RURAL-URBAN MIGRATION IN INDIA: DETERMINANTS AND FACTORS

SANGITA KUMARI

Assistant Professor (Ad Hoc), Motilal Nehru College, University of Delhi, Delhi, India

ABSTRACT

The recent migration data from 64th round NSSO (2007-08) and census 2011 shows rapid increase in internal migration in India. The migration rate (proportion of migrants in the population) in the urban areas (35 percent) was far higher than the migration rate in the rural areas (26 percent). Among the migrants in the rural areas, nearly 91 percent have migrated from the rural areas and 8 percent from the urban areas: where as among the migrants in the urban areas, 59 percent migrated from the rural areas and 40 percent from urban areas. Hence rural- urban migration plays a very significant role, so far as migration stream is concerned.

The estimated results of the regression model on the basis of cross section analysis of 30 states and UTs suggests that in determining rural-urban migration the gravity variables such as percentage of rural population and rural literacy rate are highly significant, whereas the variables such as rural poverty ratio, MNREGA employment generation in person days and rural urban wage difference remained insignificant in explaining the variation in rural- urban migration from the list of sample states taken. But there exists some social factors apart from such economic factors which also play an important role in explaining the nature and stream of rural- urban migration such as similar language which operating mutually both at origin and destination places, distance between the places, the mindset and aspirations of migrants etc.

KEYWORDS: Migration Stream, Migrants, Economic Factors, Gravity Variables, States, Union Territories, Cross Section Analysis

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Migration is one of the important factor after fertility and mortality that affect the demographic changes in a country. But whereas both fertility and mortality operate within the biological framework, migration does not. It influences size, composition and distribution of population. More importantly, migration influences the social, political and economic life of the people. Given the variation possible in the migration process, all migrants cannot be analyzed with the same theoretical framework. However, although heterogeneous factors make a universal definition impossible, in general, migration is a process in which an individual or a group shifts their residence from one place to another. When we talk about India, One of the most significant migration patterns has been rural to urban migration—the movement of people from the countryside to cities in search of various opportunities. Indian constitution provides basic freedom to move to any part of the country, right to reside and earn livelihood of their choice. Thus, migrants are not required to register either at the place of origin or at the place of destination. One important facet of study on migration is the study of rural-urban migration arising out of various social, economic or political reasons. For a large country like India, the study of movement of population in different parts of the country helps in understanding the dynamics of the society better. At this junction in the economic development, in the country, especially when many states are undergoing faster economic development,

particularly in areas, such as, manufacturing, information technology or service sectors, study of rural-urban population has become more important.

1.2 Definition of Migration

Migration is defined as a move from one migration defining area to another, usually crossing administrative boundaries made during a given migration interval and involving a change of residence (UN 1993). Apart from its spatial dimension, migration also implies the disruption of work, schooling, social life, and other patterns. A migrant is someone who breaks off activities and associations in one place and reorganizes their daily life in another place. The change in residence can take place either permanent or semi permanent or temporary basis (Premi, 1990). Internal migration involves a change of residence within national borders (Dang 2005). Until 1951, district was the migration defining area (MDA), implying that a person was considered a migrant in India only if he or she has changed residence from the district of birth to another district or a state. Since 1961, data on migration have been collected by considering each revenue village or urban settlement as a separate unit.

A person is considered as a migrant if birthplace is different from place of enumeration. In 1971 census, an additional question on place of last residence was introduced to collect migration data. Since then, census provides data on migrants based on place of birth (POB) and place of last residence (POLR). If the place of birth or place of last residence is different from the place of enumeration, a person is defined as a migrant. On the other hand, if the place of birth and place of enumeration is the same, the person is a non-migrant (Bhagat, 2005).

Since 1961 census, the duration of residence has been ascertained to provide data on timing Since 1961 census, the duration of residence has been ascertained to provide data on timing of movement. The duration data are published as less than one year, 1-4 years, and 5- 9 years, 10- 19 years and 20 and above years. Migrants of all durations are defined as lifetime migrants because the time of their move is not known. They are those who came to the place of enumeration at any point during their lives and have been living there ever since, whether this happened just a week before the census or a few decades ago (Premi, 1990). In India, information on migration has been collected in a number of large scale and localized sample surveys. Yet the population census has remained the most important source of migration data.

1.3 Definition of Migrant

As per NSSO 55th round (1999-2000), A member of the sample household was treated as a migrant if he/she had stayed continuously for at least six months or more in a place (village/town) other than the village/town where he/she was enumerated. The village/town where the person had stayed continuously for at least six months or more prior to moving to the place of enumeration (village/town) was referred to as the 'last usual place of residence' of that migrated person. Shifting of residence within village/town was not considered as an event of migration.

1.4 Distribution of Migrants by Migration Streams

Mobility of people from one region to another is a regular occurrence in any country. If we consider the population of a country an individual may often live in more than one region during his/her life time. The four main basic movements of people in a given country are

- Rural to Rural

- Rural to Urban

- Urban to Rural

- Urban to Urban

1.5 Rural-Urban Migration Streams

If we see the distribution of internal migrants, at the all-India level, by four types of migration streams, namely, rural-to-rural, rural to urban, urban-to-rural and urban-to-urban for NSS 55th round and NSS 64th round and the corresponding figures estimated for NSS 64th round for each State/U.T. we observe that during 2007-08, rural-to-rural migration was the most dominant migration stream, accounting for nearly 62 per cent of the total internal migrants, followed by rural-to- urban migration stream, which shared nearly 20 per cent of the total internal migrants. The share of urban-to-urban migration stream stood at 13 per cent, while urban-to-rural migration stream shared merely 6 per cent of total internal migrants. However, the pattern displayed by male migrants are distinct from that of female migrants. For male migrants, rural-to-urban migration stream was the most dominant one which shared nearly 39 per cent of total male internal migrants, while for female rural-to-rural migration stream shared nearly 70 per cent of the total internal female migrants. For males, the urban-to-urban migration stream shared nearly one-fourth of the total internal male migrants, while for female it was nearly one-tenth. The variation in the shares of the four types of migration streams, for males and females combined, in NSS 64th compared to those in NSS 55th round (1999-2000) is insignificant. However, some changes, in the shares of the migrations streams for male migrants have been observed in 2007-08 compared to that in 1999-2000. It may be seen that the shares of rural-to rural migration for males has decreased and the shares of rural-to-urban migration has increased in 2007-08 from those of 1999-2000. In NSS 64th round, the share of rural-to-rural migration for males has decreased by nearly 5 percentage points from 32 per cent in 1999-2000 and the shares of rural-to-urban migration has increased by nearly 5 percentage points in 2007- 08 from 34 per cent in 1999-2000. Distribution (per 1000) of internal migrants over the four which shared nearly 39 per cent of total male internal migrants, while for female rural-to-rural migration stream shared nearly 70 per cent of the total internal female migrants.

