Demography India Vol 22. No.2 (1993), pp. 203-210

K. G. Selvaraj* and P. S. S. Rao*

Household Migration—Urbanization and Consequences

Introduction

URBANIZATION in India has progressed greatly, almost doubled by population in the last two decades comprising 25.7 percent in 1991 from 19.9 percent in 1971 (Nanda 1991). Despite several programmes for rural development, there are still many rural-urban differentials in economic opportunities such as non-agricultural employment and earnings (Robert and Smith 1977). Better facilities for higher education and training in the urban areas are also factors conducive to rural emigration among youths (Odaman 1989). In rural areas, school drop outs are reluctant to return to agriculture and prefer to remain idle or migrate to urban areas in search of jobs for advancing the family's economic status (Urzua 1981).

It is estimated that about 200 million people live in the cities and towns of India (Planning Commission, 1985) and 30 per cent of them live below poverty line in poorly serviced chawls, in unhygienic slums and in illegal squatter colonies. The entire sample of children engaged in unrecognized sectors were school drop outs in a micro level study on child labour at Madras and Vellore (Srivastava and Sherief 1991).

It is essential for proper urban planning to understand the migration intentions, the extent of net migration and effective increase due to migration. Both macro and micro level studies at household level are necessary for this purpose. The present paper describes the migration patterns and relationships to specific socio-demographic factors based on longitudinal studies, carried out in North Arcot District of Tamil Nadu, Southern India.

Materials and Methods

The longitudinal studies in human reproduction were started in 1969 in North Arcot Ambedkar district of Tamil Nadu state in India (3.76 million population-1971) by the Department of Biostatistics, Christian Medical College at Vellore, the district headquarters. This is one of the backward districts of the state in which rainfall is scanty and without irrigation facility of major rivers. During most of the year the weather conditions are dry and incidence of drought periods is not uncommon in certain years. Agriculture, weaving and tanning are some of the common occupations in the district apart from the government services. The headquarters of the district, Vellore town (1,39,082 population-1971) is an important business center.

Representative segments of Vellore town were randomly selected to provide an urban sample of 45,000 population. From a nearby rural block (K.V. Kuppam, in Gudiyatham

* Department of Biostatistics, Christian Medical College, Vellore, Tamil Nadu-632 002.

Taluk), contiguous areas were chosen to provide a sample of 55,000 population to represent the rural area (Rao and Inbaraj 1973). After a detailed demographic survey at the end of the year 1969, all residential houses were visited by trained women interviewers every five weeks throughout the study period. Each interviewer was assigned a geographically defined area containing about 4000 population in the rural areas and 5000 population in urban. Birth, death and migration details were obtained through the pre-tested proforma when the interviews were conducted for other aspects of the studies on human reproduction. Sample households were re-interviewed independently by the supervisory personnel for checking the accuracy of data.

The migration details collected on pre-tested and standardized forms provide an excellent opportunity to study the information about movement at household level in both rural and urban areas. Analyses were carried out for inmigration (immigration) and outmigration (emigration) relating to the type of movement, streams, reason of the movement, and distance of the movement.

Migration was defined as a geographical movement either as a single person or as a family involving a change from a usual place of residence (Misra 1980). Migration types inmigration (immigration) and outmigration (emigration) were defined as migration of one or more person(s) from a family moved into the reference household or moved out of the reference household respectively for a year or longer respectively. 'Within' migration was defined to be the movement within the interviewer's geographically defined area and 'outside' migration as beyond the interviewer's area.

The streams of migration were considered in both rural and urban with reference to the household under observation. The distance of migration was classified into shortest if within 15 kilometres, medium distance if 15 to 75 kilometres and the longest distance if more than 75 kilometres. The migration rates were computed for thousand population per year.

