
UNIT 22 MIGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Structure

- 22.1 Introduction
- 22.2 Causes of Internal Migration
 - 22.2.1 Earnings and Employment Opportunities
 - 22.2.2 Family and Network
 - 22.2.3 Distance
 - 22.2.4 Wealth and Capital Markets
 - 22.2.5 Family Strategies to Contain Risks
 - 22.2.6 Availability and quality of Amenities
 - 22.2.7 Incidence of Violence, Diseases or Disasters
 - 22.2.8 Migration Control and Incentives
- 22.3 Economic Consequences of Migration
- 22.4 Internal Migration in India
- 22.5 Rural and Urban Migration Flows
- 22.6 Characteristics of Migrants
- 22.7 Migration and Over-Urbanisation
- 22.8 Summary
- 22.9 Exercises

22.1 INTRODUCTION

Article 19 of the Constitution of India guarantees all its citizens, the right to reside and settle anywhere in India: This freedom of movement is considered ideal for the development of any free and liberal economy. A change in the place of residence at least once is quite common in a wide range of countries. Census data show that in five years from 1976 to 1981, 7 per cent of India's population moved within the country.

22.2 CAUSES OF INTERNAL MIGRATION

Migration is a complex phenomenon with a multiplicity of causes, which can be segregated into 'push' and 'pull' factors.

22.2.1 Earnings and Employment Opportunities

It is well established that the greater the gap in earnings between origin and destination, the more likely are working age adults to move. Many migrants to urban areas initially enter the informal sector. For some this is a transitory phase prior to finding more formal employment. However, statistical studies of these patterns are plagued by the lack of precision in defining the informal sector and the evidence does not make it clear whether the formal or informal sector offers higher pay to observationally equivalent workers.

Migrants to town initially earn less than observationally equivalent natives, but the evidence indicates that this gap disappears within a few years and may even reverse. Findings on whether differences in unemployment rates between locations promote migration are mixed. Limited evidence suggests that migrants often identify their urban job before migrating, but other migrants do appear to search for work after moving, either while in temporary employment or while openly unemployed. However, at least one study maintains that off-farm migration in developing countries will cease only when the earnings gap is entirely closed. It has also been argued that unemployed workers may have at least as high a chance of re-employment in their home setting where information and contacts are more readily available.

The location of newly created employment opportunities depends in part upon the development strategy adopted. The hypothesis that import substitution leads to employment concentration in large cities, lacks systematic testing though a case study of India suggests that liberalisation has been a factor in promoting the emergence of new towns.

It has been hypothesised that large towns offer a greater diversity of employment and hence a better chance of reemployment in the event of a lay off. This might render large towns more attractive to migrating workers.

22.2.2 Family and Network

Possessing a network of family and friends in town may encourage migration into town. Conversely, a well-developed network at home may discourage departure. Migration at the time of marriage, to join or accompany a spouse, does seem common. A few studies also suggest that parents may have the welfare of their offspring in mind when making their own migration decision. Urban migrants often initially settle in ethnically similar neighbourhoods, which suggest that networks lower the effective cost of moving in some manner.

22.2.3 Distance

Migration over short distances is much more common than migration to remote locations. Whether this reflects the greater cost of moving further, lack of information about more remote alternatives, or less alienation in a nearby setting remains undetermined.

22.2.4 Wealth and Capital Markets

Incomplete or imperfect local capital markets may encourage out-migration either directly through restrictions on the ability of families to borrow or indirectly through effects on employment creation.

The opportunity cost of financing costly migrations is probably lower for wealthier families. This has two important implications: first, other things being equal, migration may be more common from richer families and this in turn may exacerbate the inequality in incomes; second, as a region becomes wealthier out-migration may actually increase as the financial constraint is reduced.

Empirical evidence on these two implications is mixed and controversial. Only a few cross-family studies examine the wealth effect and the results are too mixed to reach any conclusion. Some historical studies do show rising emigration as GDP increases but this is

probably largely a reflection of the demographic transition and altered patterns of employment rather than an alleviation of a financing constraint.

22.2.5 Family Strategies to Contain Risks

One way that families may insure themselves is by having members migrate to locations where times of economic adversity do not normally coincide with those at home. Remittances between the home base and migrant then enable consumption smoothing.

There is some evidence consistent with the remittance portion of this scenario. However no direct test of whether migration is greater from communities with higher economic risk seems to exist.