1.6 MGNREGA: An Alternative to Migration

NREGA… [should help] in reducing the number of migrant labourers in the country as employment is being provided to them in their own villages.

(Indian Labour Minister Mallikarjun Kharge, cited in *The Economic Times*, 2010).

The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) is the flagship welfare programme of the UPA government, and the largest of its kind in India. One of its main objectives is a significant reduction in labour migration through the provision of locally available work in rural areas. NREGA has been envisaged from the perspective of "right to employment" and guarantees 100 days of employment at a minimum fixed wage rate, but more importantly it bestows an entitlement. Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) was launched in February 2006 in 200 most backward districts in the first phase and was extended to 330 districts during 2007-08. The coverage was extended to all rural districts of the country in 2008-09. At present, 619 districts are covered under the MGNREGS. One of the significant objectives of the MGNREGA is to arrest out-migration of unskilled, landless labour force from the rural areas to urban areas by ensuring up to 100 days of wage employment within their native jurisdiction so that these guaranteed wage employment can be judiciously and rationally utilized by the landless peasants during lean and distress seasons. As far as possible, the work site is to be within a five km radius of the applicant's village. in case it is not,

it must be provided within the Block and the labourers must be paid 10 percent of their wages as extra wages to meet the additional travel and living expenses. MGNREGA, too, could become a "predictable" source of local employment (since it guarantees work within a fortnight to anyone demanding it), and therefore reduces distress migration. In this respect, MGNREGA contrasts with previous employment programmes such as Jawahar Rozgar Yojana or Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana.

1.7 Purpose of Study

For the first time since independence, the absolute increase in population is more in urban areas that in rural areas. During the last 50 years rural population has decreased from 82.0 to 68.9 per cent. Level of urbanization increased from 27.81 per cent in 2001 census to 31.6 per cent in 2011 census and the proportion of rural population declined from 72.19 per cent in 2001 census to 68.84 per cent census. It is estimated that approximately 22 million people have migrated from rural to urban areas since 2001. After going through the study of "Migration in India" I came to know that rural-urban migration has increased, It drew my attention and increased my inquisitiveness to find out the determinants and factors across the various states which have a role in increasing rural urban migration in India.

1.8 Objectives of the Study

The present study seeks to,

- Find out the significant economic factors responsible for explaining the variations in the level of rural-urban migration from various states of India.

- Find out whether the NREGA Act (2005) can have an impact on rural migration of India if implemented as per the criteria by getting official rural-urban migration data from the selected states of India where rural-urban migration is known to be rampant and where the NREGA has been implemented by conducting a research methodology.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Analysis of migration pattern is important to understand the changes taking place in the people's movement within the country. It is most volatile component of population growth and most sensitive to economic, political and cultural factors (Singh, 1998).

Several studies (Bose, 1977; Nair and Narain, 1985; Premi, 1990; and Singh, 1998; Zachariah, 1963, 1964) found that volume of interstate migration in India was low but asserted the fact that about one third of India's population is enumerated outside their place of birth indicating the importance of migration as a major demographic process in India.

2.2 Migration Theories – A Review

The core principle of migration theories is rationality. From the first law of migration (Ravenstein 1885), to Lewis (1954), Lee's (1966) and Harris-Todaro model (Todaro 1976 and 1977 and Harris and Todaro 1970), the rationale of migration evolves around regional disparities.

Ravenstein's Laws Of Migration (1875-89) Most migrants travel short distance and with increasing distance the no of migrants decrease. Migration occurs in a series of waves or steps. Each significant migration stream produces, to a

degree, a counter stream. Urban dwellers are less migratory than rural dwellers. The major causes of migration are economic. The Lee Model (1966) This revised the simple 'push-pull' model in two ways .It introduced the idea of intervening obstacles that need to be overcome before migration takes place. Source and destination are seen as possessing a range of attributes differently, depending on personal characteristics such as age , sex and marital status.

Lewis Model (1954) says the transformation from rural to urban is marked by two massive resource flows: the move of labour, and a parallel move of food, to support the basic needs of those individuals no longer engaged in farming. The Lewis model tells that agricultural surpluses and labour must be transferred in tandem for industrial development to begin. Development is characterized by an ongoing move of labour and resources from a "traditional sector" in rural area to a "modern sector" in urban area. Ongoing capital accumulation in the modern sector provides the fuel for sustained transfers. Lewis argued that the traditional sector is characterized by surplus labour (a situation in which labour can be removed without loss in output). In principle, this permits, industrial development with unlimited supply of labour, at least until the surplus-labor phase comes to an end. But, theory does not discuss at all the deciding factors behind the move of labours from traditional sector in rural areas towards the modern sector in urban areas.

The classic theory of rural-urban migration is based on Harris and Todaro (1970).The main idea of the model is that the formal urban sector pays a high wage to workers. In contrast to the high wages paid in the formal sector, the informal urban sector and the rural sector have low wages. Migration in the Harris-Todaro model is then viewed as a response to the significant wage gap that prevails between the rural and formal urban sector. But, what i perceive, rural people simply migrates towards urban areas because of the actual wage difference, whatever extra they get in urban area adjusted with the cost of living there than the rural area. Apart from the above factor, there are so many other economic factors, which push them towards urban area.