Results and Findings

The migration rates by type (immigration and emigration) for rural and urban areas are presented in Table 1. During the four years of study(l.1.1970 to31.12.1973), in rural areas there were2975 immigrations (13.5 per thousand per year) and 4150 outmigrations(18.9 per thousand per year). There were 4285 immigrations (23.8 per thousand per year) and 5045 outmigrations(28perthousandper year) respectively in urban areas. In all the years of study emigration was markedly higher than immigration in the rural but among the urban migrants the magnitudes were not much apparent. Urban rates were almost one and half times as compared with rural movements among both immigrants and emigrants (Table 1) but as will be shown later the urban migrations were mostly internal.

In Table 2 migration rates by streams and type of migration (within and outside movements) are shown.

Within Movement

By streams of migration, 'within movement' in urban to urban migration stream, three times higher immigration and emigration occurred than in rural to rural migration stream.

TABLE 1: MIGRATION RATES PER THOU SAND POPULATION PER YEAR BY TYPE OF MIGRATION

Rural					*Urban*			
	Immigration		*Emigration*		*Immigration*		*Emigration*	
	No.	*Rate*	*No.*	*Rate*	*No.*	*Rate*	*No.*	*Rate*
1970	632	11.5	1,047	19.0	1,235	27.4	1,651	36.7
1971	791	14.4	945	17.2	928	20.6	1,117	24.8
1972	752	13.7	1,062	19.3	1,064	23.6	1,037	23.0
1973	800	14.5	1,096	19.9	1,058	23.5	1,240	27.6
Overall	2,975	13.5	4,150	18.9	4,285	23.8	5,045	28.0

Immigration and emigration rates were similar for 'within movements' regarding rural to rural and urban to urban migration streams.

Outside Movement

In rural areas immigrants from other rural areas (4.3 per thousand) were almost equal to immigrants from other urban areas (4.1 per thousand). As far as emigrants were concerned, '{hey emigrate in higher proportion to other urban areas (7.6 per thousand) than to other rural areas (6.4 per thousand). In urban areas, a large part of immigrants were from other urban areas (6.3 per thousand) than from other rural areas (0.9 per thousand). Similarly, emigrants move to the other urban places three times more than to the other rural places.

Migration by Reason

The reasons for migration are shown in Table 3 by type of migration. In the rural sector, marriage was the prime reason for immigrants (4.0 per thousand) and for emigrants it was for job secured (6.4 per thousand). In urban sector, both immigrants (13.3 per thousand) and

TABLE 2: MIGRATION RATES PER THOUSAND POPULATION PER YEAR BY STREAMS OF MIGRATION

Stream	*Immigration*		*Emigration*	
	No.	*Rate*	*No.*	*Rate*
Within movement				
Rural to Rural	1,134	5.2	1,075	4.9
Urban to Urban	2,987	16.6	3,068	17.0
Outside Movement				
Rural to Rural	936	4.3	1,405	6.4
Rural to Urban	167	0.9	1,670	7.6
Urban to Rural	905	4.1	467	2.6
Urban to Urban	1,131	6.3	1,510	8.4

emigrants (14.7 per thousand) migrated in large proportion for better or own house. The next immediate reason among rural immigrants (3.6 per thousand) and emigrants (3.1 per thousand) was to settle down. Marriage was equally subsequent immediate reason in urban areas for both immigrants and emigrants.

Migration by Distance

The migration rates by distance and reasons among the immigrants are given in Table4. When the reasons were analyzed by the distance of migration in rural areas, the prime

TABLE 3: MIGRATION RATES PER THOUSAND POPULATION PER YEAR BY REASON

Reason	*Rural*				*Urban*			
	Immigration		*Emigration*		*Immigration*		*Emigration*	
	No.	*Rate*	*No.*	*Rate*	*No.*	*Rate*	*No.*	*Rate*
Better House	503	2.3	506	2.3	2395	13.3	2,676	14.9
Marriage	889	4.0	529	2.4	589	3.3	771	4.3
Seeking job	.109	0.5	450	2.0	166	0.7	95	0.4
Secured job	411	1.9	1,402	6.4	626	3.5	782	4.3
To Settele Down	799	3.6	689	3.1	240	1.3	285	1.3
To Join Spouse	213	1.0	400	1.8	125	0.7	284	1.6
Separated	26	0.1	118	0.5	114	0.6	162	0.9
Other Reasons	25	0.1	66	0.3	30	0.2	40	0.2

