

Male Migration from Rural Andhra Pradesh to Mumbai: Does Socio Economic Matters?

Tadapatri Masthanaiah

Ph.D Scholar, Department of Geography, Sri Krishnadevaraya University, Anantapur, Andhra Pradesh, India.

Abstract: This study investigate the migrant's socio economic and employment status at native place and their linkages with leads to the out migration. The present study is based on the quantitative data of 300 male migrant workers who were migrated from Andhra Pradesh to Bhiwandi city of Mumbai, Maharashtra. The data has been collected from 300 migrants, 100 each from Migrants never married, married but not staying with their wives and migrants married and staying with their wives. Descriptive statistic analysis has been used for the present study. Wealth index and Native wealth index has been constructed to understand the economic status of the migrants prior to migration. More than 70 percent of the migrants were belonging to rural areas of Andhra Pradesh. Landlessness, low wages, poor conditions and family responsibilities cited as major reasons for their migration. Nearly one-third of migrants [31%] reported that they did not have any alternative at their native places. Similarly family tension has been found [43%] reason for out migration among married migrants. An efforts should be made by government towards developing life skills, economic opportunities at rural areas in reducing the, rural-urban migration which in turn promotes livelihood in rural areas.

Keywords: Andhra Pradesh, rural-urban migration, socio-economic reasons, Mumbai.

1. Introduction

Migration is a global phenomenon. Uneven economic development, inter-regional disparity and differences in living standards between socio-economic groups are some of the important reasons responsible for migration. The term migration is so broad meaning and interpretations which are due to the differences in the nature, scope or purpose of the study or discussion. Sociologists have emphasized social and cultural consequences of migration. Dictionaries generally refer to migration as a change in residence from one place to another. According to Demographic Dictionary, "migration is a form of geographical mobility or spatial mobility between one geographical unit and another, generally involving a change in residence [G.S Kainth, 2010]. Rural-urban migration is "the phenomenon of a historically unprecedented movement of people from rural country side to the burgeoning cities of Africa, Asia and Latin America" [Todaro, 1997]. One noticeable issue in the society today is the velocity at which people migrate from the rural to the urban areas like a paradox, while the cities [urban areas] are increasing in population, the rural areas are decreasing [Dang, et.al, 1997].

This Rural-urban migration is a form of so-called internal migration which means a movement within a country and which stays in contrast to international or intercontinental migration. It refers to the movement of people from the country side respectively the rural areas into the cities, often the metropolitan cities of a country. This change of residence is often connected with the migration of labor and a career change from primary to second or third sector [Altenburg, 2009]. The migration of the rural masses to the urban areas has occasioned a lot of social and economic difficulties in the rural areas. McCarthy, 2004 stated that "excessive urbanization leads to high rate of city congestion, crime and poor infrastructure such as proper sewage system, electricity, clean drinking water, and other amenities, chronic unemployment and creation of large slums and Shanty towns".

Migration in India is mostly influenced by social structures and patterns of development. The development policies by all the governments since Independence have accelerated the process of migration. Uneven development is the main cause of migration [Madhumathi, 2013]. The landless, poor and who mostly belong to lower castes, indigenous communities and economically backward regions constitute the major portion of migrants. One of the factors that are responsible for rural -urban migration is lack of / inadequate social amenities and facilities in the rural areas. Push factors are those that compel a person, due to different reasons, to leave that place and go to some other place. For example, low productivity, unemployment and underemployment, poor economic conditions, lack of opportunities for advancement, exhaustion of natural resources and natural calamities may force people to leave their native place in search of better economic opportunities [G.S Kainth, 2010]. Inadequate jobs in the rural areas also make many people to migrate to the urban areas that can provide better opportunities for them.

2. Objective of the Study

To investigate the migrant's socio economic and employment status at native place and their linkages with leads to the out migration.

3. Data and Methodology

The data used for this study has been collected from the Bhiwandi industrial area in 2012, following by 'Mix Method Approach'. A structured questionnaire and interview guidelines were used to collect data from the migrants in Bhiwandi area. Some of the key characteristics that are included in age, education, caste, religion, languages known, marital status and some questions on economic condition at native place like; living conditions, type of family structure, occupation, household assets, ownership of the properties, income generation sources, reasons for migration & patterns, and source for sought help in out migration etc.