2.3 Studies on Internal Migration

Starting with the pioneering work of Davis (1951), it has been repeatedly argued that the Indian population is relatively immobile due to the prevalence of caste system, the practice of marriage at an early age, the importance of life within the 'household', the diversity of Indian languages and cultures, the low education levels, and the predominance of agriculture in the economy.

Sarkar, (1978) reported that in most developing countries such as India, Bangladesh, Pakistan most migration is from rural to urban areas due to different socio-economic push and pull factors. The study conducted by Lakshmanaswamy, (1990) says that in development literature rural to urban migration is viewed as being favourable to economic development.

Rural migration is the phenomenon that describes the movement of people from their villages to urban areas, usually in search of a better livelihood (Solanki, 2002). In India there are a vast number of landless labours and equally vast numbers of partially employed workers in rural sector, internal mobility is critical to the livelihoods of many people, especially for people from rural areas who generate a continuous stream of out migrants destined for cities. On the basis of a large sample survey in Bihar, Kerala and Uttar Pradesh, Oberai, Prasad and Sardana (1989) reported that in all the urban areas of the three states, female migrants' work participation rates are generally higher among Christians and Scheduled Castes/Tribe whether married or unmarried and availability of high productivity jobs in the rural areas could reduce inmigration to the urban areas. It is widely accepted that people move in search of employment and also from low wage to

higher wage region –a rational choice to be able to earn more and improve their standard of living. It is estimated that approximately 2 million people are shifting from rural to urban areas annually and approximately 22 million people have migrated from rural to urban areas since 2001.

Here comes the the role of NREGA as the flagship welfare programme of the UPA government, is the largest of its kind in India, thought to be as an alternative to migration. One of its main objectives is a significant reduction in labour migration through the provision of locally available work in rural areas. Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act aims at enhancing the livelihood security of people by guaranteeing 100 days of wage- employment to a rural household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work. There are so many studies related to the effect of MGNREGS on migration which generally shows a decreasing trend, some of them are follows.

2.4 Studies on Migration with its Linkage of NREGA

A study conducted by Kartika Bhatia and Ashish Ranjan (2009) shows that more than half (57 per cent) of the sample workers stated that the NREGA "helped them avoid migration", and a similar proportion (also 57per cent) felt that migration had decreased in their villages after the NREGA was launched. As expected, these figures were even larger in areas with high levels of NREGA employment or high rates of migration before the inception of the programme. For instance, in Pati block (Madhya Pradesh), a hub of out-migration where the NREGA has been deployed in a big way, 92 per cent of the sample workers felt that migration had gone down and 88 percent said the NREGA had helped them avoid migration.

According to R. D. Maurya and Gadkar (2006) recognised researchers on migration at the Ambedkar Institute of Social Research, MGNREGS has reduced migration by 15-20 per cent in some villages of Mandla. Jhabua, Dhar and Dindori. Field level observations show that this reduction is seen especially in the case of women and families with more than one or two male adult workers who stay behind in the expectation that they will get work locally. The scheme has improved the bargaining power of migrants by tightening the labour market and pushing up wages.

A study by Dreze and colleagues (2009) showed that NREGA helps to avoid migration by 59 percent and sending children to school by 38 percent. 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.

Narayan Chandra Nayak and et.al (2011), in their study of Mayurbhanj and Balasore District in Orissa also show that on an average, about 69 percent of the respondents have reported that there has been acceleration in employment opportunities on account of the NREGA and about 54 percent have said that migration has come down in the aftermath of implementation of the scheme.

This clearly indicates that before the introduction of NREGA, people in Mayurbhanj had limited livelihood opportunities forcing them to migrate outside in a large scale and the scheme has been able to solve these problems considerably. It may thus be said that the NREGA is successful in meeting its set objectives on this vital front. The outcome is equally better across education levels and age groups.

2.5 Why do People Move? Competing Views

While migration is increasingly recognised as a major factor in the lives of the rural poor, in India and elsewhere, there are several interpretations of why poor people migrate temporarily for work. First, the 'dual economy' model, which

derives from neoclassical economics, sees labour mobility as an expression of the rational choice of the migrant, to move from a poor agricultural / rural/traditional area to a richer or better paying industrial /urban /modern area (Mosse et al 2002: 59). Labour migration is seen as a voluntary choice, a "response to diverse economic opportunities across space" (Jacob 2008: 3 where the migrant is basically 'pulled' out by better economic activities. In the Indian context, this is exemplified by a praise of 'growing opportunities' in the informal sector, which accounts for approximately 60 percent of the GDP and over 92 percent of the workforce and provides more opportunities to switch rapidly between different (low-profile) jobs (Deshingkar 2008).

Second, Marxist theories emphasise structural factors rather than individual agency, the exploitation of migrants by the dominant classes and the actions of large-scale capital through 'uneven patterns of proletarianisation and depeasantisation' (Breman 1996; de Haan and Rogaly 2002). Migrants are 'pushed' out of peripheral areas. Third, the dominant view in development and policy circles is a 'neo- Malthusian variant' of structural analysis, where migrants are seen as 'ecological refugees', pushed out by natural calamities (e.g. drought, crop failure), declining agricultural opportunities (decreasing production, land fragmentation, declining agricultural commodity prices), debt cycles, demographic pressure, deforesta-tion, soil erosion or water scarcity (Mosse et al 2002: 59; Deshingkar 2008). In both these understandings, labour migration by poor people from rural areas is seen as largely 'involuntary', as an expression of distress (Deshingkar and Start 2003).

