Journal of Civil Engineering and Environmental Technology
p-ISSN: 2349-8404; e-ISSN: 2349-879X; Volume 4, Issue 6; October-December, 2017, pp. 551-556

http://www.krishisanskriti.org/Publication.html

The Duration of Rural Urban Migration: The Analysis and Understanding Based on Socio-ecological Perspectives

Anannya Chakraborty[1] and SK Acharya[2]

[1,2]Department of Agricultural Extension, BCKV, Mohanpur, Nadia, Pin code-741252
E-mail: [1]chakraborty.ext@gmail.com, [2]acharya09sankar@gmail.com

Abstract—*Rural-urban migration implies geo-spatial movement of population from the countryside/ rural areas into the cities, often the metropolitan cities of a country. Nearly 29% of rural male migrants had migrated due to employment related reasons and 91% of the rural female migrants due to marriage. (National Sample Survey 64th Round.2010) The majority of migrants move because of economic reasons (e.g., Niimi et al. 2009; UNFPA 2006, 2010; Dang et al. 2016). The present study is conducted in Ghoragachha village under Saguna gram panchayet, Nadia, West Bengal. The number of respondents were 60 and they were selected randomly.The data were collected through pilot survey, structured interview and focused group interview. The statistical tools used for data analysis are correlation coefficient, step down regression, path analysis and factor analysis. Here in this study we can see that Age at the time of migration-(X1), family Education(in years)(X3), family size-(X5), number of years since Marriage-(X6), Cosmopoliteness(X13), Per capita income from Agriculture and livestock (X16)are some of the variables those have created a significant impact on the duration of migration. The variables which were retained after step down regression is Cosmopoliteness (X13) that means this is the most important causal variable which affect the consequent variable.*

Keywords*: Cosmo politeness, migration, rural, urban.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Hossain *et.al.* (2001) conducted a study in Bangladesh. His study mainly focuses on differentials and determinants of migration and finds that persons involved in the process of rural out-migration are adults and more educated. Most of them were engaged in studies or unemployed before migration. Another study of Pandey (2002) finds that the expanding employment opportunity and higher wages in urban area and declining employment opportunities and relatively lovey wages in the villages are respectively the pull and push factors in the rural-urban migration. Shrivastava *et.al.* (2013) examined the factors by primary survey of migrants using a probate model. Analysis indicated that the lower the level of education of the migrant, the greater the importance of the push factors whereas with increasing level of education of the migrant, pull factors become more important in migration. So, here we can see that the main factors behind rural to urban migration are education, high wages, lavish urban life style, lower income in villages and so on. Today a farmer is finding farming as least beneficial and doesn't want their children to continue with the contemporary occupation.

2. OBJECTIVES

The present research has got the following objectives for proper justification of the topic and for bringing out the expected outcome-

General objective:

Rural Urban Migration: The understanding and analysis on socio-ecological perspectives

Specific Objectives:

- To build up concept rural urban migration, factors and consequences.
- To identify socio-ecological and socio-economic factors contributing to rural urban migration.
- To estimate socio-economic and socio-ecological on the consequent factor, Nature, Level and Direction of migration.

- To generate some micro-level policy implications, from this empirical study as applicable to socio-ecological setting having similarity with research location.

Research Setting

The area of investigation of this study is situated in the state of West Bengal located in the eastern part of India. The state of West Bengal in eastern India has a unique social and ecological background which influences the living standard and behavioural patterns of the people in many ways. The area of investigation belongs to the Haringhata block in Nadia district. The area of the study in village Ghoragachha under Rautari gram panchayat.

Research Methodology

State, district, sub division, block, panchayet and village is selected through purposive sampling. Sixty respondents are selected through random sampling. Here, in this study we have considered 19 independent variables against one dependent variable that is Duration of migration(in years**)** (Y).First of all 5% of the total sample (i.e. 3) has selected randomly for pilot study. These respondents are eventually discarded from main sample to reduce the sampling error. Then the rest respondents are interviewed with the help of an interview schedule listed with some specific and relevant questions. This interview has done with rapt attention and care so that putting word in mouth effect, anypersonal or communal biasness couldn't take place.

Result and Discussion

The qualitative data is quantified using specific numerical procedure. Then the quantified data were put under five statistical analysis that are- co-efficient of co-variance, step down regression, canonical co-variate analysis, path analysis and factor analysis.

The findings and their revelations are discussed here under-

Table 1: Coefficient of Correlation (r): Y: Duration of migration (in years) vs. 19 independent variables(x_1-x_{19}).