The present study is based on the quantitative data of 300 male migrant workers who migrated from Andhra Pradesh to Bhiwandi city area of Mumbai, Maharashtra. The data has been collected from each of the three categories, viz., respondents who never married [100 interviews], respondents who are married but not staying with their wives [100 interviews], and the respondents who are married and staying with their wives [100 interviews].

3.1 Analysis

Descriptive statistic analysis has been used for the present study. The native wealth index has been computed to understand the economic status of the migrants prior to migration. The wealth index is often referred in many of the large scale surveys as proxy indicator for economic status. The index has been computed based on the information collected on 11 household items and two items on agriculture and livestock. Overall, information on 13 items was used to calculate native wealth index. The migrant population is divided in to three equal groups of 33.3 percent each [quintiles] at the levels lowest, moderate and high.

4. Key Variables

Marital status a question on their marital status has been asked to find out their marital status. Further, the respondents were categorized into three groups; viz. [1] unmarried, [2] married but not staying with wife at destination place and [3] married and staying with wife at destination place.

Type of family at native place The question was asked what type of family structure you have at your native place; the options were given whether it is joint family or nuclear family. If the respondents residing with only his wife and children considered as nuclear family and if parents and siblings are also staying it was considered as joint family.

Ownership of the house Question was asked about the ownership of house. Have asked to the respondent if any of household members own the house or not.

Type of house at native place This question was asked to the respondent. What type of your house at your native place? Classified the houses based on respondent information. Information used the information on the nature of materials used for construction. If the house is made of mud, include those residing in tents, cement pipes, natural shelter such as other low quality materials it is a *kachcha* house. If, on the other hand, the house is made of partly low quality and partly high quality materials classify it as semi-*pucca*. Houses made of high quality materials throughout, including the roof walls and floor classify it as *pucca*.

Number of rooms in native house Simply asked about the number of rooms in that house. Include all the rooms which persons in the household are using for all the purposes, even the kitchen.

Own agriculture land Ownership of agriculture land is another important indicator of the economic status of the migrant here 'agricultural land' includes only land which is being used or can be used for agricultural purposes. The

question was asked to the respondent any member of the household owns any land. The land does not have to be near where the household lives.

Irrigated land & Non- irrigated land Those who reported that they own agricultural land. Only agricultural land which is irrigated by one or more sources of irrigation such as canal, pond/tank, well, tube well, hand pump or river is to be recorded here. Land that depends only on rain for irrigation is not to be included as irrigated land. The size of the land should record in acres.

Type of native place The question was asked to the respondent; "was your native place is rural or urban.

Prime occupation The question was asked to the respondent; what was your prime occupation at your native place, for generating income.

Household income at native place How much is the total monthly income at your native place from all sources.

Reasons for migration The question was asked to the respondent; what was the main reason for your out migration from your native place?

5. Results and Discussion

The results have been discussed under the various sub-headings:

5.1 Demographic Profile of Migrants

Table 1: presents male migrants of selected characteristics pertaining to Unmarried migrants, married but not staying with their wives and migrants married staying with their wives. Among the total migrants nearly one quarter [23%] belong to below 25 years of age group, 46 percent to 26-35 years age group and 31 percent to above 36 years of age group. Male migrants who are aged 26-35 years were overwhelmingly more [46%] than other two categories. As revealed by many existing surveys educational level was an important factor for migration which can give force to out migration [Baljinder, 2011]. Looking at the educational level of migrants, 84 percent of them ever attended school and more than half [55%] of them have completed 6 and above years of schooling. Sixteen percent of migrants never attended school and the same is highly reported among the migrants married but not staying with wife [31%] followed by migrants married and staying with wife [15%] and unmarried migrants [3%]. Educational attainment levels suggest that Unmarried migrants are better educated than their counterparts of migrants. Nearly a quarter [24%] of them has completed 10 years and above schooling. More than half of the migrants [56%] reported that their wives can read and write while 44 percent reported that they cannot read and write.

The distribution of migrants by family structure at their native place, nearly three fourth [74.7%] of the migrants are from nuclear families while only 25 percent of them reported to be from joint families. Unmarried migrants [43%] from joint families are comparatively higher in number than the

migrants not were staying with wife [12%] and migrants staying with wife [21%]. Vast majority [88%] of the married migrants who are not staying with wife reported having nuclear families at their native places whereas 79 percent of migrants married and staying with wife and 57 percent of

unmarried migrants reported the same. The data suggest that migration from nuclear families is more. Vast majority [88%] of the migrants reported to belong to non SC/ST community.