Over the past fifteen years or so, sociological and anthropological studies have moved beyond 'push-and-pull' analyses, and tend to view labour migration as a complex process, combin-ing structure and agency and rejecting the view that 'urban' work and 'rural' society are somehow separate (de Haan 1999; Mosse et al 2002; Rogaly et al 2003; Gardner and Osella 2003). They also describe migration as a 'dynamic socio-political process' (Shah 2006: 93) rather than as purely economic, and as part of the 'normal' livelihood strategy of poor people across India, not only during times of crisis (Deshingkar and Start 2003; de Haan 1999; Rogaly et al 2003; Mosse et al 2002; de Haan and Rogaly 2002; Gardner and Osella 2003). In other words, the livelihoods of the rural poor in India are 'multilocational' (Deshingkar and Farring-ton 2009). Here, 'livelihood' does not mean mere subsistence, but also en-compasses social factors; material gains are only one of the reasons why people leave – though generally the main one –, and only a part of what migrants bring back (de Haan and Rogaly 2002).

Other reasons may include challenging existing social relations, gaining skills and networks, exploring a new environment, escaping social constraints at home (notably in the case of women) etc. (de Haan and Rogaly 2002; Gardner and Osella 2003; Shah 2006). The meaning of labour migration in India, as well as its drivers, vary from place to place and from migrant to migrant; it is very difficult, and often problematic, to generalise. Nevertheless, it has increasingly been considered an important development issue in the country, as shows the recent setting up of the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act.

2.6 NREGA: Labour Migration as a Development 'Problem'

The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act was the flagship welfare programme of the United Progressive Alliance (UPA) government during the General Election 2004. It was passed in August 2005 and launched in February 2006, initially across 200 districts. It was extended to 330 districts in April 2007 and then by another 295 districts from April 2008, making up 625 districts out of a total of 640 nationwide (Census 2011). The Act guarantees up to 100 days of unskilled manual work at the statutory minimum wage, on a voluntary basis, to adult members of any

rural house-hold. The work undertaken aims to de-velop infrastructure (notably water harvesting structures and roads) in rural areas. Households are registered by the Gram panchayat which issues a job card. Applications for work must be submitted in written form, either to a Programme Officer or to the panchayat. If an applicant is not provided with employment within 15 days, he is entitled to an unemployment allowance. The employment must be provided by the Gram panchayat within a 5 km radius (otherwise extra wage has to be paid). Being an Act, NREGA binds the state to implement it. Officially, 25 percent of the funds allocated to the programme are provided by the central government and the rest by the respective state govern-ments (Government of India 2005; Jacob 2008; Khan and Saluja 2007; Marius- Gnanou 2008).

Though its scale makes NREGA unique, the principle of rural employment programmes is not without precedent in India, and NREGA is based on previously existing schemes- such as the Maharashtra Employment Guarantee Scheme (MEGS), the National Rural Employment Programme (NREP), the Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojna (SGRY) etc. (Datar 2007; Khan and Saluja 2007; Jacob 2008).

2.7 Labour Migration as a Poverty Problem

It is widely accepted in Indian policy circles – and among the urban middle classes – that 'reducing migration' is a good development measure (Jacob 2008; PACS 2007; Economic Times 2010). Labour migration is under-stood as a negative force', as a cause of poverty (Jacob 2008: 3). The fact that migrants generally do not have "continued access to health… and welfare facilities" is often invoked to justify this position, notably in the context of NREGA (Jacob 2008: 6; Khan and Saluja 2007). However, this should be seen as a political issue rather than as an intrinsic feature of labour migration (cf. Tacoli et al 2008); indeed, migrants could be included in, rather than excluded from, health and welfare systems in their area of destination.

This view of labour migration as a 'problem' (cf. Spencer 2003) stems largely from two misconceptions. Firstly, mobility for work is viewed essentially as a response to crisis or distress –as 'a sign of rupture' (de Haan 1999: 30). While distress migration does take place, especially among the poorest and socially excluded, the recent literature shows. In most cases mobility is an integral part of, and a critical factor in the livelihoods of the rural poor in India, and not just a response to crisis or an 'involuntary' undertaking (de Haan 1999; de Haan and Rogaly 2002). Therefore, labour mobility should be seen as 'the rule rather than the exception' (Breman 1996: 83).

Secondly, migration for work is thought to be detrimental to migrants, who often end up swelling the ranks of the urban poor –a phenomenon that Harris and Todaro classically described as the 'urbanisation of poverty'(1970).

Even where migration is profitable, the benefits are thought to occur to the detriment of social welfare in destination areas, through overcrowding and increased inequalities (Jacob 2008; Khan and Saluja 2007). However, recent studies have shown that while the outcomes depend on the context – especially the resources, both social and economic, that a household can command (Mosse et al 2002; Gardner and Osella 2003; Skeldon 2003; Kothari 2002; de Haan and Rogaly 2002) – and are not uniformly positive, labour migration tends to improve the lot of most – both the migrants and those left behind (Skeldon 2003; Deshingkar 2008; de Haan and Rogaly 2002). Furthermore, the problem posed by unacceptably substandard urban infrastructure and services is, yet again, a political issue as much as a financial or technical one, as regulations often serve to render poor urband wellers' neighbour-hoods informal or illegal rather than to improve them (Tacoli et al 2008). Thus, 'excessive' labour migration *per se* is not a cause of poverty, and, as Robert Skeldon put it, "there is a basic contradiction between attempts to control migration on the one hand, and poverty alleviation on the other"

(Skeldon 1997: 12). Another misconception, evident in what has been discussed above, which underpins the design of NREGA is the opposition between 'rural' and 'urban' livelihoods.