22.2.6 Availability and Quality of Amenities

Improved amenities in a location may attract industry or permit agricultural expansion; To the extent that this results in employment expansion or higher wages out-migration may be discouraged and in-migration encouraged. Improved local amenities may also have a direct effect upon migrant's decisions, simply by making life in this setting more attractive. Unfortunately no evidence appears to exist on the effects of amenities on migration outcomes in the developing countries.

22.2.7 Incidence of Violence, Diseases or Disasters

It is obvious that episodes of violence and natural disasters result in mass migrations either of internally displaced persons or of international refugees. However, the extent to which on-going violence, political repression and recurrent risk from disasters increase the flow of migrants is far less well documented.

22.2.8 Migration Control and Incentives

A few countries have attempted to restrict internal migrations. Unless the state is prepared to take draconian measures, such controls are usually ineffective. In a number of contexts it has been found that expelled migrants soon return. In some of the socialist states access to jobs, housing, food rations and other state benefits have been tied to a specific location, effectively preventing migration by removing the incentive to work. However, at least in China, the emergence of a more market-oriented system has eliminated the efficacy of these controls and migration has duly expanded.

22.3 ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF MIGRATION

A mobile labour force can be an important ingredient in enabling more efficient production in an economy. Migration for wage gains enhances the efficiency of production. There are, however, few studies of the total contribution of internal migration to productive efficiency to make a generalisation.

Migration may also impact the rate of savings and accumulation in an economy and perhaps growth. In particular, it is commonly held that temporary migrants save a large

fraction of their earnings because risk-averse migrants save for their return to a lower and less certain income and because the marginal utility derived from consumption while away from the family is low. However, supporting evidence in the context of temporary internal migrants is lacking. Moreover, temporary migration may only raise the propensity to save temporarily.

Migration may not only change the efficiency of production but also profoundly alter the distribution of income through a number of channels.

Migrants presumably gain from migration unless they make errors in judgement, or a gamble with respect to migration fails to pay off or migration is not of the migrant's own free will.

Nonetheless the extent of social mobility associated with migration may vary. Evidence from India suggests that a tiny group of urban migrant households fare extremely poorly, but the average migrant household enjoys a higher living standard than non-migrants particularly after sometime in town.

Migration also affects the incomes of people, both at origin and destination. One way that this happens is by altering the pattern of earnings among non-migrants as the migrant labour shifts. It is not obvious whether wages at origin increase and those at destination decline. In the longer run, the departure of skilled migrants can raise the returns to education and training of those left behind, resulting in greater investments in human capital and higher income. Countering this are at least two forces.

First, there is some evidence of agglomeration of economies driven by a pool of well-educated workers. This can imply that departure of skilled personnel actually lowers the return to education.

Second, the education of children left behind by migrating parents faces two opposing forces; migration may provide resources to finance better education, but lack of parental presence may lower commitment to schooling.

The other major route through which migration may impact incomes of non-migrants is through remittances. The extent to which poor and rich rural families benefit from this is a matter of some dispute. Early village studies in India suggest that rural-urban migration is rare among the very poorest of rural households, more common among agricultural labouring families, declines again among somewhat better off village households, but the educated children of the rural elite commonly move to town. Combined with village study observations that net remittances from town to village are small and that the children of the wealthy are more likely to retain their rural ties and remit, this implies that remittances may largely benefit relatively affluent rural families.

22.4 INTERNAL MIGRATION IN INDIA

Demographers view migration under four broad streams:

- a) Within rural areas
- b) Within urban areas

- c) From rural to urban areas and
- d) From urban to rural areas.

These categories, of course, encompass inter-state, intra-state and international migration. The 1991 census analysed the reasons of migration under the categories of employment, education, business, marriage, family relocation, natural calamities and others.

The total migrant population as per the census of 1991 was 821,07,175 roughly 9 per cent of the country's population. Nearly two-thirds of these were women and only half that number (27,255,302) were men. Of the total migrants, 85.1 per cent had spent between 0-9 years in the place of residence of the last enumeration. Of the total migration across the country, 13.5 per cent took place between states.