Table 1: Socio demographic characteristics of the male migrants [in %]

Characteristics	Unmarried [n]	Married but not staying with wife [n]	Married staying with wife [n]	Total Percent [n]
Age				
<=25 years	51.0 [51]	6.0 [6]	12.0 [12]	23.0 [69]
26-35 years	48.0 [48]	47.0 [47]	44.0 [44]	46.3 [139]
36+ years	1.0 [1]	47.0 [47]	44.0 [44]	30.7 [92]
Schooling				
Yes	97.0 [97]	69.0 [69]	85.0 [85]	83.7 [251]
No	3.0 [3]	31.0 [31]	15.0 [15]	16.3 [49]
Years of schooling				
No Education	3.0 [3]	31.0 [31]	15.0 [15]	16.3 [49]
1-5 years	20.0 [20]	32.0 [32]	34.0 [34]	28.7 [86]
6-9 years	53.0 [53]	27.0 [27]	40.0 [40]	40.0 [120]
10+ years	24.0 [24]	10.0 [10]	11.0 [11]	15.0 [45]
Caste				
SC/ST	22.0 [22]	2.0 [2]	12.0 [12]	12.0 [36]
None SC/ST	78.0 [78]	98.0 [98]	88.0 [88]	88.0 [264]
Wife's education				
Yes	NA	39.0 [39]	48.0 [48]	43.5 [87]
No	NA	61.0 [61]	52.0 [52]	56.5 [113]
Type of Family at native place				
Joint	43.0 [43]	12.0 [12]	21.0 [21]	25.3 [76]
Nuclear	57.0 [57]	88.0 [88]	79.0 [79]	74.7 [224]

Note: NA-Not applicable; [n]-Number of respondents

5.2 Motivational Factors for Migration

Table 2: presents migration factors of poor civic amenities, leading a poor life of migrants, particularly on ownership of a house, number of rooms in living house and type of house at migrant's native place, about 41 percent of the total migrants have semi pucca house, followed by pucca house 28 percent and Kuchcha house 31 percent. The percentage of pucca house varies from 30 percent of unmarried migrants, 19 percent of married not staying with wife and 34 percent of married staying with wife. The vast majority of the total migrants are [81%] own a house. Significantly the high proportion of the total migrant has only one room house [45%] followed by two room's house 38 percent. There has more existing programs for constructing a house in financial support for poor people in all governments at all the states even though the present data shows that nearly 16 percent of migrants from Andhra Pradesh they don't have own house at their native place. Have a poor civic amenities and leading a poor life has been found the leading factors for migration. The existing studies on labour migration also revealed that from poor living conditions to better living conditions had remained an important pull factor to attract labour migration from backward areas [G.S Kainth, 2010].

Table 2: Information reported by migrants on ownership of living house, number of rooms in that house and type of house at migrant's native place.

Characteristics	Unmarried[n]	Married but not staying with wife[n]	Married staying with wife[n]	Total Percent[n]
Type of your house				
Pucca	30.0 [30]	19.0 [19]	34.0 [34]	27.7 [83]
Semi-pacca	43.0 [43]	45.0 [45]	36.0 [36]	41.3 [124]
Kuchcha	27.0 [27]	36.0 [36]	30.0 [30]	31.0 [93]
No of rooms in house				
1room	43.0 [43]	45.0 [45]	48.0 [48]	45.0 [136]
2 rooms	36.0 [36]	44.0 [44]	35.0 [35]	38.3 [115]
3 rooms	14.0 [14]	8.0 [8]	13.0 [13]	11.7 [35]
4 rooms	7.0 [7]	3.0 [3]	4.0 [4]	4.7 [14]
Ownership of house				
Owned	95.0 [95]	69.0 [69]	80.0 [80]	81.3 [244]
Rented	3.0 [3]	31.0 [31]	12.0 [12]	15.6 [47]
Others	2.0 [2]	0.0 [0]	8.0 [8]	3.0 [9]

Note: [n]-Number of respondents

Table 3: presents information by total migrant on ownership of agricultural land [irrigated and non-irrigated]. Most of the migrant workers in their native place do not own any agricultural land [73 percent]. Data suggest that only the low proportions of migrants have [27percent] agriculture land, followed by quantity of owned by irrigated land by total migrant up to one acre 51 percent, 1 to 2 acre 94 percent and three acre is nearly 6 percent. Coming to non-irrigated land, nearly 43 percent of migrants have up to one acre, 41 percent of 1 to 2 acre and above 3 acres is nearly 16 percent owned by migrants at their native place.

