Chapter -II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The history of migration is probably as extensive as human history itself. Internal and international migrations have been associated with military conquests, agricultural development, expansion of trade and the like. It is only in recent times that migration and its impact has attracted economists, sociologists, political scientists, psychologists and geographers. The development of migration literature, especially the economic aspects, is only five decades old. In recent times in both developing as well as in developed countries, a lot of emphasis had been placed on the study of migration because it is inter-related with socio-economic and cultural life of the people. Different aspects of migration are studied from different dimensions. The economists approach migration in terms of rational expectations of differential economic opportunities between two places. A study on economic aspects of migration was initiated in the development models of Lewis (1954) and Ranis and Fei (1961).
Due to the growing socio-economic importance as explained already in this Chapter, migration drew attention of the social scientists. One needs to begin the analysis of the migration problem by looking at the theoretical and empirical studies about migration. To understand this problem better and also to know the historical aspect of internal outmigration, the prevailing theoretical and empirical literature on out migration is being reviewed.

The migration literature on outmigration is classified into two broad categories, namely the theoretical and the empirical. The empirical studies look also into places of origin and destination.

This section is organized as follows: (i) review of theoretical works on migration, (ii) literature on outmigration relating to places of destination and (iii) review of literature rural-based.

In 1985, Ravenstein developed a law of migration, on the basis of it Lee developed the theory of internal migration in 1966. The theory mainly argued about pull and push factors in migration. He concluded that migration took

---

place on the basis of positive and negative factors in the place of origin and in the place of destination. Intervening obstacles made people move from place of origin to the place of destination, in which personal factors also counted. The main limitation of this theory is its high degree of generality.

In 1962, Sjaastad\textsuperscript{12} developed a human capital model of migration. He suggested that the migration added to human capital formation. He assumed that people would migrate when benefit from migration outweighed the migration costs. Benefits of migration were measured in terms of potential income gains due to migration and benefits arising from location preferences. Cost of the migration included, transport cost to move from one place to another, opportunity cost of foregone earning between jobs, psychological cost in the form of separation involved in leaving one's native place and settling down in an unfamiliar environment.

Lewis-Fei-Ranis' model of development devised in 1961, by John Fei and Gustav Ranis\textsuperscript{13} was the extended form


of the process of rural-urban labour transfer developed by
Arthur Lewis in 1954. They developed the model on the basis
of two sectors-traditional rural subsistence sector and a high
productivity modern urban industrial sector. They assumed
that urban industrial sector earnings should be minimum 30
per cent higher than average rural earnings. They argued that
capitalists in urban industrial sector would reinvest all the
profits leading to an increase in the capital stock in the
modern sector. This would increase the labour demand until
all surplus rural labour was absorbed in the urban industrial
sector. The key weakness of their theory is the assumption of
reinvestment in the industrial sector. Moreover they did not
discuss labour saving bias of most modern technological
transfer. Moreover, they did not take into account the urban
surplus labour.

Michael P. Todardo\(^{14}\) developed an economic theory
of rural-urban migration on the basis of his Doctoral (Ph.D)
thesis in the year 1969. He postulated that migration was
taking place in response to urban-rural differences in expected
rather than actual earnings. The expected gains in migration

\(^{14}\) Michael, P. Todardo, “A Model of Labour Migration and Urban Unemployment in Less
were measured by (i) the difference in real income between rural and urban job opportunities and (ii) the probability of a new migrant obtaining an urban job. His model has been extended and modified by many social scientists.

Most of the recent models and theories of migration are based extensions of the theories reviewed above.

Barnum and Sabot\textsuperscript{15} (1976) have analysed the relation between educational attainment and migration with the help of primary data collected in 1971 from seven urban areas in Tanzania. They found that the tendency for migration was greater among the more formal educated rural residents. The returns from migration also were high for the more educated. Their study further showed that rural-urban income differential and probability of finding an urban job determined the rate of rural-urban migration. The study focused only on human capital investment, on education and the relation with migration behaviour.