The break up for different states presents interesting variations. Maharashtra received the largest number of migrants (16,65,328) followed by Delhi (15,87,661), West Bengal (10,96,152), Madhya Pradesh (9,78,478) and Uttar Pradesh (8,07,459). The largest migration out of any state is from Uttar Pradesh (24,57,996), followed by Bihar with nearly half that number. Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan and Punjab represent more or less equal figures for migration into and outside the state. Kerala took in 2,64,140 migrants while 4,39,285 left it. Gujarat and Bihar provide an interesting comparison in terms of migration into and outside the state. While Bihar's incoming population was 3,61,337 the outgoing was 12,26,839. By contrast, the incoming for Gujarat was double that of Bihar at 7,16,190 and the outgoing population of 3,05,738 stood roughly at a quarter of the population leaving Bihar.

Indeed migration into and out of different states could be attributed to their performance on various development indicators such as industrialisation, education and availability of employment.

While Bihar and Gujarat provide critical variations, one would also have to factor in the area and population of a state in assessing migration patterns. For example, large migrations into Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh may have to be viewed against the large population in these states. International migrants form only 1.3 per cent of the total migrant population.

India is constantly termed a nation with an immobile population. The volume of internal migration has been increasing steadily throughout the century, yet the percentage increase in migration has been viewed as small in comparison to the mobility transitions that have occurred in parts of sub-Saharan Africa. Migration in India has traditionally been dominated by short term rural to rural movements, which account for more than sixty per cent of all migrations and are comprised mainly of women moving between their natal and affinal homes upon marriage. Long distance urban-ward migrations form only a minority of all movements within India, leading to the literature to term India's population as stubbornly immobile, and remaining in the early stages of the mobility transition.

The primacy of the agricultural sector in the Indian economy has resulted in tying the population to the land. It is suggested that long distance urban ward migration would only occur once the Indian economy develops a more industrial base. In addition to this, the dominance of agriculture has succeeded in creating a culture of settlement and cultivation,

which it is suggested, acts to discourage migration. The process of early marriage and the tradition of marriages between people from nearby villages and territorial endogamy has resulted in both early adult responsibilities and reduced the need to migrate long distances. Finally, it is suggested that such is the economic and cultural diversity of India, with some states larger in size than some European countries, that the sheer distances involved and the potential socio-economic adaptations required are in themselves sufficient to discourage long distance migrations.

22.5 RURAL AND URBAN MIGRATION FLOWS

During the 1960s migration was still dominated by local rural-rural migrations that had characterised Indian migration for most of the century. However, this period witnessed an increase in the number of short distance rural to urban migrations to local and regional urban centres. Long distance migration, although still a minor aspect of India's migration system, was dominated by movements to urban areas, which involve moves up the urban hierarchy. This decade also represents a period of substantial growth in urban economies and the associated stagnation of small towns. Thus this period saw the beginning of the urbanisation process in India, although it started primarily in the form of long distance moves. The increase in urbanisation has continued as the importance of rural to urban migration increases in the Indian migration system. During the 1960s the outflow from rural to urban areas was 14.6 per cent of all migration. By 1970 this had increased to 15.3 per cent and further to 17.7 per cent in 1991.

Despite the increase in rural-urban migration in India since the 1960s rural-rural migration continues to dominate the migration system (Table 1). In 1991, 64.5 per cent of all migration had been between rural areas. A majority of those participating in rural-rural migration are female, due to the prevalence of patriarchal marriages. Although such a process has been in operation throughout the country, it has been suggested by some that the Indian marriage market has become much wider, with longer distances apparent in the marriage system. A product of this has been an increase in the distances involved in rural-rural migration with an increase in the number of inter-state rural bound migrations. The development of increased technological agricultural methods and the resultant increase in demand for agricultural labour in the north west of India acted to precipitate an increase in the number of long distance rural-rural movements by increasing the opportunities for agricultural work.

The remaining combinations of rural and urban migrations (urban-rural and urban-urban) continue to form only minor aspects of the migration system in India. Urban-urban migration accounts for approximately 12 per cent of the total migration since the increase in urbanisation during the 1960s. A majority of urban-urban migration is in the form of an upward movement through the urban hierarchy. It has been argued that such migration is dominated by public servants and those employed in the service sectors who wish to improve employment by moving to larger urban areas with potentially higher wages. Thus, most movements occur from urban areas with low per capita incomes to those with higher per capita incomes.

Urban to rural migration has consistently constituted the lowest percentage of total migration (about 6 per cent in 1991). In general it is thought that an increase in rural to urban migration precipitates a parallel move of people out from urban areas into urban suburbs. However there exists no empirical evidence to suggest that this theory of migratory behaviour is applicable in the Indian context. It has been pointed out that the lack of employment in urban areas is the major factor behind urban-rural migration. In addition it is argued that the return of temporary workers may form a substantial section of this migratory stream. It is also reported that return migrants may be those who have finished their economically productive lives in the urban areas, and are returning to their rural origins. Those who own agricultural land are the most likely to take part in this form of migration.