Sl. No	Variables	R value	remarks
1	Age at the time of migration-(X1)	0.384	**
2	schooling of Migrant(number of years)-(X2)	-0.104	
3	family Education(in years)-(X3)	-0.307	*
4	Caste-(X4)	0.164	
5	family size-(X5)	-0.281	*
6	number of years since Marriage-(X6)	-0.681	**
7	change in number of occupations after migration-(X7)	0.223	
8	number of source information acquired-(X8)	-0.157	
9	number of source of money for migration-(X9)	0.13	
10	family material possession-(X10)	-0.065	
11	family house type-(X11)	-0.191	
12	family Social participation-(X12)	-0.173	
13	Cosmopoliteness-(X13)	0.653	* *
14	mass media exposure-(X14)	0.058	
15	Per capita area(acre)-(X15)	0.064	
16	Per capita income from Agriculture and livestock -(X16)	0.455	* *
17	Per capita income from other source-(X17)	-0.173	
18	Per capita annual Expenditure on education-(X18)	0.172	
19	per capita annual other Expenditures-(X19)	0.075	

r>0.250 and 0.320 are significant at 5% and 1% level respectively

Results:

Table 6.2 presents the coefficient of correlation betweenY1: Duration of migration (in years) vs. 19 independent variables(x1-x19). It has been found that following variables viz.Age at the time of migration-(X1),family Education(in years)-(X3), family size-(X5), number of years since Marriage-(X6), Cosmopoliteness-(X13) and Per capita income from Agriculture and livestock -(X16) have recorded significant correlation with the dependent variable.

Revelation:

The result reveals that duration of migration is higher for the respondent who are relatively older with higher family having lower educational score which shows downside of options leading to lesser choice but to stay long in migration process and also the duration of migration is higher for those having lower profile of marriage in addition Cosmo politeness helps easy compatibility to community. The respondent migrating because their income from farm enterprise comprising of crop and livestock is low this may act as push factor to stay long time in migration process.

Table 2: Regression Analysis, Y1:Duration of migration(in years)vs 19 Causal variables(x_1-x_{19})

Sl no.	Variables	BETA	BETA × R	REG COEF-B	S E OF B	T-VAL OF B
1	X1: Age at the time of migration	-0.018	-1.062	-0.015	0.128	0.118
2	X2: schooling of Migrant(number of years)	-0.055	0.896	-0.109	0.245	0.444
3	X3: family Education(in years)	-0.04	1.905	-0.025	0.085	0.300
4	X4:caste	0.181	4.616	0.903	0.616	0.451
5	X5:family size	-0.263	11.498	1.26	0.670	0.920
6	X6:number of years since Marriage	0.592	-2.681	0.391	0.099	1.696
7	X7:change in number of occupations after migration	0.028	0.972	0.081	0.344	0.243
8	X8:number of source information acquired	-0.055	1.347	-0.387	0.456	0.475
9	X9:number of source of money for migration	0.097	1.972	1.478	0.585	1.123
10	X10:family material possession	0.917	-0.169	000	000	0.816
11	X11:family house type	-0.111	5.013	1.300	1.033	1.239
12	X12:family Social participation	-0.208	5.611	000	000	1.058
13	X13:cosmopoliteness	0.079	62.409	1.025	1.200	1.931
14	X14:mass media exposure	0.062	0.562	000	000	0.111
15	X15: Per capita Area(acre)	-1.04	2.035	-0.952	1.059	0.899
16	x16 :Family income (Agriculture and livestock)	0.19	0.046	0.017	0.139	0.109
17	x17 :per capita family income from other sources	-0.104	2.793	-0.557	0.664	0.831
18	X18 : Family annual Expenditure Per capita(education)	1.05	2.810	-0.945	0.476	1.051
19	X19:per capita other Family annual Expenditure	-0.169	-.0798	-0.122	0.231	0.372

MULTIPLE R-SQ=78.32%
S.E=2.80

Table 3: Regression Analysis, Y: Duration of migration (in years)vs 1 Causal variables(x13):

Variables	Beta	Beta x R	Reg.coef. B	S.E. of B	t value
X13:cosmopoliteness	0.673	78.510	4.445	1.057	7.781

MULTIPLE R-SQ=58.37%S.E=1.95

Result

Table 2 presents the multiple regression analysis between exogenous variable Y: duration of migration(in years)VS 19 Causal variables(x_1-x_{19}): It has been found that the variable X13:cosmopoliteness has contributed to the substantive variance embedded with the consequent variable Y; duration of migration(in years).

The R^2 value being 0.7832, it is to infer that 78.32 percent of variation in the consequent variable has been explained by the combination of these 19 causal variables.

