

important role in the context of migration, are prevalent among the short distance migrants and tend to lose their significance with a rise in the distance between the place of origin and destination though there are some exceptions to this phenomenon. As regards the effect of factors at the place of destination, prospects or better job opportunities are a major determinant of male migration.

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

Nicholas Van Hear (2010) has written that the appetite for searching for an overreaching theory of migration has waned along with the increasing diversity of migration flows in the new global political economy of the New World Order. He speaks of 'mixed migration': the mixed nature of migration flows, and the mixed motivations in many individuals' embodiment of migration, such as the migrating student/worker, the tourist/migrant, the wandering migrant/ trader, and so on (2010). Two very broad trends can be noted in the recent writings about migration by some of the most influential scholars in the field such as Stephen Castles (2010), Thomas Faist (2010) and Alejandro Portes (2010). The first is an attempt to reinscribe migration within the wider phenomena of social change and social transformation, so that migration is not studied and theorised in isolation. Indeed, not only is migration affected by broad dynamics of national and global social change, but it is part and parcel of that change.