22.6 CHARACTERISTICS OF MIGRANTS

The study of the characteristics of mobile population is an area much neglected in Indian demography, despite the availability of census data on migration by age, sex and marital status. A majority of literature on this subject refers to small-scale empirical studies, from which the general characteristics of all migrants are hypothesised. The principle characteristic of Indian migration is age selectivity. It has been shown that the age group 20-35 are by far the most migratory group. However, female migrants tend to be younger than their male counterparts due to the practice of patrilocal marriages. This age selectivity is apparent in all migration streams at both the intra-state and inter-state level, and this is the only characteristic that is universal to all migration streams in India.

Each of the migration streams in operation in India is strongly sex selective. At the intra-state level females dominate the rural to rural stream, accounting for more than two-thirds of all migrants. This domination is attributable to the process of marriage migration by females between rural areas. The rural-urban and urban-urban streams are both predominantly male oriented, and at the inter-state level all migration streams are male dominated. The ratio of migrating females to the total migrants varies inversely with the distance of migration, emphasising the male domination of the long distance rural-urban and urban-urban movements. The main reason behind such sex selectivity lies in the causes of migration. It is hypothesised that males migrate predominantly for economic reasons, whilst females migrate for marriage. Therefore, those streams with urban destinations and perceived greater economic gains will attract more male than female migrants. When males migrate to urban areas, females remain behind to provide a sense of familiar security in the rural areas.

A study of the effects of male selective migration from Kerala discovered that at the household level, the major impact was an improvement in income due to the flow of remittances. However, this male domination of rural to urban migration is not uniform throughout India. Such migration is more selective of males in the north of India and in the south there is a trend towards increasing female participation in rural-urban migration. The greater male selectiveness of migration in the north has been attributed to both the caste system and the religion. The prevalence of scheduled castes in the south has led to female participation in migration. As such castes are usually landless and thus the need for spousal separation to ensure land security in the rural areas is reduced. The stronger influence of Islam in the north has restrained female migration, resulting in masculine sex ratios in many northern cities.

However, the participation of females in all migration streams has been increasing during the last two decades. This trend is particularly apparent in the rural-urban stream, which has been attributed to increases in the rates of female participation in education and the labour force. It has been reported that females in the untouchable class and in south India have shown major increases in their rates of labour force participation and that this has precipitated the migrating of women for economic reasons. The increasing numbers of female urban migrants has led to an increase in the number of Female employed in unskilled work in urban areas of south India. The increase in female educational participation has increased female labour force participation, thus creating economic incentives for females to migrate.

Migration theory suggests that rural to urban migration is economically selective with most migrants originating from the low-income groups and as a result remaining in the low-income strata once in the urban areas. Such a process does not adequately explain the economic selectivity of rural-urban migration in India. In India it is both the poor and the rich who migrate, rather than, in general, the poorest, the middle or the richest.

It is suggested that for the poor; migration to urban areas is a survival strategy against decreasing productivity in rural areas, whereas for the rich such migration is a strategy of economic accumulation. The economic position of a migrant may not only provide the stimulus for migration, but also provide the means of migration.

The poor do not have the means to make the move; thus they remain instituted in the rural areas, while becoming further pauperised through the introduction of labourers from other rural areas. It has been shown that the propensity to migrate to an urban area is highest among educated people in rural areas. As a result the depletion of rural areas in India is occurring with the out-migration of the capital holding education sectors. The availability of western style employment in the major urban areas, particularly the mega cities, provides the main attraction for such migrants. The rural areas may hold greater economic security for unskilled and uneducated for which employment is scarce in the cities. Also, it has been reported that the upper castes are more migratory than the lower castes suggesting that castes that are no longer functionally integrated into the village economy are more mobile than others.

Migration in India has a history of short distance female dominated rural-rural movements .The past four decades have seen slight increases in the numbers involved in migration, with the gradual emergence of migration streams with urban destinations involving longer distance movements. Recent changes in the economic activities of females are acting to slowly change the sex selectivity of some migration streams. The growth of urban areas and the resultant creation of industrial based employment have created economic incentives for migration, based predominantly on urban areas.

