Subject – Indian Economy - I

Notes Unit 2 Part B

By -

Dr. Nafees Hashim Rizvi
Assistant Professor
Department of Economics,
Shia P.G. College, Lucknow

Migration and Its Effects -

Migration is a way to move from one place to another in order to live and work. Movement of people from their home to another city, state or country for a job, shelter or some other reasons is called migration. Migration from rural areas to urban areas has increased in past few years in India.

Migrants -

People who move from one place to another in search of work or shelter are called *migrants*. Most of the times migrants' people are not skilled or educated therefore they usually employed as daily wagers (*workers who are paid at the end of each day, for their services*). Daily wagers do not get enough money for the survival of their families and suffering from many problems such as they do not have enough food to eat, sanitation, hygiene, a proper place to live etc.

Impacts of Migration

Migration is becoming a very important subject for the life of cities. Many opportunities and attraction of big cities pull large numbers of people to big cities. Migration can have positive as well as negative effects on the life of the migrants.

Positive Impact

- Unemployment is reduced and people get better job opportunities.

- Migration helps in improving the quality of life of people.

- It helps to improve social life of people as they learn about new culture, customs, and languages which helps to improve brotherhood among people.

- Migration of skilled workers leads to a greater economic growth of the region.

- Children get better opportunities for higher education.

- The population density is reduced and the birth rate decreases.

Negative Impact

- The loss of a person from rural areas, impact on the level of output and development of rural areas.

- The influx of workers in urban areas increases competition for the job, houses, school facilities etc.

- Having large population puts too much pressure on natural resources, amenities and services.

- It is difficult for a villager to survive in urban areas because in urban areas there is no natural environment and pure air. They have to pay for each and everything.

- Migration changes the population of a place; therefore, the distribution of the population is uneven in India.

- Many migrants are completely illiterate and uneducated; therefore, they are not only unfit for most jobs, but also lack basic knowledge and life skills.

- Poverty makes them unable to live a normal and healthy life.

- Children growing up in poverty have no access to proper nutrition, education or health.

- Migration increased the slum areas in cities which increase many problems such as unhygienic conditions, crime, pollution etc.

- Sometimes migrants are exploited.

- Migration is one of the main causes of increasing nuclear family where children grow up without a wider family circle.

General Theories of Migration –

1. Ravenstein's Laws of Migration:

The first attempt to spell out the 'laws of migration' was made by E.G. Ravenstein as early as in 1885. Using the birthplace data, Ravenstein identified a set of generalizations, which he called as 'laws of migration' concerning inter-county migration in Britain in the nineteenth century. Most of these generalizations hold good even today.

These generalizations can be listed as follows (Grigg, 1977:42; Johnston et al, 1981:218):
(a) There is an inverse relation between distance and volume of migration. Majority of migrants moves to short distance only. Migrants going long distance generally go by preference to the large centres of commerce and industry.

(b) Migration proceeds step by step. The inhabitants of countryside flock into the nearby rapidly growing town. The gap created by this out-migration in the countryside is filled up by in-migration from still remoter countryside. The inhabitants of the town then move to the nearby urban centre up in the hierarchy.

(c) Every migration current produces a counter-current.

(d) The native of the rural areas are more mobile than their counterpart in the urban areas, and the major direction of migration is from agricultural areas to the centres of industry and commerce.

(e) Females are more mobile than male in the country of birth, but male more frequently venture beyond.

(f) Migration is highly age selective where adults in the working age groups display a greater propensity to migrate.

(g) Volume of migration increases with the process of diversification of the economy, and improvement in transport facilities.

(h) Migration occurs mainly due to economic reasons.

That migration tends to decline with increasing distance is almost i universal fact. Evidences also indicate that there are generally currents and counter-currents in the migration process (Woods, 1979:191). It has also been established that development and modernization promote internal migration. Several studies have proved that migration is highly age-selective.

However, doubts have been raised concerning some of the other generalizations. That migration occurs in different steps is rather difficult to be established. Similarly, though rural population in the less developed parts of the world is more mobile than its counterpart in the urban areas, migration in the economically developed countries is more likely to be urban to rural than in the opposite direction.