2.8 NREGA's Relative Failure: Accepted Explanations

While in some places –especially (though unevenly) in Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Gujarat and Rajasthan– and amongst Scheduled Castes (SC) and Scheduled Tribes (ST), the programme has been fairly successful and has employed over 40% of women (cf. PACS 2007; Khan and Saluja 2007; Jacob 2008; Marius-Gnanou 2008; Ministry of Rural Development 2012b), it is a matter for consensus that on the whole it has not had the expected impact (Jacob 2008; Khan and Saluja 2007; Das 2008; Datar 2007; Dhar 2011; Siddharta and Vanaik 2008). Every year since its launching in 2006, around 25% of the funds allocated to the programme are not being used, and though in absolute numbers the demand has increased (cf. Ministry of Rural Develop-ment 2012a, 2012b; Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation 2011: Table 35.1), so has the coverage –from 200 districts in 2006 to the entire country (upwards of 600 districts) today. Furthermore, one of the most compre-hensive studies since the infamous 'CAG Report' –an interim performance audit conducted by the Comptroller and Auditor General of India (CAG) in 2007, which described the programme as plagued with corruption and deficiencies–, carried out across nine states by the Centre for Science and Environment (CSE), shows that the much-hyped NREGA has limited takers and has failed to generate 'any major interest' among the rural poor (Das 2008). Demand for employment in the programme has been particularly low in poorer states, such as Bihar, Orissa and Uttar Pradesh, which have a high incidence of out-migration for work (Khan and Saluja 2007; Deshingkar 2008; Shah 2006). In short, it is widely acknowledged that on the whole, labour migration has not decreased significantly since NREGA came into effect (Khan and Saluja 2007; Datar 2007; Das 2008; Jacob 2008), and a number of explanations for this have been advanced.

The issue brought up most often in explaining the relative failure of NREGA is that of corruption. Indeed, stories of 'irregularities', of "workers not being paid their wages, of inflated muster rolls with nonexistent workers and [of] large amounts being swindled out of the programme" abound (Jacob 2008: 1; see, for example, Dhar 2011; Das 2008; PACS 2007; Singh 2009; Khan and Saluja 2007). Wages are another, often mentioned reason behind the lack of demand for NREGA employment. In most states, workers are paid less – when they are paid – than the statutory minimum wage, which varies from state to state (Das 2008; Rajalakshmi 2011; Singh 2009). Further-more, few states have been able to provide more than 50 average person days of employment per year to NREGA takers, let alone the 100 days to which every household is entitled as per the Act (Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation 2011: Table 35.1). It is also worth noting that the 100-day limit takes no account of the varying number of people (whether of working age or dependent) constituting one household; this implies potentially vast discrepancies in the relative value of the income provided by employment under the Act.

Technical issues have also been identified as a hindrance to providing enough work, especially in relation to the decentralised nature of the programme – the setting up of employment schemes is devolved to the Gram panchayats (GP). Indeed, it has been argued that the GPs do not have the means to design enough good projects and provide work for all employment seekers – they lack capacity building (Mukherjee and Ghosh 2009; Khan and Saluja 2007). Lastly, but importantly, it is said that "most people do not access the scheme [because] they have not heard of the programme" (Khan and Saluja 2007: 19; Jacob 2008). This point derives from the fact, mentioned earlier, that employment in NREGA is provided on a voluntary basis. What is more, applicants are expected to apply, and to receive a response, in written form

(Jacob 2008). As a consequence, the socially excluded and/or illiterate are at a disadvantage as they may not be aware of the opportunity to be provided work under NREGA. Lack of access to information may be a hindrance to more people applying for work.

2.9 Migration as a More Attractive Activity

The view of labour mobility as essentially 'involuntary' and driven solely by economic factors, which underpins the design of NREGA, has overshadowed the possibility that the limited impact of the programme may partly be a consequence of the perception of labour migration as more attractive than working 'at home', on several grounds other than economic. This is not to say that distress migration does not happen, or that economic factors are not important determinants; but those are only part of what constitutes labour mobility in India.

The first set of reasons why people may still prefer to migrate relates to social dimensions. A crucial factor is that NREGA provides unskilled work – which, in the worst cases, means "digging ditches and then refilling them at work sites" (Jacob 2008: 1) and in virtually any case means that the nature of the work undertaken will not enable takers to learn new skills. As such, it is unlikely to improve one's social capital (whether in Bourdieu's or in Putnam's sense), which, as was discussed in the first section, is often one of the reasons why poor people migrate (de Haan and Rogaly 2002; Gardner and Osella 2003). That the work will improve one's social position is equally improbable – it might even, in some cases, worsen it, where working under NREGA may be looked down on. This is another important factor since migration is often perceived as a way to challenge existing social relations (Gardner and Osella 2003; Shah 2006).

The second point relates to what may be described as the relationship between migration and 'modernity', or rather perceptions of modernity – from the perspective of the migrant –, and to the capacity of the poor to 'aspire' (Appadurai 2004). The design of NREGA stems from the assumption that all villagers want to work in or around the village and be involved in agriculture full time –that they want to go 'back to farming' (Shah in Indianomics 2011; cf. de Haan 1999; Deshingkar and Start 2003). This opposition between rural livelihoods and migration is false, and fails to grasp the role of wider notions of 'modernity' in which decisions to migrate are embedded – where modernity could be defined as 'a set of imaginings and beliefs about the way life should be' (Gardner and Osella 2003: xi). Indeed, as Robert Skeldon has it, it is often 'not absolute poverty as such that is significant in accounting for migration but whether people feel that they are poor' (Skeldon 2003:4, emphasis added). The spread of information about (supposed) conditions elsewhere – people's 'media scape' (Appadurai 1996) – can alter the meaning of 'poverty'. And, as Arjun Appadurai has it, "the poor, no less than any other group in society, do express horizons in choices made and choices voiced" (Appadurai 2004: 68). In other words, the rural poor too have dreams and aspirations – they do not just think in terms of survival. Often, migrants move even if they do not gain much – materially – from it (de Haan and Rogaly 2002; Shah 2006). This fact is often ignored in development discourses and welfare programmes, which may lead to design misconceived projects – as in the case of NREGA and its attempt to curb labour migration.

