

Rural to Urban Labour Migration for Social and Economic Inclusion

MADHU G R
UMA H R

Abstract

Migration and urbanization are direct manifestations of the process of economic development, particularly in the contemporary phase of globalization. In recent years, several changes in India are likely to have impacted the pattern and pace of migration. The pattern of growth in the last two decades has steadily widened the gap between agriculture and non-agriculture and between rural and urban areas. A good number of studies have been done on the different dimensions of internal labour migration; some of the studies concentrate on dynamics of migratory flows and growth in a developing economy. This study aims to examine the socio economic status of the migrants from rural to urban areas during post migration period and to study the impact of urban migration on rural agriculture.

Keywords: Migration, Social Inclusion, Economic Inclusion, Rural and Urban Labour, Agriculture

Authors: Madhu G.R. UGC-Senior Research Fellow, DoS in Economics and Cooperation, University of Mysore, Manasagangotri, Mysore - 570006, India. Email: madhu.rajgowda01@gmail.com

H.R.Uma, Professor of Economics, University of Mysore, Sir M.V. PG Center, Tubinkere Mandya, India. Email : umahr30mahesh@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Migration of persons within national borders is far greater in magnitude than migration across international borders and has enormous potential to contribute to economic prosperity, social cohesion and urban diversity. Internal migration is an essential and inevitable component of the economic and social life of the country. Given regional imbalances and labour shortages, safe migration should be promoted to maximize its benefits.

Migration and urbanisation are direct manifestations of the process of economic development, particularly in the contemporary phase of globalisation. Understanding the causes and consequences of the former in terms of the changes in the distribution of population and economic activities, along with the success and failures of the interventions by state and other organisations would be extremely important for evaluating the available policy options and exploring areas of possible strategic intervention. Internal migration not only involves much poorer segments, its impact on the economy as a whole, on sending and receiving regions, and on the migrants and their families are also arguably much more than international migrants.

Structurally, in the last two decades or so, capital has become hugely more mobile than earlier. The verdict on whether labour too has become more mobile is still not out, although many would argue that population and workers have also become somewhat more mobile than before, both nationally and internationally.

The constitution of India (Article 19) gives the Right to all citizens, “to move freely throughout the territory of India”. Internal migrants in India constitute a large population, “309 million internal migrants or 30 percent of the population (Census of India 2011), and by more recent estimates 326 million or 28.5 percent of the population (NSSO 2007-2008).

In recent years, several changes in India have impacted the pattern and pace of migration. The pattern of growth in the last two decades has steadily widened the gap between agriculture and non-agriculture and between rural and urban areas, and it has steadily concentrated in few areas and a few states. The growing spatial inequalities in economic opportunities must have necessarily also impacted the pace and pattern of migration. Uneven growth and a growing differential between agriculture and industry is a necessary concomitant of the pattern of development. Migration has historically played a role in reducing the gap in living standards between sectors and areas and in fuelling growth in the more dynamic sectors.

LITERATURE REVIEW

After reviewing the literature of internal labour migration, it is clear that a good number of studies have been done on the different dimensions of internal labour migration; some of the studies concentrate on dynamics

of migratory flows and growth in a developing economy.(Manon Domingues, Dos Santo Thiser), the push and pull factors which influence workers' interstate migration (Kumar and Sidhu 2005), Internal Migration and Development: A Global Perspective (Deshingkar and Grimm 2005), Internal Migration and Youth in India: Main Features, Trends and Emerging Challenges(Rajan 2013), International Migration and the Integration of Labor Markets (Chiswick 2002) and Migration and Exclusionary Urbanization in India (Amitabh Kundu, Lopamudra Ray Saraswati ,2012) many studies are done on intra district, inter district and interstate but hardly any study is done on rural to urban migration with respect to the villages in Hassan district, Karnataka. This study concentrates on rural to urban labour migration for socio-economic inclusion and is one of the original studies to bridge the research gap in this area of study.

OBJECTIVES

- * To examine the socio economic status of the migrants from rural to urban areas during post migration period;
- * To study the impact of urban migration on rural agriculture;

METHOD OF STUDY

This paper is based on both secondary and primary data. Primary data is collected from 200 households using survey method with scheduled questionnaire in one village closely located to urban area in Hassan district. SPSS package was used for data analysis. Paired T test method was used to analyse wage differences before and after labourers shift to urban area. Excel is used for tabulation and construction of Chart. Garret's ranking technique is used to rank the reasons for urbanisation effect on farmers and changing cropping pattern.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

It has been observed that the most productive manual labour of the rural population that is youth is getting attracted towards urban life. This has made a big negative impact on agricultural productivity. But on the other hand, urban migration enhances the social and economic status of the migrants says this study.