22.7 MIGRATION AND OVER-URBANISATION

A major consequence of rural-urban migration is over-urbanisation. Over-urbanisation involves both the sheer growth of the proportion of a national population living in cities as well as

the concentration of the population in particular cities. To the extent that rural-urban migration leads to a misallocation of labour between the rural and urban sectors and increases the cost of providing for a country's growing population, over-urbanisation remains a problem. It used to be assumed in overpopulated countries like India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, and Egypt and in much of Latin America that the marginal productivity of the rural labour is zero. But in rural areas where uncultivated land is still available and where institutional restraints on the intensification of farming can be overcome, rural-urban migration does entail a loss of potential agricultural output.

It should also be remembered that a large proportion of the rural population is engaged in full-time or part-time non-farm activities. Labour utilisation by farm families is high. The inefficiency of current rural-urban migration patterns is the result of the loss of potential rural output and the inability of cities to fully employ their existing labour force to productive ends.

There is a tension between individual and national interests in the problem of over-urbanisation. Despite the inefficiencies at the aggregate or national level, at the individual level, most migrants report that they are motivated to move for economic reasons and that they have improved their condition. For individual rural dwellers, migration may be a rational response to economic realities and it is not so easy to dismiss the advantages to be gained from the move. But what about the increasing pull on urban resources and amenities by the migrants from the point of view of the state? And what are developing states themselves contributing to the problem?

National policies do indeed contribute to over-urbanisation. When severe imbalances in income-earning opportunities exist between city and countryside, people are forced to leave in search of urban jobs.

National policies bringing this about include institutionally rigid minimum urban wage policies, over valued foreign exchange rates that lower the price of capital below its real value, per capita disproportionate provision of urban services, skewed public investment and tax programmes that provide incentives for both domestic and foreign investors to locate in major urban areas, and transportation networks that centre on the metropolis and its immediate surrounding areas to the neglect of the hinterland.

Government policies need to create a more viable balance between rural and urban economic opportunities by stressing a realistic combination of rural development and dispersed urbanisation strategies. Specific short, medium, and long-term policy tools are available to accomplish this goal.

Short-term policies might include the generating of rural employment and related income-earning opportunities, as well as modifying and rationalising the pattern of internal migration. This could be done with the help of rural public works programmes for the landless, unskilled, and semi-skilled; farm price supports, including crop insurance schemes, guarantees, and less over-valued exchange rates to promote agricultural exports, supervised credit programmes for small farmers, including the introduction of locally adapted agricultural inputs and extension services; a freeze on urban real wage rates, particularly in public sector, either through a modification of civil service salary scales or by letting

urban prices and taxes accelerate disproportionately to rural prices and taxes; explorations of feasibility of utilising labour exchanges and employment information systems in rural areas in an attempt to match urban employment opportunities with both urban and rural job seekers.

Over the medium-term, more fundamental institutional and structural changes have to be initiated. These would include a major reordering of development priorities in which comprehensive rural development assumes greater importance, along with the articulation of a dispersed urbanisation strategy that emphasises the development of market towns, rural service centres, and small regional cities.

The objective is to create a hierarchy of small towns and service centres that give rural populations access to a wider range of producer and consumer goods, expanded markets to counter the current control of local monopoly powers, and wider range of investment and employment opportunities to strengthen agricultural development.

Long-term policies to address over-urbanisation would begin with land reform supported by appropriate national policies. Why do landless labourers or urban migrants come into being? It is because the potential advantages of new high-yielding cereal varieties are turned to the exclusive use of the already prosperous. New agricultural technologies are neutral – i.e., they are equally effective on small and large plots- but are typically not institutionally neutral- i.e., larger, more wealthy farmers have greater institutional and political access to credit, extension services, and other inputs necessary to realise the potential of the new technologies.

Land reforms, properly initiated, should be a vehicle for redistribution of rural assets and income-earning opportunities, and also a means for increasing productivity. Land reforms, to work, must be buttressed to supportive policies that extend the availability of credit, improve input supply, expand research and extension services, and build new storage and marketing facilities,

The process of dispersed urbanisation through new town development and the strengthening of existing rural service centres has to be backed up by providing incentives for investors to locate their activities in dispersed urban locales and by redirecting public expenditure programmes to create new non-agricultural job opportunities.

Public policy has promoted more capital-intensive production technologies than might have been used if relative factor prices are a more accurate reflection of relative factor scarcities. Rural and urban production processes have become more capital-intensive, despite the obvious resource costs and foreign exchange burdens of this process. This disparity must be addressed.