3. METHODOLOGY AND DATA BASE

3.1 Selection of the study Area

I have taken 30 states and UTs of India, states are selected on the basis of NREGA's effective implementation in their respective rural regions. Those states and union territories of India are selected where rural-urban migration is known to be rampant and where the NREGA has been implemented effectively. The study attempts to find explanatory variables

that affects rural-urban migration States taken for the study of migration stream from rural to urban areas (dependent upon the various explanatory factors) are following;

- Bihar
- Uttar Pradesh
- Odisha
- Chhattisgarh
- Jharkhand
- Rajasthan
- Assam
- Madhya Pradesh
- West Bengal
- Andhra Pradesh
- Tamil Nadu
- Kerala
- Haryana
- Karnataka
- Manipur
- Maharashtra
- Arunachal Pradesh
- Gujarat
- Punjab
- Himachal Pradesh
- Sikkim
- Meghalaya
- Mizoram
- Nagaland
- Tripura
- Uttarakhand
- Andaman & Nicobar Island

- Lakshdweep

- Puducherry

- Goa

3.2 Multiple Regression Model

Using OLS- Ordinary Least Squares, multiple linear regression model is used on the basis of cross section analysis of 30 states for the year 2010.

$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \mu$

Here

The regression model is as follows

Y = Number of Rural-urban migrant of the states and UTs taken for

study

X_1 = No of rural literates of the states and UTs selected.

X_2 = No of rural people living below poverty line in the states and

UTs.

X_3 = Rural population of the states and UTs in question.

X_4 = NREGA's employment provided to households (in lakhs) of

States and UTs taken.

X_5 = Rural urban wage difference of states and UTs concerned.

B_0 is an intercept

B_1 is coefficient of No of rural literates of the states and UTs.

B_2 is coefficient No of rural people living below poverty line in the States and UTs taken.

B_3 is coefficient of rural population of the states and UTs in question.

B_4 is coefficient of NREGA's employment provided to households in rural area (in lakhs) of various states and UTs.

B_5 is coefficient of rural urban wage difference of states and UTs concerned.

μ is error term.

3.3 HYPOTHESES

Testing the overall significance of the estimated multiple regression model, that is finding out if all the partial slope coefficients are simultaneously equal to zero.

$H_O; \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = \beta_4 = \beta_5 = 0$

(ie, all the slope coefficients are simultaneously zero) verses,

H_1 ; Not all slope coefficients are simultaneously zero.

NREGA plays a significant role in reducing the levels of rural-urban migration.

3.4 Database

The study uses secondary data obtained from various sources. State-wise data on rural-urban wage difference is obtained from Rural-Labour Enquiry (61st Round of N.S.S.), Report on Wages & Earnings of Rural Households, Employment provided to households person days under NREGA taken from www.nrega.nic.in; rural population of states drawn from census of India, 2011 respectively. Data on Number of rural living below poverty line and number of rural literates in the concerned states is obtained from Poverty Estimates For 2009-10 66th Round, Govt. of India, planning Commission. State-wise data on Rural-Urban Migration Stream as a dependent variable is taken from 'Migration In India' NSS 64th Round in June 2010. First I have derived the level of migration of states (rural + urban) on the basis of Migration rate (per 1000 persons) for each state/U.T.(rural+urban) of male+female given in the data. Afterwards the level of rural-urban migration can be obtained on the basis of four types of rural-urban migration streams (rural to rural; urban to rural; rural to urban; urban to urban) of states/u.t. distribution (per 1000) of internal migrants. Since the total number of migrants in the respective states is derived on the basis of population of the states given the migration rate (per 1000 persons) for each state/u.t. taken in the study.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction

The previous chapter presented the methodology and database used in this study. The major objective of this study, as mentioned in Chapter 1, is to establish the relationship of rural-urban migration stream with number of rural literates, number of rural living below poverty line, rural population, Nrega employment provided to households and lastly with rural urban wage difference using secondary data. The study uses cross-sectional data on 30 states in India for the period 2010-11.

Using econometric software 'SPSS 16', multiple linear regression equations are estimated. The states covered are Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Goa, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Kernataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Orissa, Punjab, Rajasthan, Sikkim, Tamilnadu, Tripura, Uttarakhand, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, A & N Islands, Lashadweep and Puducherry.

The present chapter is organised as follows: Section 5.2 discusses the result of F test, for testing the overall significance of sample data. Section 5.3 analyses the relationship of explanatory variables with the dependent variable rural-urban migration stream. Section 5.4 checks the correlation of Nrega Employment provided to households and rural urban migration. Section 5.5 concludes the chapter.

4.2 Result of the Test

The following table shows the result of the test while using multiple regression model on the basis of cross section analysis of 30 states, where nrega has been implemented and where has been the trend of rural-urban migration for last few years and considered to be illiterate, populated, poor and where the rural urban wage gap is significant. Result is derived by using econometric software "SPSS 16".

Descriptive statistics explaining rural-urban migration stream

Table 1

	Coefficient	Standard Error	t-Value	p-Value
Constant	-1.238E6	1.355E6	2.473	0.16
Explanatory variable				
No of rural literates	.494	.158	3.137	.004
Nrega employment provided to households	-.402	.213	-1.887	.071
Rural population	-.229	.090	-2.552	.017
No of rural people living below poverty line	.027	.031	.898	.378
Rural-urban wage difference	11080.259	10152.649	1.091	.286
R²	.627			
Adjusted R²	.549			
F value	8.072			.000
Total observation 30				

The dependent variable is rural-urban migration stream.

The estimated equation is obtained as

Y = -1.238E6 + .494RL +.027RBPL -.229RP -.402NE + 11080.259RUWD

 (1.355E6) (.158) (.031) (.090) (.213) (10152.649)

RL= No of Rural Literates

RBPL= No of Rural living below poverty line

RP = Rural Population

NE = Narega Employment provided to households

RUWD = Rural Urban Wage Difference

Figure in parenthesis represent standard error.

4.2.1 The F Test

This test is used for the analysis of variance approach to testing the overall significance of an observed multiple regression. Since

TSS = ESS + RSS, which decomposes the total sum of squares (TSS) into two components: explained sum of squares (ESS) and residual sum of squares (RSS). A study of these components of TSS is known as the analysis of variance (ANOVA). In this case, the F value is 8.072 (computed from data) exceeds the critical F value from the F table at 1 percent level of significance. Thus, the value of F test indicates that the model is significant at 1percent level. The value of R² is .627, which reveals that 63 percent of variation in dependant variable (rural-urban migration) is explained by independent variables (no of rural literates, no of rural people living below poverty line, rural population, nrega employment provided to households and rural urban wage difference). Values of R^2 in all cases are around 63%, suggesting a reasonable explanatory power of the models. The fit of the regressions is good as well.