Table 3 presents the step wise regression and it has been depicted that the 1 causal variables,X13:cosmopolitenesshas been retained at the last step.

The R^2 value being 0.5837, it is to infer that 58.37 percent of variation in the consequent variable

Revelation:

So the duration of migration has been well estimated with variable X13 that is Cosmo politeness. Cosmo politeness is the free from local and national ideas, prejudice and attachments. This perception accreditation will enable grabbing the opportunity in competitive condition. The highly competitive job gives better benefit which leads to long duration stay in urban areas.

Table 4: Path analysis: Decomposition of total effect (r) into Direct, Indirect and Residual effect Y:duration of migration(in years) VS 19 consequent variables(X1-X19)

Sl No.	Variables	Total effect	Total Direct Effect	Total Indirect Effect	Highest indirect Effect
1	X1: Age at the time of migration	0.384	0.317	0.067	0.333(x13)
2	X2: schooling of Migrant(number of years)	-0.104	-0.055	-0.049	0.059(x13)
3	X3: family Education(in years)	-0.307	-0.040	-0.267	0.125(x13)
4	X4:caste	0.164	0.180	-0.016	-0.027(12)
5	X5:family size	-0.281	-0.262	-0.019	-0.071(x6)
6	X6:number of years since Marriage	-0.381	-0.292	-0.089	0.031(x5)
7	X7:change in number of occupations after migration	0.223	0.028	0.195	0.126(x13)
8	X8:number of source information acquired	-0.157	-0.055	-0.102	-0.155(x3)
9	X9:number of source of money for migration	0.130	0.097	0.033	0.071(x13)
10	X10:family material possession	-0.065	0.016	-0.081	-0.051(x5)
11	X11:family house type	-0.191	-0.110	-0.081	-0.138(x4)
12	X12:family Social participation	-0.173	-0.208	0.035	0.048(x13)
13	X13:cosmopoliteness	0.653	0.279	0.374	0.051(x6)
14	X14:mass media exposure	0.058	0.062	-0.004	0.034(x12)
15	X15: Per capita area(acre)	0.064	-0.104	0.168	0.091(x13)
16	x16 : Per capita Family income (Agriculture and livestock)	0.455	0.019	0.436	0.111(x5)
17	x17 :family income (other per capita)	-0.173	-0.103	-0.07	-0.079(x3)
18	X18 : Family annual Expenditure Per capita(education)	0.172	0.104	0.068	0.046(x13)
19	X19: Per capita other Family annual Expenditure	0.075	-0.068	0.143	0.103(x5)

Residual effect:0.2168

Results

The variable X13: Cosmo politenesshas enrooted the highest indirect effect (for 8 times) on the consequent variable. Table 6.26 presents the path analysis to decompose the TE into direct, indirect and residual effect. It has been found that the variable X1: Age at the time of migration (0.317) has highest direct effect, while the variableX16: Per capita Family income from Agriculture and livestock(0.436) has exerted the highest indirect effect on the duration of migration(in years).

The residual effect being 0.2168percent, it is to infer that with the combination of these 19 exogenous variables, 100 per cent of variance can be explained.

So, the predominated factors, as formed by interactionally accommodating them based on factor loading, can offer a strategic implication by effectively downsizing the sphare of variables into well textured factors.

Revelation:

Migrants who start their migration at relatively older age stay more in urban areas due to the fact that, in many cases the lack of knowledge, skill and experience become obstacle factor to get job which delay attainment of better livelihood. After attaining, the dissonance faced will avoid them to change their occupations so they tend to continue with their present condition in which they settled with.

The better farming in rural area by migrant family and absorbent to new ideas by migrants in urban areas become balancing factors to continue the stay.

Table 5: Factor Analysis –Conglomeration of 19 variables in 6 Factors.

Factors	Variables	Factor Loading	% of variance	Cumulative %	Factors Renamed
Factor 1	X3: family Education(in years) X5:family size x16 :Family income (Agriculture and livestock) X19: Family annual Expenditure per capita (family)	.584 .534 .746 .816	17.530	17.53	Family capacity
Factor 2	X2: schooling of Migrant(number of years) X10:family material possession X11:family house type X13:cosmopoliteness	.533 .611 .733 .687	13.795	31.32	Family resource
Factor 3	X1: Age at the time of migration X6:number of years since Marriage X7:change in number of occupations after migration x17 : Per capita family income (from other sources)	.585 .696 .569 .579	12.366	44.69	Migration chronology
Factor 4	X4:caste X12:family Social participation	.618 .502	9.978	54.67	Community affiliation
Factor 5	X8:number of source information acquired X9:number of source of money for migration X14:mass media exposure	.557 .528 .542	9.343	64.01	Communication proficiency
Factor 6	X15: Per capita area(acre) X18 : Family annual Expenditure Per capita(education)	.532 .543	7.128	71.14	Economic proficiency

Result:

Table 5 presents the factor analysis, wherein 19 numbers of independent variables have been conglomerated into 6 dominant factors.