The World Bank notes that policies to halt over-urbanisation have largely failed, and economists indeed predicted this some decades ago. Efforts to force populations to move are unlikely to work, and governments have shown little real will to change urban bias policies to get at the root of the problem.

The role of public policy is certainly constrained by a number of factors. The impact of direct public policies on over-urbanisation is important but is overshadowed by the consequences of larger policy shifts taking place across the world.

Some economists are sceptical of the ability of public policy to influence over-urbanisation and say that it might end up reducing welfare, especially of the poor and middle classes. Their conviction, however, that most policy-makers remain profoundly unaware of the impact of specific economic policies on population shifts remains a continuing challenge.

Sceptical economists hold that in contrast to the direct intervention favoured by governments before the 1970s, the new orthodoxy of liberalisation – including balanced budgets, removal of subsidies and tariffs, privatisation of government enterprises, and the development of legal institutions and property rights which enable free and competitive markets to function more efficiently – has greater impact on rural-urban migration than the smaller scale policy shifts aimed to directly affect this problem.

Sceptics are doubtful of intervention on other scores. Governments may not be motivated enough to curb urban growth: when urban jobs are growing rapidly; when foreign investment is high so that public investment in infrastructure does not mean an end to industrial capital accumulation; when economic growth is sufficiently rapid to provide government with the resources it needs to make key infrastructure investments; and when agricultural development results in the rapid growth of smaller cities and towns, which serve as marketing depots and commercial centres for an increasingly prosperous countryside.

Where rural education is advanced, so that urban migration does not result in a flood of unskilled labourers, the whole issue is of minor importance to the governments. Ironically, successful agricultural growth may itself be a contributor to rural-urban migration.

The idea of establishing secondary cities is sound, but it faces the challenge of infrastructure expenses under conditions of severely strained national budgets.

There is also the paradox that repressed agricultural prices might not necessarily lead to sustained urban growth, since low agricultural prices diminish foreign-exchange earnings, which are essential for city growth. The structural adjustment programme of the IMF is likely to reduce rural-urban migration because of devaluation, reductions in government budget deficits, reduction in money supply growth, wages and employment declines in urban areas, the tightening of state enterprises budgets, and in general reduction of other forms of rent sharing and rent-seeking behaviour.

Nevertheless, government has a distinct role to play in curbing the rural-urban dis-equilibrium from further intensifying. There are obvious psychological factors in the attraction of cities, but to compound that there should not be the push factor that results from low levels of investment in agriculture

Urban infrastructure has tended to receive disproportionate emphasis. When it comes to education the countryside has been relatively ignored. The disparity between wage levels in rural and urban areas is a problem that has to be addressed by targeted policies. Leaving the problem of over-urbanisation mostly to market forces is not likely to result in a return to equilibrium.

22.8 SUMMARY

Migration is a complex phenomenon. This unit attempts to explain the relationship between migration and development. To begin with, causes for internal migration are listed out.

The reasons for internal migration may be many—a gap in income between regions; location of a family network in town; availability of improved amenities; marriage; education; or natural disasters. Higher wages implies higher productivity and efficiency and a mobile labour force is an important ingredient in enabling a more efficient production in an economy. Migration also affects the rate of savings and accumulation of an economy and hence its growth.

Internal migration in India has been dominated by short term rural to rural movements dominated by women. While rural-urban migration has increased since the 1960s in India, rural-rural migration continues to dominate the migration system. The primacy of the agricultural sector in India has tied the population to land. A long term urban ward movement would occur only when the Indian economy develops an industrial base. Females dominate the rural-rural stream (migrating for marriage) but the rural-urban and urban-urban streams are male dominated (migrating for economic gains) though these figures too are slowly changing over the years.

A major result of the rural-urban movement is over-urbanisation. While migration from rural to urban areas may improve the economic conditions, there is an increasing pull on the urban resources and amenities by migrants. Government policies thus need to create a more viable balance between rural and urban opportunities. Policy makers should be aware of the impact of the specific economic policies on population shifts. Leaving the problem of urbanisation to market forces is not a likely solution.

22.9 EXERCISES

- 1) List the causes of internal migration.
- 2) Internal migration contributes towards a productive economy. Comment.
- 3) Why are the migration streams in India strongly sex selective? Has there been a change in this ratio over the years?
- 4) What are the causes of over-urbanisation and how can this problem be addressed?