2. Gravity Model:

One of the most important contributions of geography in the field of migration analysis is with respect to the relationship between distance and migration. A clear and persistent inverse relationship between the two has been established in several studies (Woods, 1979:183). Gravity model, based on Newton's law of gravitation, goes one step further and states that the volume of

migration between any two interacting centres is the function of not only distance between them but also their population size.

In other words, migration is directly proportional to the product of their population size and inversely proportional to the square of the distance separating them. The model was initially proposed by the exponents of social physics in the nineteenth century, and was later revived in the middle of the twentieth century Johnston et al, 1981:141).

The index of migration between two centres according to this model can be expressed as follows:

$$MI_{ij} = P_i P_j / d^2_{ij} * K \qquad\qquad (10.1)$$

where MI_{ij} is the volume of migration between the centres i and j, P_i and P_i are population size of the two centres, d_{ij} is the distance between them. Finally, K is a constant. Besides in the area of migration analysis, the model has been used to account for a wide variety of flow patterns in human geography like telephone traffic, passenger movements, commodity flows etc. It was W.J. Reilley who had first applied the law of gravitation in 1929 to the retail trade of a city centre (Srivastava, 1994:169).

Known as Reilley's Law of Retail Gravitation, the model states that a city attracts retail trade from an individual customer located in its hinterland in proportion to its size and in inverse proportion to the square of the distance separating the individual from the city centre. John Q. Stewart, an American astrophysicist, in 1947, also pointed that there exists an isomorphic relationship between these concepts and Newton's law of gravitation (James and Martin, 1981:413). In 1949, G.K. Zipf, an economist, used this empirical generalization in his principle of least effort in human behaviour while explaining the movement of people between two centres.

Later, using the basic principles of gravity model, Stewart and Warnz developed the concept of population potential. Population potential of an urban centre is the potential exerted on it by a series of centres in the region.

It is worked out in the following manner:

$$PP_i = \sum_{j=1}^{K-1} P_j / D_{ij} \qquad\qquad j \neq i \qquad\qquad (10.2)$$

where PP_i is the population potential of a centrei, P_j is the population of *j*thcentre, and D_{ij} is the distance separating *i* from *j*. Thus population potential exerted on point i equals the sum of the ratios of the population of points j to k-1, to the distance between point i and all the points j to k-1. The concept of population potential depicts the average access to population and as such summarizes very simply the changing gravity of a population distribution (Woods, 1979:182). Gravity model later attracted severe criticism. Doubts have been raised regarding the validity of population size as a potential force for attraction. Use of simple linear distance, rather than distance measured in terms of transport routes and facilities, frequency of movement and cost of transport, is another weak point of the model. Further, the model treats all the migrants as one homogeneous group, and fails to explain the age and sex selectivity of migration.

It has, therefore, been suggested that the model is too simple to account for a complex phenomenon like migration. According to P.J. Taylor, the model is based on a crude analogy with Newton's law of gravitation having no theoretical bases in social sciences (quoted in Chandna, 2002:255). Subsequently, the model has been modified for maximum applicability to the study of various forms of flow patterns. These modifications relate to the introduction of some weights to the population size and use of distance in social and economic, rather than geometric, terms. Stouffer introduced one such modification in 1940.

3. Stouffer's Theory of Mobility:

S.A. Stouffer, an American sociologist, introduced one such modification in the gravity model. Stouffer formulated his intervening opportunity model in 1940, and claimed that there is no necessary relationship between mobility and distance (Stouffer, 1940:846). Instead, the observed decline in the volume of migration is due to an increase in the number of intervening opportunities with increasing distance. Stouffer's model suggests that the number of migrants from an origin to a destination is directly proportional to the number of opportunities at that destination, and inversely proportional to the number of intervening opportunities between the origin and the destination.