The study by Aroma Glory Sam\textsuperscript{16} (1977) on urbanization in Pudukottai has shown that the majority of the migrants were from rural areas and the push factor in the rural areas was more dominant. The analysis of occupation shows that the majority of them were employed in informal sector and in more than three-fourth of the cases the migrant's occupation changed due to migration.

The study by Shekhar Mukherji\textsuperscript{17} (1982) based on survey data in Varanasi city found patterns of relationships between structure of attributes-cum-utilities and the movement behaviour. This relationship showed that poor, economically disadvantaged people were searching for any kind of manual job and moving to places of greater job-ubrabor utility gain. The educated landless person, and unemployed were searching for gainful employment interestingly high caste people and rich landowners only migrated medium distances.


\textsuperscript{17} Shekhar Mukherji, \textit{Poverty and Mobility in India}, Prajna, Calcutta, 1982, pp.78-85.
Vatsala Narain and Gotpaga\textsuperscript{18} (1983) examined the socio-economic characteristics of the in-migrants in Bombay, based on their survey in 1979. This study revealed that the migrants came directly from the villages without any experience of migration. The study found that average age at migration for males was 18.2 year and 19.4 years for females. It further pointed out that most of the male migrants were not-married and they migrated alone. The index of education and work participation was also high among the migrants, compared to non-migrants. Among the causes of migration, employment motivation and education of a person were found to be very important.

The study by Rathnasamy\textsuperscript{19} (1984) reveals that low income in the place of origin and higher income at the destination were the main causes of migration. Moreover, social discrimination, manual kind of farm work and lack of amenities in the place of origin were important push factors for migration. This study also highlighted the role of friends


and relatives in information supply and job search for the migrants. The analysis on rural-urban links shows that majority of the migrants visit their native place. Nearly one-third of the migrants had sent remittances to their relatives. The remittance was only a supplement of income to the near-and-dear in their place of origin.

Biswajit Banerjee\(^\text{20}\) (1986) examined the causes and consequences of rural-urban migration on the urban labour market. The study is based on the survey data of 1600 respondents conducted in 1975-76, in Delhi. The concept of this study was that the worsening of the economic situation in the rural areas was a valid reason for migration. But the main cause for migration was the desire to earn money, to repay a debt, or the dislike of agricultural work. The analysis of information on job opportunities suggests that potential migrants need not be physically present in urban centers. Urban-based contacts have played a major role in passing information on job opportunities to the rural potential migrants. Further it shows that migrants did not remain unemployed for considerable periods on arrival in Delhi, and

majority of the migrants arrived with pre-arranged jobs. Majority of the migrants entered into informal sector employment.

The analysis on urban-rural links indicated that migrants had strong ties with their areas. Twenty-eight percent of the sample was married migrants who had left their wives behind in their rural homes. The author found that land holding in rural area and the motive to earn money reduced the probability of bringing their wives to the city. The tendency to keep the wife in rural area had decreased as education attainments increased. Urban to rural remittance had increased on account of dependency burden in the rural households. The remittance was positively related to urban earnings and level of education of the migrant. The amount of land owned in the rural areas was not a significant determinant of remittances.

Arup Mitra21 (1988) studied the impact of the rural outmigration in urban areas with the help of census data and various rounds of N.S.S. data. It was found that, migration of

---

disadvantaged or lower classes led to the slum formation in cities.

Gupta (1988) examined the socio-economic characteristics of immigrant farm workers and the causes and consequences of migration. The study is based on primary survey carried out in Ludhiana and Hoshiarpur districts in Punjab, during the period 1984-86. The data analysis pinpointed the fact that most of the immigrants from rural areas belonged to low castes. Negligible number of upper caste people also migrated and were ready to take low-status occupation, which they would not do at their native places for fear of losing social status. Migrants were mostly married and few migrated alone. Lack of irrigation facilities, debt, landlessness and lack of employment seemed to be major causes of migration. Among the pull factors, better employment, better wage, better job security and better food were seen as the contributing factors for migration. The analysis of pattern of job search shows that the majority of them negotiated directly with the employer/farmers. It also

---

shows the middlemen playing a significant role in securing jobs.