Table -1 Education

Education	f	Percentage
Illiterate	30	15
High school	83	41.5
P.U.C	35	17.5
Technical education	31	15.5
Under graduation	21	11.5
Total	200	100

Table 1 illustrates the educational level of the respondents. Education plays a crucial role in determining the formal and nonfarm sector employment of the job seekers. Compared to other groups, technically educated are getting good jobs in formal sector. Among the migrants, highest position has been taken by those with high school education (41.5%) followed by secondary education with 17.5%. Both these levels are the turning points for these people because, initially they discontinue their education and work in agriculture but later, due to many push and pull factors, shift to non-farm urban sector to earn higher wages for their work.

Table -2 Gender

Sex	f	Percent
Female	35	17.5
Male	165	82.5
Total	200	100.0

Table 2 shows the gender wise distribution of migrant labourers in this study area. It clearly shows that men are more mobile than women. When men shift their work to urban areas, automatically women take care of the agricultural activity. It shows the gender discriminatory trend in urban migration and it is predominantly male dominated. More males than females migrate for better jobs from rural to urban areas.

Table - 3 Age

Age	f	Percentage
21-30	110	55
31-40	62	31
41-50	27	13.5
51-60	1	0.5
Total	200	100

Table -3 shows age wise distribution profile of the migrant labourers. It clearly shows that younger population of 21-30 and 31-40 age groups are more mobile than 41-50 and 51-60 age groups. Young people in the family seek jobs in the urban areas for stable and higher income, in which time parents and other members of the family take care of agricultural activities. Mobility from rural to urban areas for jobs in nonfarm sector is more among males who are young between the age of 21-40 years than middle aged and old people.

Table - 4 Caste

Caste	f	Percentage
2A	7	3.5
3A	153	76.5
CAT - 1	3	1.5
SC	37	18.5
Total	200	100

Table- 4 shows the caste wise (categories as defined by state government) job seekers in the study area. Of all the caste categories, 3A has the highest density of population and the same trend follows in the job seeking also. Category- I has lower density of population in this study area which is reflected in job seeking behaviors also. Compared to other three categories, SC has lower socio economic status and they are more mobile than others mainly because they have no permanent settlement of property to stick on to.

Table - 5 Marital Status

Marital status	f	Percentage
Married	114	57
Unmarried	86	43
Total	200	100

Table 5 shows the marital status of migrant job seekers. Data reveals that married are more mobile than unmarried ones. Married migrants seek jobs in highly paid urban areas for supporting and improving the living standard of the family.

Table - 6 Paired Sample T Test

Before and After migration	Paired Differences					
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error mean	T	df	Sig. (2tailed)
	-4724.000	3848.517	272.131	-17.359	199	.000

Table - 6 shows the paired sample test for income difference of the before and after migration of the farmers and agriculture labourers to the urban non-farm sector for higher wages and regular employment. Here the test clearly shows significant difference in the income after changing their work. Here the t value ($17.359 > 2.626$) is greater than the table value and it clearly shows the significant difference in income. This positively has an impact on economic status of the migrant labourers. Improvement of economic status directly or indirectly has an impact on socio- economic inclusion of the migrants.

Table -7 Garrett Ranking Table for Reason to Leave Agriculture

Reasons	Score	Rank
Unstable income	12879	I
Environmental reasons	11069	II
Loss in agriculture	10498	III
Higher input cost	8547	IV
Over dependency	7925	V
Labour problem	6348	VII

Above Garrett ranking table-7 shows the reasons for small and medium farmers partially leaving the agriculture activity and depending on the non-farm sector for higher income in urban area. Here unstable income in agriculture activity takes first place for leaving the agriculture. Environmental reasons follow the unstable income. Environmental reasons include heavy rain, crop diseases, drought etc. Poor transport, marketing system and lower prices for agricultural produce in harvesting season form the third reason justifying migration for jobs. Higher input costs like higher cost for hybrid seeds, fertilizers, insecticides and technology are placed in forth position in the hierarchy of reasons for migration from agriculture to nonfarm sector. Over dependency on agriculture land and labour problems in agriculture activities are the two other reasons that induce the small and medium farmers to prefer urban jobs over agriculture.

Table - 8 Garrett Ranking
Reason for Migrating to Urban Area

Reasons	Score	Rank
Stable income	12282	I
Improvement of infrastructure	11945	II
Irregular work in village	9252	III
Weekly/monthly income availability	8827	IV
Higher income	7111	V

Table-8, Garret ranking table, shows the reasons cited by migrants for preferring to work in urban areas instead of agriculture. Stable income stands first in the Garret ranking table and obviously it is the unstable income in the agriculture sector that induces them to work in urban area. The second reason for seeking jobs in non-farm sector is attributed to improvement in roads, communication, and transportation. Seasonal employment in agriculture is the third reason while continuous and timely payment in the nonfarm sector jobs is the other reason for migration. Interestingly higher income when compared to agriculture sector is the next reason for seeking employment in urban non-farm sector.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

Changes in recent decades have impacted migrant labour markets and migration, but many of these have not yet been studied in detail. There has been a significant improvement in road infrastructure and telecommunications, reducing the real costs of transport and communication. This has led to improved information flow, potentially reducing information asymmetries and isolation for the migrants, and a reduction both in the cost of migration and in the speed at which migrants can move from their native place to urban destination. Improved infrastructure and reduced transport costs have also made daily commutation to work (sometimes over several hundred kilometers) a viable option to migration.

