

The Distance of Migration: An Analysis and Understanding

S.K. Acharya¹, Anannya Chakraborty²

Author's Affiliation

¹Professor ²Ph D Scholar (UGC fellow),
Department of Agricultural Extension,
BCKV, Mohanpur, West Bengal
741252, India.

Reprint Request

S.K. Acharya, Professor,
Department of Agricultural Extension,
BCKV, Mohanpur, West Bengal
741252, India.
E-mail: acharya09sankar@gmail.com

Received on 09.01.2018

Accepted on 09.02.2018

Abstract

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, economic and ecological aspects of both destination and departure system. In this study we have discussed the several causes of migration with special emphasis on how these causes are affecting the distance of migration. The present study is conducted in Ghoragachha village under Saguna gram panchayet, Nadia, West Bengal. The numbers 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. Family Education (in years)-(X3), number of source information acquired-(X8), Cosmo politeness-(X13), Per capita income from Agriculture and livestock-(X16) and per capita annual other Expenditures-(X19); these are the independent variables which are significant with respect to dependent variable i.e. Y2: Distance of migration.

Keywords: Cosmopoliteness; Distance of Migration; Expenditures; Family Education; Income.

Introduction

Migration is a socio-economic and ecological phenomenon that characterizes Indian economy both by structure and function. It's an unending process of transfer, there is no indicator of whether employment is in rural, semi-urban, or urban areas cultural constraint seem to be included. According to Herrendorf et. al. (2016) Evidence shows that workers in urban areas – and rural-urban migrants – tend on average to be those with more education and higher returns to schooling. Mukhopadhyay et. al. (1985) Finds that rural non-farm sector comprises two subsectors. Sector I inter alia includes those ventures that are administered on an approximately

steady basis with an objective of generating surplus and registering growth, hiring labour and with a certain degree of technical sophistication. Sector II includes products or activities which are usually seasonal, managed exclusively with the help of unpaid family labour, relying on primal technology and catering mostly to the local market characterized primarily by petty production. Both these sectors of rural India find it better to go to the far or near urban areas where they will get better employment, better income, higher education opportunities and more access to modern amenities. So, on the contrary of becoming a carry catcher of past, they would rather prefer to shift to urban areas with higher options.

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 distance of migration.
- To estimate socio-economic and socio-ecological effect on the consequent factor i.e. distance 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 influence the living standard and behavioural patterns of the people in many ways. The area of investigation belong 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 distance of migration (Y).

Result and Discussion

Table 1 presents the coefficient of correlation between: Distance of migration vs. 19 independent variables(x1-x19). It has been found that following variables viz.family size-(X5), umber of source information acquired-(X8), Cosmo politeness-(X13), Per capita income from Agriculture and livestock-(X16) and per capita annual other Expenditures-(X19) have recorded significant correlation with the dependent variable.

Revelation (Table 1)

The sharing of responsibility and large liability is relatively more in large family size, with a good amount of knowledge regarding different socio-economic and ecological conditions helps easy acclimatization to new conditions along with this better support from information channel enable migrants to travel and stay at long distances.

Table 1: Coefficient of Correlation (r): Y: Distance of migration vs. 19 independent variables(x₁,x₁₉).

Sl. No	Variable	R value	Remarks
1	Age at the time of migration-(X1)	-0.021	
2	schooling of Migrant(number of years)-(X2)	-0.021	
3	family Education(in years)-(X3)	0.011	
4	Caste-(X4)	0.002	
5	family size-(X5)	0.309	*
6	number of years since Marriage-(X6)	-0.016	
7	change in number of occupations after migration-(X7)	-0.099	
8	number of source information acquired-(X8)	0.3	*
9	number of source of money for migration-(X9)	0.001	
10	family material possession-(X10)	-0.049	
11	family house type-(X11)	0.143	
12	family Social participation-(X12)	-0.056	
13	Cosmo politeness-(X13)	0.251	*
14	mass media exposure-(X14)	-0.111	
15	Per capita area(acre)-(X15)	0.161	
16	Per capita income from Agriculture and livestock -(X16)	0.286	*
17	Per capita income from other source-(X17)	-0.136	
18	Per capita annual Expenditure on education-(X18)	-0.059	
19	per capita annual other Expenditures-(X19)	0.292	*

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

Table 2 presents the multiple regression analysis between exogenous variable Y: distance of migration vs. 19 Causal variables (x1-x19): It has been found that the variable X13: Cosmo politeness, X8: number of source information acquired and x16 : Family income (Agriculture and livestock) has contributed to the substantive variance embedded with the consequent variable Y: distance of migration.