Mehta (1990) examined the socio-economic aspect of migration in Kanpur City, with the help of primary data collected from 1500 households (1000 migrant and 500 non-migrant households). The data analysis shows that three-fourth of the in-migrants were rural outmigrants. Among the various causes for migration, incidence of poverty in rural area was the first followed by inadequate days of employment. Most of the migrants migrated with an aim to get jobs in factories, followed by jobs in government department and in the informal sector. The analysis on source of information for migration shows the dominant role was that of informal source.

The pattern of employment shows that majority of the workers were confined to factory jobs, followed by self-employed and administrative jobs. Generally, earnings of the migrants were higher than those of the non-migrants and the economic condition of a sizable proportion of the migrants had improved after migration.

Dependant family members in their native places seemed to be an important reason for maintaining links with their native place for the migrants. And two-thirds of the migrants made at least two visits in a year to their native place. A sizeable proportion of the migrant native households depended on the remittances of migrants (21 per cent).

The analysis on economic impact of migration showed that migration improved the economic status in migrant native villages. The remittances were mainly used to educate the children of the family, to perform marriages of blood relatives, for purchasing durable goods and clearing debts.

Tiwari\(^\text{24}\) (1991) analysed the main cause of migration among the migrant workers based on a survey of Kanpur City. It was found that among the migrants, majority of them migrated from rural areas to the urban center. This study shows that rural push and possibility of getting job in the informal sector were the main determinants of rural-urban migration rather than the urban pull factor.

The analysis on job search and information flow shows that a migrant could take up to three months to get a job. More than nine-tenth of the migrants got information about jobs through their friends and relatives. Moreover, due to migration the majority of the migrants benefited economically.

Siva Prasad and Yogi25 (1991) analysed the absorption and mobility of migrant workers in the urban informal sector with the help of data collection from migrant workers in Vijayawada City, in 1988. Their study reveals that the majority of the migrants were self-employed or were in other informal wage employment. The analysis on pre-migration occupation shows that majority of them were employed as labour in the informal sector.

Arup Mitra26 (1992) studied the relation between the development of tertiary sector and rural-urban migration with the help of Census and N.S.S. data. This study found a positive association between the rural to urban migration rate


and the share of tertiary activity. Further he argued that the rural to urban migration rate increased employment in low productivity trade, transport and service in response to larger inflow of migrant labour. This study highlighted the impact of large rural out-flow to urban areas.

Jayasri Ray Chaudhuri\(^{27}\) (1993) studied remittances by migrants in urban area to their relatives in their native places, on the basis of her survey in Durgapur City, in 1987. This analysis pointed out that the town had a stronger link in monetary term with rural areas compared to the urban areas. Moreover, the study pointed out that among the various uses of the remittances, consumption expenditure, construction activity and agricultural production were important.

Solucis Santhapparaj\(^{28}\) (1993) studied the causes and consequences of urban in-migration. He found that more than four-fifth of the migrants were from rural areas and they were from areas very near to the study area. The proportion of


young and educated migrants was high. The analysis on causes of migration showed that lack of employment opportunities in the rural area and better employment change in urban area was the important push and pull factors respectively. The nuclear family system in rural areas and lack of land-holding induced rural outmigration with wife and children.

The analysis on occupation and earnings shows that majority of the migrants got jobs through informal sources, that is, friends and relatives, and that majority of them were employed in the informal sector. Due to migration, they gained on an average, nearly a 40 per cent increase in their earnings.