reason was marriage (3.3 per thousand) among immigrants of shortest distance (within IS kms)and in urban areas the reason was for better or own house(12.6perthousand). Moderate (15-75 kms) distance immigrants moved to rural areas predominately to settle down (1.3 per thousand) and in urban it was for job secured (1.5perthousand). For largest distance (more than 75 kms) immigrants, the prime reason was to settle down (1.0 per thousand) whereas in urban it was secured job (1.5 per thousand).

The migration rates by distance and reasons among the emigrants are presented in Table 5. Among the emigrants, the shortest distance migrants move prominently for marriage (2.7 per thousand) but in urban they move for better house (14.2per thousand). The marriage (3.0 per thousand was the reason for the most medium distance emigrants in rural areas whereas secured job (1.9 per thousand) for the urban emigrants. The longest distance emigrants in rural areas migrate for the prime reason of settling down (1.7 per thousand), whereas it is for secured job in urban areas (2.3 per thousand).

Discussion

The present study confirms higher rural to urban emigration as compared to urban to rural immigration throughout the years studied. Excessive rural to urban migration is an important contributor to urban population problems (Bose 1991),which cannot be ignored. Rapid

TABLE 4: IMMIGRATION RATES PER THOUSAND POPULATION PER YEAR BY REASON AND DISTANCE*

Reason	*Rural*						*Urban*					
	<15		15-75		>75		<15		15-75		>75	
	No.	*Rate*	*No.*	*Rate*	*No.*	*Rate*	*No.*	*Rate*	*No.*	*Rate*	*No*	*Rate*
Better House	325	1.5	116	0.5	83	0.4	2,276	12.6	83	0.5	59	0.3
Marriage	726	3.3	103	0.5	74	0.3	227	1.3	252	1.4	131	0.7
Seeking Job	37	0.2	47	0.2	26	0.1	33	0.2	83	0.5	51	0.3
Secured Job	132	0.4	221	1.0	74	0.3	63	0.4	265	1.5	275	1.5
To Settle Down	258	1.2	279	1.3	216	1.0	115	0.6	42	0.2	46	0.3
To Join Spouse	58	0.3	89	0.4	68	0.2	51	0.3	32	0.2	40	0.2
Separated	11	0.1	5	0.0	5	0.0	91	0.5	15	0.1	10	0.1
Other Reasons	12	0.1	5	0.0	7	0.0	26	0.1	6	0.0	8	0.0

* Distance (in km)

urbanization also has implications to human well-being and environmental quality (Imtiazuddin andTanvir 1990). Majority of ever increasing rural to urban migrants in developing countries ace those belonging to lower status and are thus likely to settle down in low income neighbourhoods (Michael 1987), such as slums and shanty towns. Consequently, they continue and also become much more vulnerable to the problems of ecological degeneration and environmental pollution (Kundu 1990). Rural migrants to urban areas invariably face unemployment, underemployment, delinquency and housing problems (Odaman 1989) and generate pavement dwellers and street children, who turn out to be the root cause of crime