The R² value being 0.8450, it is to infer that 84.50 per cent 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 2 causal variables X8: number of source information acquired and x16: Family income (Agriculture and livestock) that is has been retained at the last step.

The R² value being 0.6455, it is to infer that 64.55 per cent of variation in the consequent variable has been explained by the combination of these 2 causal variables.

Revelation (Table 2 and 3)

So the distance of migration has well been estimated by variable X8 that is number of source information acquired and X16: Per capita Family income (Agriculture and livestock)

The better return farm enterprise, generates enough financial resources for initial investment to go for long distance migration. A good number of information channels enrich different socio-economic and ecological knowledge which builds confidence in migrants to go long in search for better opportunity to earn better livelihood.

Table 4 presents the variable X10: family material possession has enrooted the highest indirect effect (for 12 times) on the consequent variable. Table 4 presents the path analysis to decompose the TE into direct, indirect and residual effect. It has been found that the variable X19: Per capita other Family annual Expenditure (0.459) has highest direct effect, while the variable X15: Per capita area(acre) (0.377) has exerted the highest indirect effect on the Y: Distance of migration.

Table 2: Regression Analysis, Y: distance of migration vs. 19 Causal variables (x1-x19)

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	-0.038	0.352	-0.391	0.729	0.184
2	X2: schooling of Migrant(number of years)	-0.171	1.525	-3.309	1.143	0.043
3	X3: family Education(in years)	-0.072	0.244	1.444	0.448	0.391
4	X4:caste	-0.190	-0.710	-4.362	1.303	0.525
5	X5:family size	1.171	-2.403	6.324	0.342	0.377
6	X6:number of years since Marriage	1.201	10.739	-0.749	1.329	0.563
7	X7:change in number of occupations after migration	-0.116	1.561	-1.477	0.502	0.106
8	X8:number of source information acquired	1.590	27.229	1.231	0.235	2.888
9	X9:number of source of money for migration	0.028	-0.983	000	000	0.303
10	X10:family material possession	0.058	2.207	-4.453	1.168	0.711
11	X11:family house type	1.150	8.433	9.379	3.108	1.048
12	X12:family Social participation	1.191	2.295	-5.892	1.558	0.918
13	X13:cosmopoliteness	-1.133	20.074	-4.735	4.287	1.523
14	X14:mass media exposure	-1.313	13.869	-6.151	0.300	0.738
15	X15: Per capita area(acre)	-0.113	20.712	19.332	0.200	1.353
16	x16 :Family income (Agriculture and livestock)	1.130	32.375	7.895	1.950	2.767
17	x17 :Per capita family income from other sources	1.711	10.944	-1.068	1.068	1.909
18	X18: Family annual Expenditure Per capita(education)	1.216	13.797	000	000	0.044
19	X19:per capita other Family annual Expenditure	-1.017	-2.460	000	000	0.173

Multiple R-SQ=84.50%
S.E=2.12

Table 3: Regression Analysis, Y: distance of migration vs. 2 Causal variables(x8 , x16)

Variables	Beta	Beta x R	Reg. coef. B	S.E. of B	t value
X8:number of source information acquired	0.323	31.921	15.897	6.636	2.395
x16 :Family income (Agriculture and livestock)	0.397	68.079	5.996	2.041	2.937

Multiple R-SQ=64.55%
S.E=8.44

Table 4: Path analysis: Decomposition of total effect (r) into Direct, Indirect and Residual effect Y: distance of migration VS 19 consequent variables(x1-x10)