Factor 1 is consists of 4 variables viz X3: family Education(in years),X5:family size,x16 :Family income (Agriculture and livestock) and X19: Family annual Expenditure per capita (family). These variables contribute about 17.53 per cent of variance, and the factor renamed as **Family capacity**.

Factor2 consists of 4 variables viz. X2: schooling of Migrant(number of years),X10:family material possession,X11:family house type and X13:cosmopoliteness. These variables contribute about 31.25 per cent of variance and is renamed as **Family resource.**

Factor3 consists of 4 variables those are size of X2: schooling of Migrant(number of years), X10:family material possession, X11:family house type and X13:cosmopoliteness. Which contributes about 44.691 per cent of variance and is renamed as **Migration chronology**.

Factor 4 consists of 2 variables viz X4:caste and X12:family Social participation. These 2 variables contribute 54.670 per cent variance and is renamed as **Community affiliation** .

Factor 5 consists of 3 variables viz. X8:number of source information acquired, X9:number of source of money for migration and X14:mass media exposure. These 2 variables contribute 64.013 per cent of variance and is renamed as **agro ecological proficiency.**

Factor 6 consists of 2 variables X15: Per capita area(acre) and X18 : Family annual Expenditure Per capita(education). These 2 variables contribute 71.141 per cent variance and is renamed as **Community affiliation.**

Interpretation

The factor Family capacity 17.53 % by becoming the prime mover of change in process of Rural-Urban migration,under the study has also contributed substantially towards start migration along with financial and information support to stay in urban areas.

Family capacity has rightly contributed the highest to become the prime factor in Rural-Urban migration

Rural-Urban migration, on other way higher the family capacity is higher family needs and aspiration along with better support that is how and why these factor percentage has contributed substantially towards Rural-Urban migration.

3. CONCLUSION

Push and pull factors are very important determinant as far as the rural to urban migration is concerned. As a study of Singh *et.al.* (1998) finds inadequate irrigation facilities, lack of employment opportunities in rural non-household manufacturing activities and decline in the average size of operational holdings as the major 'push' factors; and increase in rural literacy and expansion of non-household manufacturing and construction activities in urban areas as the leading 'pull' factor in rural-urban migration**.** Richard Rhoda (1983) studied with close focus on push factors, concludes that the common belief that rural interventions reduce urban migration is not justified. Rural-urban migration may be reduced by interventions which increase cultivatable land, equalize land or income distribution, or decrease fertility. On the other hand, migration is stimulated by interventions which increase access to cities, commercialize agriculture, strengthen rural-urban integration, raise education and skill levels, or increase rural inequalities. So, we can conclude here that higher the education, higher is the exposure to the outer world. These kind of rural residents have higher affinity towards shifting to urban areas. Education brings Cosmo politeness and with the same note Cosmo politeness brings higher information gathering capacity as well as higher opportunity grabbing mentality. The topsy turvy of farming is now distracting the farm youths from farming; they don't like the uncertainties involved in farming. On the contrary urban life is quite certain and full of modern amenities. Easier life style, lavish way of living, certain bread butter earning occupations hugely attract rural youth to join with the urban mass. Easy way of living restrain them to become a carry catcher of customs and tradition.

REFERENCE

[1] HOSSAIN, MD. ZAKIR (2001), "Rural-Urban Migration in Bangladesh: A Micro-Level Study", Seminar Proceedings on Internal Migration, Brazil IUSSP Conference, August 20-24, 2001.

[2] PANDEY, R *et al* (2002), Rural Non-Farm Employment in Nayagarh District of Orissa: Findings from a Participatory Rural Appraisal, Chatham: NRI (draft).

[3] RICHARD RHODA (1983) Rural Development and Urban Migration: Can we keep them down on the Farm? International Migration Review, 17 (1) (Spring): 34-64.

[4] SINGH,S.P & R.K. AGGARWAL (1998): ' Rural-Urban Migration: The Role of Push and Pull factors revisited', *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, Vol 41 No. 4, pp.653-667.

[5] SRIVASTAVA, R. AND SASIKUMAR, S.K. (2003), '*An Overview of Migration in India: Its Impact and Key Issues'*, Migration, Development and Pro Poor Policy Choices in Asia.