TABLE 5 : EMIGRATION RATES PER THOUSAND POPULATION PER YEAR BY REASON AND DISTANCE

Reason	*Rural*						*Urban*					
	< 15		15-75		>75		<15		15 -75		>75	
	No.	*Rate*	*No.*	*Rate*	*No.*	*Rate*	*No.*	*Rate*	*No.*	*Rate*	*No.*	*Rate*
Better House	330	1.5	52	0.2	15	0.1	2,558	14.2	53	0.3	38	0.2
Marriage	595	2.7	663	3.0	199	0.9	330	1.8	241	1.4	271	1.5
Seeking Job	57	0.3	138	0.6	54	0.2	12	0.1	32	0.2	53	0.3
Secured Job	162	0.7	485	2.2	381	1.7	74	0.4	335	1.9	430	2.3
To Settle Down	210	1.0	243	1.1	99	0.4	69	0.4	128	0.7	42	0.2
To Join Spouse	57	0.3	105	0.5	142	0.6	108	0.6	69	0.4	106	0.6
Seperated	52	0.2	24	0.1	11	0.1	117	0.7	26	0.1	12	0.1
Other Reasons	15	0.1	25	0.1	16	0.1	11	0.1	12	0.1	11	0.1

and violence in major cities. Rational planning in both rural and urban areas, taking into account the basic needs of migrants in terms of housing, sanitation, education and recreation, are crucial to promote social health.

The study area is noted for high inbreeding levels (Rao and Inbaraj 1977), where a high percentage of consanguineous marriages occur within the village or at a distance of less than 15 kms. This shows that the selection of the spouse from amongst relations was usually intensely local. In rare instances when a marriage takes place with a relative living in a distant village, social reasons are usually given by way of explanations (Boyce *et al.* 1967). Thus, large scale rural to urban migration in our area will alter age-old custom of consanguinity in these populations. Greater marital distance due to migration results in introduction of deleterious genes into their genetic pool (Rao and Murthy 1986) and implications of such changes should be considered.

Immigrants in our study area returned from long distances (above 15 kms) mostly for the reason to settle down. Following decades of large scale rural to urban migration, in some developing countries, there has been recent growth in migration from urban to suburban or to rural areas (Day *etal.* 1987). Suchurban to rural migrants who returned to their home areas on completion of sojourns have put to use the cash from urban (Caldwell 1969). Although such future moves including return migration have far reaching implications for rural development efforts (John 1986), these are not likely to happen soon. Many of the migrants in Papua New Guinea were circular migrants and restless migrants with their dependents moving between non-village destinations (Walsh 1987). In our study, the emigrants from urban areas move to other urban areas in larger proportion than to other rural areas. The characteristics and the relationships of migration at household level by age and sex composition will be reported in a later communication.

It has been highlighted in the present study that the reason to emigrate to distances above 15 kms was for job secured. The implication of this is essentially to alter work participation in rural areas. Even though the overall (both sexes) work participation rate in India increased gradually during the last three decades from 34.2 to 36.7 and 37.7 percent, the rural male work participation has declined slowly from 53.78 to 53.77 and 52.5 percent whereas in urban it remained around 49 percent (Rajalakshmi 1992). The depletion of population in this manner can only be controlled with policies to develop the rural areas, and maintain its resources. The rural area loses its development potential through a depletion of the able bodied and educated youths and results in depression of agricultural output and increase in the dependency (Odaman 1989). The rural labour is one of the main concerns of the Government of India who has implemented a large number of employment generation programmes to uplift the weaker sections in terms of Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP), fixing minimum wages, rural manpower programme, food for work programme, national rural employment programme and 'Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (Anonymous 1992). Since these are part of the unorganized sector which constitutes 90 per cent of general work force, the benefits available to the organized sector are beyond the reach of the unorganized labour (Rasool 1992). Many of these schemes are entrusted to first grade contractors who employ non-local labour groups and they neither pay the minimum wages nor distribute subsidized food grains as part of the wages (Galab 1993). Moreover, majority of the rural educated unemployed \

youth are matriculates, without professional education, untrained, belong to families with low to medium socio-economic status and possess low innovation proneness (Sharma and Sheharawatl991).

In Tamil Nadu, the IRDP has generated an employment assistance ratio as 0.30 (Rs. 100 per 30 man hours of employment), a considerable increase due to financial or material assistance (Vijayakumar 1992). The same programme was found to increase 10 percent higher income in rural areas of Andhra Pradesh (Ethirajulu 1992). Even then the programmes did not attract the work force since the sector is unorganized and without consistent income and appropriate training facilities for educated youth or school drop outs at village levels. A national level rural technology organization may be set up to take care of various aspects of modernization of the rural sector. The potential of employment in non-agricultural rural jobs should be fully explored in order to accommodate those who cannot find work in the land-based occupation.