Table 3: Information reported by migrants on ownership an agriculture land [Irrigated land & Non-irrigated land] at their native place

<i>Owned agriculture land</i>	<i>Total Percent</i>	<i>No. of respondents</i>
Yes	27.3	82
No	72.7	218
Irrigated land		
Up to 1 acre	51.4	18
1-2 acre	94.3	15
3+ acre	5.7	2
Non-irrigated land		
Up to 1 acre	42.9	27
1-2 acre	41.3	26
3+ acre	15.9	10

In India major rural economic activity is based on the agriculture but somehow, agriculture is mainly facing rain-fed, low wages, seasonal employment and holding small landforms. The result shows that most of the migrants have small landforms and high proportion of the respondent have non-irrigated land.

5.3 Socio-Economic Factors for Migration

Table 4: shows the percent distribution of migrants by selected Socio Economic Characteristics like prime occupation before migration, native wealth index for revealing economical status of migrants and multiple reasons for out migration.

5.3.1 Prime Occupation before Migration:

Significantly 43 percent of the total migrants reported that they were not working prior to migration and the same is reported as 51 percent among unmarried migrants, 38 percent among migrants who are not staying with wife and 40 percent among migrants married and staying with wife. The data shows that higher proportion of migrant's occupation is agriculture related this is respectively married not staying with wife 31 percent, married and staying with wife were 27 percent and same as reported that total migrants 22 percent. From many of migration studies reveal that "The currents of migration, in general, flow from the areas of limited economic opportunities and retarded social development to the developed and the fast developing areas, where migrants can expect greater pecuniary gains and consequently a better level of living areas, for Ex: United Nations, 1961; Zachariah, 1964; Mitra, 1967; Sen Gupta,

1968; Kaur, 1971; Weiner, 1973; Gosal and Krishan, 1975; and Premi, 1976.

Nearly half of the migrant respondents was worked in agriculture related [22%] and daily wage laborer [24%] in prior to migration. Considerably 16 percent of migrants are illiterates and 29 percent of them reported completed only primary education it means nearly half of the respondents are unskilled and less educated and such types of these conditions are functioning as a push factors for their out migration.

5.3.2 Native Wealth Index

Native wealth index shows marginal difference between low, moderate and high wealth index. Among the total migrants, 35 percent of the respondents belong to Low wealth index, 30 percent belongs to moderate wealth index and 34 percent belongs to high wealth index.

5.3.3 Economical Reasons for Out Migration

Multiple reasons are cited by migrants for their out migration irrespective of their marital status. Unemployment, landlessness and low wages are found to be the major reasons for the out migration. 67 percent of the male migrants reported that they have migrated from their native place because of the unemployment. 60 percent of them reported landlessness, 18 percent of Insufficient land, 44 percent reported low wages, 21 percent of irregular work, and more than half [26 percent] reported that indebtedness as a reason for their out migration. According India 2001 census: 14.7 percent of among male migrants reported the most important reason for migration was 'Work/Employment'.

5.3.4 Social Reasons for Out Migration

Significantly family tension [32 percent] also placed as a reason for the out migration and better life/job 20 percent, other reasons 5 percent are considered to be the reasons for the out migration. Nearly one-third of them [31%] reported that they have migrated as they did not have any alternative at their native places. Family tension was reported more among married migrants those who are not staying with wife [43%] than other counter parts. In the case of other categories 36 percent of Male migrants who stay with wife and 17 percent of unmarried male migrants reported family tension as the main reason for out migration.