Stouffer's formulation can be mathematically expressed as follows:

$$Y = (\nabla x / x)\, k \qquad\qquad (10.3)$$

where Y is the expected number of migrants, Δx is the number of opportunities at the destination, x is the number of intervening opportunities, and k is a constant. Stouffer modified his theory of migration and intervening opportunities in the mid-1950s and added the concept of competing migrants in his model. His modified theory of mobility was published in 1960. The revised model proposes that during a given time interval, the number of migrants from city 1 to city 2 is the direct function of the number of opportunities in city 2, and an inverse function of the number of opportunities intervening between city 1 and city 2, and the number of other migrants for the opportunities in city 2. Thus, the revised formulation would read as under (Galle and Taeuber, 1966:6):

$$Y = (X_1 / X_B\, X_C)\, k \qquad\qquad (10.4)$$

where Y is the number of migrants moving from city 1 to city 2, Xi is the number of opportunities in city 2, X_1 is the number of opportunities intervening between city 1 and city 2, Xc is the number of migrants competing for opportunities in city 2, and k is a constant.

It may be realized here that the volume of migration from one city to another is the function of as much the attraction of one city as the repulsion from the other. Hence, another component as a measure of disadvantages that push people from city 1 is introduced in the numerator. The final formulation may be expressed as under:

$$Y = (X_0\, X^a_1 / X^b_B\, X^c_C)\, k \qquad\qquad (10.5)$$

where Xo is the number of out-migrants from city 1; a, b and c are parameters to be determined empirically; and other notations are as before.

In Stouffer's model the measure of 'disadvantages' or 'push' factors in city 1 (X_0) is defined as the total out-migrants from the city. Likewise, the measure of number of opportunities in city 2 (X_1) is defined as the total in-migrants in city 2, whereas the measure of intervening opportunities between city 1 and city 2 (X_2) is defined as the total number of in-migrants in a circle centred mid-way between city 1 and city 2, and having a diameter equal to the distance between the two cities. And, finally, the measure of competing migrants (X_c) is defined as the

total number of out-migrants from a circle centred on city 2 with the distance between the two cities as its radius.

4. Lee's Theory:

Everett Lee proposed another comprehensive theory of migration in 1966. He begins his formulations with factors, which lead to spatial mobility of population in any area.

These factors are:
(i) Factors associated with the place of origin,

(ii) Factors associated with the place of destination,

(iii) Intervening obstacles, and

(iv) Personal factors.

According to Lee, each place possesses a set of positive and negative factors. While positive factors are the circumstances that act to hold people within it, or attract people from other areas, negative factors tend to repel them (Lee, 1975:191). In addition to these, there are factors, which remain neutral, and to which people are essentially indifferent. While some of these factors affect most of the people in the area, others tend to have differential effects. Migration in any area is the net result of the interplay between these factors.

Lee suggests that individuals involved in migration have near perfect assessment of factors in the place of origin due to their long association. However, the same is not necessarily true for that of the area of destination. There is always some element of ignorance and uncertainty with regard to reception of migrants in the new area (Lee, 1975:192).

Another important point is that the perceived difference between the areas of origin and destination is related to the stage of the lifecycle of an individual. A long association of an individual with a place may result in an over-evaluation of positive factors and under-evaluation

of negative factors in the area of origin. At the same time, the perceived difficulties may lead to an inaccurate evaluation of positive and negative factors in the area of destination.

The final decision to move does not depend merely upon the balance of positive and negative factors at the places of origin and destination. The balance in favour of the move must be enough to overcome the natural inertia and intervening obstacles. Distance separating the places of origin and destination has been more frequently referred to in this context by authors, but according to Lee, distance while omnipresent, is by no means the most important factor (Lee, 1975:193). Furthermore, the effect of these intervening obstacles varies from individual to individual.

References -

Books -

1. AN Agarwal/ MK Agarwal - Indian Economy.
2. Rudra Dutt and KPM Sundaram – Indian Economy.
3. Uma Kapila – Indian Economy 4
4. Misra and Puri – Indian Economy
5. Government of India – Economic Survey

Websites –

1. What is migration and its effects? - EasyRelocated.
2. Migration: Meaning, Types and Effects (sociologydiscussion.com).
3. Impacts Of Migration: Positive and Negative Effects Of Migration (studynlearn.com).