The rural urban link analysis shows that majority of the migrants visited their native places to meet their parents and relatives. Only about one-fourth of the migrants were remitting money regularly to their kith and kin, and that too for consumption purpose. Probit and Logit methods on cause of remittance to rural area shows that, migrants who were unmarried, who owned lands in rural area, or who had their household members in rural area were more likely to send
money. But amount of remittance is positively influenced by the level of education of the migrant and negatively influenced by the migrant's age and his period of urban study.

The study by Yeshwant29 (1962) based on rural survey revealed that small cultivators and agricultural labourers were more likely to migrate. Low caste people migrated to improve their economic and social position. However, most socially backward communities, showed less migratory tendencies than others. Most of the migrants were found to be in the age group of 15 and 24 years. Distance of migration reveals that short distance migration was predominant over long distance migration. Majority of the migrants migrated to urban area, leading to an occupational shift.

The Kunj Patel's study30 (1963) on rural labour in Bombay city was based on a survey in villages in Ratnajire district and on migrants in Bombay. This study whoos that acute poverty in villages and a slightly better-off condition of

29 T.S.Yeswant, "Rural-Migration – A Case Study in Four Ramanathapuram Villages", Agricultural Situation in India, Vol.27, No.6, September 1962, pp.655-663.
migrant rural conditions encouraged migration to Bombay for employment. Moreover the rural household benefited economically due to migration and the remittances helped the rural households in improving their agricultural operations to some extent.

Singh and Yadava\textsuperscript{31} (1974) made a rural based survey and examined the nature of migration from rural to urban areas. Their study found that the previous migration from a particular rural area was very important variable in explaining the current migration stream.

John Connell et al., (1976) have analysed the social, economic and demographic factors in villages, associated with rural out-migration. The study is based on village level data from Agro-Economic Research Centres of India, in the 1950's and the early 1960's. Their study showed that the majority of the outmigrants were young adult-males, married and educationally more advanced than the fellow villagers. Majority of the out-migrants were cultivators, and non-agriculturist households.

The analysis on causes for migration shows that land shortages, low fertility of land, skewed distribution of land and the high proportion of landless agriculturists were major push factors.

Saxena\textsuperscript{32} (1977) examined the causes and consequences of rural to urban migration on the basis of his survey data from four villages in the eastern district of Uttar Pradesh. The study revealed that majority of the rural outmigrants migrated within the state. Among the push factor, poverty seemed more important, followed by increasing population, shrinking per capita cultivable land and decline of rural handcrafts. Low income was felt by 70 per cent of the rural outmigrants as the main cause for migration.

The analysis on economic impact of migration shows that 72 per cent of the migrants had turned to self-supporting jobs. Majority of the rural out-migrants were self-employed and majority of the rural migrant households were financially benefited. Three-fourth of the rural outmigrants sent remittances to their native households.

Roberts\textsuperscript{33} (1981) has analysed the relation between agricultural development and migration in rural Mexico. This study was based on the primary data collected from four regions of Mexico. The analysis showed the differential relation between the agricultural development and rural outmigration. Two regions evidenced the fact that agricultural development, equated with farm income, decreased migration. But another two regions provided very little support for this. Hence he argued that no general theory of rural mobility transition could be applied without an examination of the agrarian structure of a particular region.

Yousuf\textsuperscript{34} (1983) study of villages in Ramanathapuram district reveals that persons with larger-sized families were more inclined to migrate than those with small-sized families, especially among males between 15 and 45 years. This study did not find any significant association between rural poverty, unemployment and rural outmigration.

\textsuperscript{33} Kenneth D. Roberts, \textit{Agrarian Structure and Labour Migration in Rural Mexico}, Working papers in U.S. Mexican Studies, 30, University of California, San Diego, 1981.

\textsuperscript{34} P. Yousuf, "Interrelation between Poverty, Unemployment and Migration" Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Maharaja Sayirrao University, Baroda, 1983.
Shyam Narayan, Sharma and Singh (1985) studied outmigration from nearby villages of Srinagar in 1981. Their study contradicted some other studies, that high caste and larger land holding groups from villages had higher tendency toward outmigration.