4.2.2 Rural Literacy and Rural Urban Migration

Rural literacy rate is the significant factor in explaining the behaviour of dependent variable, rural urban migration

of states at the level of significance .004. The influence of education on migration of people from rural to urban area is found significant (p value= .004). Again t value is 3.137, the computed t value exceeds the critical t value at the chosen level of significance, we may reject the null hypothesis. Result can be interpreted in this way: more the rate of literacy in rural areas, more will be the rural- urban migration stream. Level of education is the guiding factor in increasing the level of migration from rural areas to urban area.

4.2.3 Rural Poverty and Rural Urban Migration

The number of rural people living below poverty line is not the significant factor in explaining the behaviour of rural-urban migration of states at the level of significance .378. The influence of rural people's poverty in states is found insignificant since the p value is .378. The result interprets that rural- urban migration has nothing to do with number of rural people living below poverty line. It doesn't mean that if more people are poor in the particular state, more migration will take place from rural area. Again t value is .898.

4.2.4 Rural Population and Rural-Urban Migration

The influence of rural population on rural-urban migration is found significant at 90 percent confident interval. If rural population of state is on high level, the number of migrant, who wants to migrate towards urban area will be automatically high, since the p value is .017. Mass migration is a phenomenon that is a consequence of increasing population in the rural India

4.2.5 NREGA Employment Provided to Households and Rural-Urban Population

NREGA employment generation (started in 2005) across the country has not been a significant factor in influencing the trend of rural urban migration in various states, since the level of significance is .071. It meant rural-urban migration has nothing to do with the NREGA employment provided to households in rural areas correlation between NREGA employment generation in rural areas and rural-urban migration is .116, which shows that there is no correlation between them.

4.2.6 Rural Urban Wage Difference and Rural-Urban Migration

Even rural urban wage difference is not a significant factor in explaining the behaviour of rural- migration from the states, since p value is .286. It meant even though the rural urban wage gap is more or less, it is not going to effect the trend of migration from rural area to urban area in case of India, which comes under the category of underdeveloped, though developing.

4.3 Conclusions

The result of test shows that only two explanatory factors, number of rural literates and rural population are significant in explaining the behaviour of dependent factor rural-urban migration stream across the rural areas of India. On the other hand, number of rural living below poverty line, nrega employment provided to household in rural areas and rural urban wage difference has nothing to do in influencing the level of rural-urban migration stream.

5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 NREGA's Failure to Recognise the Poor's 'Capacity to Aspire'

One of the main objectives of the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) is a

significant reduction in labour migration through the provision of locally available work in rural areas, but in spite of some successes, the programme did not do well in its impact as expected. NREGA's limited impact partly stems from a misconception of labour migration – as a poverty 'problem' and as merely a product of 'push-and-pull' economic factors. It assumes that farming is what 'the poor' really want, establishing poverty as chiefly a rural problem to be tackled by rural development. Labour mobility is not driven solely by economic considerations, there are two sets of reasons why people still prefer to migrate; namely social factors and evolving perceptions of modernity. The poor people too have aspirations, which are not restricted to survival matters. NREGA has benefitted those with little or no access to positive migration opportunities, especially Sceduled castes and Tribes, but is unlikely to succeed in curbing labour mobility significantly. It may be a good way to curb distress migration. This can also supplemented by the fact that migration rate in rural areas was lowest among the scheduled tribe (ST), nearly 24 per cent as per NSS 64th round on "Migration in India".

But it too early to decide about MNREGA, it can have significant positive impact on seasonal rural-urban migrations by providing rural workers with employment during the lean season. This will reduce the problems of excessive population pressures in Indian cities as surplus rural labour will find employment in their own villages. MGNREGA will also have an impact on permanent migrations trends. While it is difficult to ascertain what the exact impact will be, one can assume that the created infrastructure and the increased activity in the rural economy due to increased purchasing power will lead to higher rates of permanent job creation and thus mitigating the urgency to migrate.

5.2 Education Breeds the Impulse to Migrate

Educated rural communities are more prone to migrate. Their livelihood activities are no longer confined to farming and are increasingly being diversified through rural-to-urban and international migration. With the development of trade and industry and the awareness produced by the mass media, rural literate people have a more valid reason to shift towards the urban areas in order to improve their standard of living and to search for better livelihood opportunities. The NSSO in its 64th round explored the significant trend that for rural male, migration rate was lowest (nearly 4 per cent) among the 'not literates', and it was nearly 14 per cent among those with educational level 'graduate and above'.

5.3 Much Pressure on Land Gives Rise to Rural-Urban Migration

States like U.P, Orissa, Bihar, M.P., where the rural population is on the higher side, an abundance of labour, and low productivity in agriculture and limited development of non farm, people from rural areas prefer to go towards town or cities. Rural people migrate to urban areas to get rid of rural unemployment and underemployment. Backward states have a surplus of unproductive labour in the agricultural sector. surplus labour from traditional agricultural sector is transferred to the modern industrial sector whose growth over time absorbs the surplus labour, promotes industrialization and stimulates sustained development. More rural population is an alarming situation. Traditionally, agriculture and related cottage industries were the only major professions in the rural areas.

These professions could not absorb the ever increasing population in the rural areas. Loss of job opportunities in agriculture is the primary factor of driving people away from agriculture. Agrarian crisis can be gauged from the fact that 240, 000 debt-ridden farmers committed suicide between 1995 and 2009. There is urgent need to slow the rate of migration from rural to urban areas to strengthen the agriculture. Thus, there is need for on-farm and off-farm rural employment to combat rural poverty and to secure adequate livelihood within the households of smallholders and land-less agricultural labourers.

5.4 Limitation of Study

The lack of exact official data on migration is a matter that should be corrected as soon as possible as it is quite important to quantify this as accurately as possible as rural-urban migration can become quite a problem for both the source and the destination areas.