References

Anonymous, 1992, Organizing the rural unorganized labour. *Yojana* **36:** 17-19.

Bose, A.. 1991, *Population of India. 1991 Census Results and Methodology. India.* B.R. Publishing Corporation.

Boyce, A. J., Kuchman, C. F. and Harrison, G. A.. 1967. Neighborhood knowledge and the distribution of marriage distances. *Annals of Human Genetics* **30:** 335.

Caldwell, J. C., 1967, *African Rural-urban Migration. The Movement ofGhana Towns.* **Australian University Press. Day, R.. Chand. H., Dasgupta. Datta. S..Nugent, S, andJefferey. B., 1987. Instability in rural urban migration.**

Economic Journal. ***91*** (338) : 940-950. Ethirajulu. A.. 1992. Impact of IRDP on income and employment generation: A micro level study. *Yojana,* 36(18): 13-16 Galab. S.. 1993. Rural employment programs. Case for involving voluntary organizations. *Economic and Political Weekly* 28(10): 409-413. Imtiazuddin, H. and Tanvir, K.. 1990. On the industrialization of small towns in Pakistan. *Asia Pacific Population Journal,* 5 (3): 51-62. John, 0., 1986. Rural orientation return migration and future movements of urban migrants: A study of Kisumu Town.

Kenya. *African Urban Quarterly* 1(3-4): 207-219. **Kundu. A.. 1990.** Micro level **environment in urban planning**—Issues **concerning** access **of poor to basic amenities.**

Demography India 19 (1): 79-91 Michael. C.A., 1987. Slums and squatter areas as extroports for rural urban migrants in a less developed society. *Social Forces* **66** (2): 427-445.

Misra, B. D., 1980. *An Introduction to the Study of Population.* South Asian Publishers Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi. Nanda, A. R., 1991. *Provisional Population Totals. Rural-Urban Distribution. Series I. Paper 2 of! 991. Census of India.* Registrar General of India. Odaman. 0. M., 1989. Migration and rural development: An empirical investigation of migrants participation in rural community development projects in Nigeria. *Demography India,* **18:** 191-199. Planning Commission, India. 1985, Report of Task Force on Financing ofUrban Development. New Delhi. Rajalakshmi. R .R.. 1992. Workers in India. *Social Welfare, **19*** (2): 3-6. Rao, P. S. S. and Inbaraj, S. G., 1973, Some aspects of pregnancy terminations in a South Indian population. *Indian Journal of Medical Research.* **61:** 1247-1258.

_____ and ____ . 1977, Inbreeding in Tamil Nadu, South India. *Social Biology24:* 281-288. Rao. V. V. and Murthy. .1. S.. 1986. Mortality as disclosed by inbreeding in different castes ofAndhra Predesh. *Human Biology* **58** (5): 699-708.

Rasool- S. A., 1991. Unorganized workers form ninety percent of India's work force. *Yojana,* 37: 13-14. Robert, L. B. and Smith. .1.. 1977. Community statisfaction. expectations of moving and migration. *Demography*

14 (2): 147-167.
Sharma. R. K. and Shehrawat, P. S., 1991, Helping rural youth find employment. *Yojana* 38: 10-11. Srivastava, S. and Sherief, H.. 1991. Child labour in Madras and Vellore. *Social Welfare* **38** (6): 14-16. 30. Urzua, 1981. *Population Redistribution Policies in Development Planning.* Population Studies, 75. United Nations

Department of International Economic and Social Affair, New York. Vijayakumar, A.. 1992. Impact ofIRDP on income and employment a case study. *Yojana*, 35(24): 17-18. Walsh, C.. 1987. On the move: Migration and development in Papua New Guinea. *Asia Pacific Population Journal*, 2(1): 21-40.