Sl. No.	Variables	Total effect	Total Direct Effect	Total Indirect Effect	Highest indirect Effect
1	X1: Age at the time of migration	-0.021	-0.038	0.017	0.931(x17)
2	X2: schooling of Migrant (number of years)	-0.021	-0.007	-0.014	-0.826(x13)
3	X3: family Education(in years)	0.011	0.071	-0.06	-0.115(x10)
4	X4:caste	0.002	-0.090	0.092	0.059(x10)
5	X5:family size	0.309	0.071	0.228	-0.180(x10)
6	X6:number of years since Marriage	-0.016	-0.115	0.099	-0.446(x11)
7	X7:change in number of occupations after migration	-0.099	-0.016	-0.083	0.107(x10)
8	X8:number of source information acquired	0.300	0.027	0.273	-0.853(x10)
9	X9:number of source of money for migration	0.001	0.005	-0.004	0.489(x10)
10	X10:family material possession	-0.049	-0.144	0.095	0.158(x10)
11	X11:family house type	0.143	0.190	-0.047	-0.412(x13)
12	X12:family Social participation	-0.056	-0.132	0.076	0.705(x10)
13	X13:cosmopolitaness	0.251	0.313	0.062	0.865(x11)
14	X14:mass media exposure	-0.111	-0.112	0.001	-0.458(x13)
15	X15: Per capita area(acre)	0.161	-0.216	0.377	0.618(x10)
16	x16 : Per capita Family income (Agriculture and livestock)	0.286	0.010	0.276	0.303(x10)
17	x17 :family income (other per capita)	-0.136	-0.328	0.192	0.177(x10)
18	X18 : Family annual Expenditure Per capita(education)	-0.059	-0.130	0.071	0.166(x10)
19	X19: Per capita other Family annual Expenditure	0.292	0.459	-0.167	-0.499(x10)

Residual= 0.155

The residual effect being 0.155 per cent, 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 internationally accommodating them based on factor loading, can offer a strategic implication by effectively downsizing the sphere of variables into well textured factors.

Revelation (Table 4)

The family expenditure is a sign of lack of enough resources to fulfil the family needs and obligations. These downsize the options in rural areas to choose to migrate at distance places in search for job opportunities for better livelihood. Higher material possession and higher land holding generates good income, which can be used in initial investment to go long distances.

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.

Factor 2 consists of 4 variables viz. X2: schooling of Migrant (number of years), X10:family material possession, X11:family house type and X13: cosmopolitaness. These variables contribute about 31.25 per cent of variance and are renamed as Family resource.

Factor 3 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:cosmopolitaness. Which contributes about 44.691 per cent of variance, and is renamed 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

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

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 (Table 5)

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.

Conclusion

Bryceson, D.F. (2002) refers that certainly in Sub-Saharan Africa, diversification can be represented as a failure of agriculture to provide a sufficient livelihood for a substantial proportion of rural dwellers and an active process of 'deagrarianization' is occurring whereby farming becomes a part-time, residual, or fall-back activity and livelihoods become increasingly oriented to non-farm and non-rural activities. The same can be marked in this study also. Higher the sources of information, Cosmo politeness; higher would be tendency to migrate from rural areas. These factors along with the others like income, expenditure are the aspects on which distance of migration can be determined. Higher the information, higher would be the opportunity to find the best place of earning and living, no matter whether it is far or near. On the

other side higher the family expenditure, higher would be the vow to migrate in even distant places. So, in a nutshell we can say that higher the need higher the zeal and higher the sources of information, higher would be the opportunities to migrate to a better place.

Reference

1. Bryceson, D.F. The Scramble in Africa: Reorienting Rural Livelihoods, *World Development*, 2002 May;30(5):
 2. Chadha GK. Non-Farm Employment for Rural Households in India: Evidence and Prognosis, *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 1993;36(3): 296-327.
 3. Herrendorf, B., and T. Schoellman. Wages, Human Capital, and Structural Transformation, Unpublished Manuscript, Arizona State University. 2016.
 4. Mukhopadhyay, S and CP Lim. Development and Diversification of Rural Industry in Asia, Asian and Pacific Development Centre, Kuala Lumpur. 1985.
 5. Acharya S K, Chethana. K, Anannya Chakraborty and A Biswas. Migration: The Dream Destination and Destiny, Delhi, Nirmal Publication. 2008.
-