As per the economists and development experts – migration is essential for development and it is a desirable phenomenon; but what is not desirable is the distressed migration found across the nation resulting in over-crowding of cities. But there exists some social factors apart from such economic factors which also play an important role in explaining the nature and stream of rural- urban migration such as similar language which operating mutually both at origin and destination places, distance between the places, the mindset and aspirations of migrants etc.

Thus, mass migration from BHARAT to INDIA is a phenomenon that is a consequence of various problems in the rural India. But, this is a wrong notion which can lead to the destruction of agriculture on the whole, almost or completely damaging "BHARAT". If the village perishes, India will perish too. It will be no more India. It is possible only when the government's policies for the development in rural areas, with the prospect of fewer leakages, can help translate outlays into outcomes. Hence, first understanding the nature of mass migration from BHARAT to INDIA can be more helpful in rooting out the problem and seeking out the solution for the policy makers for the bright future of rural India.

CONCLUSIONS

As per the economists and development experts – migration is essential for development and it is a desirable phenomenon; but what is not desirable is the distressed migration found across the nation resulting in over-crowding of cities. But there exists some social factors apart from such economic factors which also play an important role in explaining the nature and stream of rural- urban migration such as similar language which operating mutually both at origin and destination places, distance between the places, the mindset and aspirations of migrants etc. Thus, mass migration from BHARAT to INDIA is a phenomenon that is a consequence of various problems in the rural India. But, this is a wrong notion which can lead to the destruction of agriculture on the whole, almost or completely damaging "BHARAT". If the village perishes, India will perish too. It will be no more India.

It is possible only when the government's policies for the development in rural areas, with the prospect of fewer leakages, can help translate outlays into outcomes. Hence, first understanding the nature of mass migration from BHARAT to INDIA can be more helpful in rooting out the problem and seeking out the solution for the policy makers for the bright future of rural India.

REFERENCES

1. Akhtar S M Jawed and Azeez N P Abdul,(2012), 'Rural Employment Guarantee Programme and Migration', *Kurukshetra,* Ministry of Rural Development, Vol. 60 No.4, Pages 11-15.

2. Banerjee Biswajee, Kanbur S. M (1981), 'On The Specification and Estimation of Macro Rural-urban Migration Functions: With An Application to Indian Data', *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics,* Vol. 43, Issue 1, Pages 7-29.

3. Basu D.N., Kashyap S.P(1992), 'Rural Non- Agricultural Employment in India; Role of Development Process and Rural-urban Employment Linkages', *Economic and Political Weekly.*

4. Connell, Johan *et al (1976),* "Migration from Rural Areas: The Evidence from Village Studies", *Oxford University Press*, New Delhi.

5. Fei, J. C. H., & Ranis, G. (1964). 'A theory of economic development'. *American Economic Review*, 51, 533– 565.

6. Gary S. Fields(1975), 'Rural-urban Migration, Urban Unemployment And Underemployment, and Job-Search Activity in LDCs', *The Journal of Development Economics*, Vol.2, Issue 2, Pages 165-187.

7. Gupta, Manash Ranjan (1993), 'Rural-urban Migration, Informal Sector and Development Policies: A Theoretical Analysis', *Journal of Development Economics,* vol.41, Issue 1, Pages 137-151.

8. Hare, D. (1999). 'Push versus pull factors in migration outflows and returns: Determinants of migration status and spell duration among China's rural population'. *Journal of Development Studies*, 35(3), 45– 72.

9. Harris, J. R. and Todaro, M. P. (1970, March). 'Migration, unemployment, and development: A two-sector analysis'. *American Economic Review*, 60, 126– 142.

10. Hazra Anupam,(2012), 'Rural India: Still Floating Towards Cities' *Kurukshetra,* Ministry of Rural Development, Vol. 60 No.4, Pages 3-5.

11. Jorgenson, D. W. (1961). 'The development of a dual economy'. *Economic Journal,* 71, 309–334.

12. Kelley, A. C., Williamson, J. G., & Cheetham, R. J. (1972). *Dualistic economic development: Theory and history.Chicago:* University of Chicago Press.

13. Knight, J., & Song, L. (1999). *The rural– urban divide: Economic disparities and interactions in China.* Oxford University Press.

14. Kundu A, 'Trends and Structure of Employment in the 1990's: Implication for Urban Growth'(1997), *Economic and Political Weekly.*

15. Lewis, W. A. (1955). 'The theory of economic growth'. *Homewood, IL: Irwin*.

16. Mazumdar Dipak,(1986), 'RURAL-Urban Migration In Developing Countries' *Handbook of Regional and Urban Economics.*

17. Michal J. Greenwood (1971), 'A Regression Analysis of Migration to Urban Areas of A Less Developed Country: The Case of India', *The Journal of Regional Science*, Vol. 11, Issue 2, Pages 253- 262.

18. Mills, E. S., & Becker, C. M. (1986). *Studies in Indian urban development*. New York: Oxford University Press.

19. Ray Debraj (2012), 'Rural and Urban', *Development Economics,* Nineteenth Impression 2012, Oxford University Press, Pages 345-397.

20. Solinski Thomas (2012), 'NREGA and labour Migration In India: Is Village Life What The Rural Poor Want', *The South Asianist,* Vol. 1, No. 1, Pages 17-30.

21. Todaro, M. P. (1969, March). 'A model of labor migration and urban. unemployment in less developed countries' *American Economic Review*, 59, 138– 148.

22. Zhao, Y. (1999). 'Leaving the countryside: Rural – urban migration decisions in China'. *American Economic Review: Papers and Proceedings,* 89(2), 276– 280.

23. Govt. of India, Planning Commission March 2012,

24. Poverty Estimates For 2009-10, 66th round.

25. "Migration In India" NSSO 64th round,(July 2007-June 2008) June 2010.

26. India Guide : Population of India 2010.

27. Rural-Labour Enquiry (61st round of NSS), Report on Wages and Earnings of Rural Households.

28. www.nrega.nic.in