The migration of agriculture labourers and small farmers in the village seeking jobs in the urban area is having positive impact on their socio economic status. They are shifting to urban areas without leaving the agriculture sector completely as improved cropping methods have made agriculture more flexible than ever before. It has helped them indirectly solve the problem of disguised employment which is highly prevalent in agriculture sector. These male workers assign the agriculture activity to the wife, parents and other members of the family and continue to retain urban-rural connectivity. This trend on one hand helps migrants to not only work in urban areas but also helps them to avoid the risk and problems of agriculture. Thus rural to urban labour migration positively influences the economic status of the migrant workers in urban area. Income from agriculture and urban nonfarm sources has positive impact on socio economic status of the migrants.

Migration to urban area for work has positive effect on small farmers and agricultural labourers. Without leaving the agriculture activity completely, rural labourers are working in the urban area for some of above stated reasons leading to a hike in agriculture productivity and improvement in the socio-economic status of the migrant workers. This has led to the inclusion of migrant labourers who are excluded from the socio-economic mainstream.

REFERENCES

1. Amitabh Kundu (1986) "Migration, Urbanisation and Inter-Regional Inequality" The Emerging Socio-Political Challenge", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 21, No. 46, pp. 2005-2008.
2. Amitabh Kundu (2009) "urbanization and migration: an analysis of trend, pattern and policies in Asia", *human development research paper 2009/6*, United Nations Development Programme.
3. Deshinkar, Priya (2006) international migration, poverty and development in Asia, downloaded from website www.asia2015conference.org/pdhs/deshinkar.pdf.
4. Rogaly, B, et al, (2001) "seasonal migration, social change and migration rights (lesson from West Bengal)", December 8, pp. 4547-57.
5. Amitabh Kundu and Shalini Gupta (1996) Migration, Urbanisation and Regional Inequality", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 31, No. 52, pp. 3391-3393+3395-3398.
6. Amitabh Kundu (2009) "Exclusionary Urbanization in Asia: A Macro Overview" *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 44, No. 48, pp. 48-58,
7. Amitabh Kundu (2011) "Trends And Processes Of Urbanisation In India", Urbanization And Emerging Population Issues- 6, *Human Settlement Group*, IIED. Population and Development Branch, UNFPA.
8. Biplab Dasgupta (1987) "Urbanisation and Rural Change in West Bengal", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 22, No. 7, pp. 276-287
9. Bryan R. Roberts (1989) "Urbanization, Migration, and Development" *Sociological Forum*, Vol. 4, No. 4, Special Issue: *Comparative National Development: Theory and Facts for the 1990s*, pp. 665-691.
10. Kalpana Bardhan (1973) Factors Affecting Wage Rates for Agricultural Labour" *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 8, No. 26, pp. A56-A64
11. M. S. A. Rao (1966) "Urbanisation in a Delhi Village: Some Social Aspects" *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 1, No. 9, pp. 365-370.
12. M. S. Gore (1975) "Development and a Strategy for Urbanisation: Absence of a Positive" 115+117-119.
13. Natta Duvvury, (1989) "Women in Agriculture: A Review of the Indian Literature" *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 24, No. 43 (Oct. 28, 1989), pp. WS96-WS112
14. Nigel Harris (2005) "Migration and Development" *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 40, No. 43, pp. 4591-4595.
15. Nirmala Banerjee (1969) "What Course for Urbanisation in India?" *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 4, No. 28/30, pp. 1173-1176.
16. P. Parthasarathy Rao, P. S. Birlal and P. K. Joshi (2006) "Diversification

towards High Value Agriculture: Role of Urbanization and Infrastructure”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 41, No. 26, pp. 2747-2753.

17. Pabitra Giri (1998) Urbanisation in West Bengal, 1951-1991, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 33, No. 47/48, pp. 3033-3035+3037-3038.
18. Robyn Eversole (2008) “Development in Motion: What to Think about Migration? “, *Development in Practice*”, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 94-99.
19. Tapan Piplai and Niloy MajumdarSource: Sankhy? (2002)”Internal Migration in India: Some Socio-Economic Implications”, *The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series B* Vol. 31, No. 3/4, pp. 509-522,
20. Improving Statistics on International Migration in AsiaAuthor(s): Graeme HugoReviewed work(s): Source: *International Statistical Review / Revue International de Statistique*, Vol. 74, No. 3(Dec., 2006), pp. 335-355Published