Table 4: Migrants by selected socio-economic characteristics [in %]

<i>Characteristics</i>	<i>Unmarried [n]</i>	<i>Married but not staying with wife [n]</i>	<i>Married staying with wife [n]</i>	<i>Total Percent[n]</i>
Type of Native Place				
Rural	82.0 [82]	64.0 [64]	70.0 [70]	72.0 [216]
Urban	18.0 [18]	36.0 [36]	30.0 [30]	28.0 [84]
Prime Occupation before Migration				
Not working	51.0 [51]	38.0 [38]	40.0 [40]	43.0 [129]
Agriculture related	9.0 [9]	31.0 [31]	27.0 [27]	22.4 [67]
Daily wage labourer	26.0 [26]	26.0 [26]	19.0 [19]	23.6 [71]
Small or petty business	5.0 [5]	0.0 [0]	4.0 [4]	3.0 [9]
Small scale livelihood	0.0 [0]	0.0 [0]	3.0 [3]	1.0 [3]
Others	9.0 [9]	5.0 [5]	7.0 [7]	7.0 [21]
Native wealth Index				
Low	22.0 [22]	39.0 [39]	45.0 [45]	35.3 [106]
Moderate	31.0 [31]	32.0 [32]	28.0 [28]	30.3 [91]

High	47.0 [47]	29.0 [29]	27.0 [27]	34.3 [103]
No Employment	Economical Reasons for Out Migration			
Yes	69.0 [69]	76.0 [76]	55.0 [55]	66.7 [200]
No	31.0 [31]	24.0 [24]	45.0 [45]	33.3 [100]
Landlessness				
Yes	55.0 [55]	67.0 [67]	58.0 [58]	60.0 [180]
No	45.0 [45]	33.0 [33]	42.0 [42]	40.0 [120]
Insufficient land				
Yes	22.0 [22]	18.0 [18]	15.0 [15]	18.3 [55]
No	78.0 [78]	82.0 [82]	85.0 [85]	81.7 [245]
Irregular work				
Yes	20.0 [20]	19.0 [19]	23.0 [23]	20.7 [62]
No	80.0 [80]	81.0 [81]	77.0 [77]	79.3 [238]
Low wage				
Yes	35.0 [35]	52.0 [52]	46.0 [46]	44.3 [133]
No	65.0 [65]	48.0 [48]	54.0 [54]	55.7 [167]
Indebtedness				
Yes	22.0 [22]	38.0 [38]	19.0 [19]	26.3 [79]
No	78.0 [78]	62.0 [62]	81.0 [81]	73.7 [221]
Business failure				
Yes	3.0 [3]	0.0 [0]	5.0 [5]	2.7 [8]
No	97.0 [97]	100.0 [100]	95.0 [95]	97.3 [292]
Family tension	Social Reasons for Out Migration			
Yes	17.0 [17]	43.0 [43]	36.0 [36]	32.0 [96]
No	83.0 [83]	57.0 [57]	64.0 [64]	68.0 [204]
Social stigma				
Yes	0.0 [0]	2.0 [2]	0.0 [0]	0.7 [2]
No	100.0 [100]	98.0 [98]	100.0 [100]	99.3 [298]
No alternative				
Yes	24.0 [24]	31.0 [31]	37.0 [37]	30.7 [92]
No	76.0 [76]	69.0 [69]	63.0 [63]	69.3 [208]
For better life/job				
Yes	27.0 [27]	25.0 [25]	8.0 [8]	20.0 [60]
No	73.0 [73]	75.0 [75]	92.0 [92]	80.0 [240]
Other				
Yes	7.0 [7]	1.0 [1]	7.0 [7]	5.0 [15]
No	93.0 [93]	99.0 [99]	92.0 [92]	94.7 [284]
Note: [n]-Number of respondents				

5.4 Changes in Income of Migrants after Migration

Table 5: presents migrants workers income for monthly in rupees from all sources at native and current places. Looking for native place, 34 percent of the total migrants have monthly income is less than 2500 rupees, 39 percent of migrants have income from 2500 to 4400 rupees, followed by 15 percent of income from 4500 to 6400 Rs/- and 12 percent of migrants have income 6500 and above rupees.

Table 5: Migrant workers income for monthly in rupees from all sources at native place and at destination place

Income at native place		Income at destination place	
Income levels in Rs/-	In percent [n]	Income level in Rs/-	In percent [n]
Less than 2500	34.3 [103]	Less than 5000	6.0 [18]
2500 – 4400	39.0 [117]	5000-9900	64.7 [194]
4500 – 6400	15.0 [45]	10000-14900	22.7 [68]
6500 & above	11.7 [35]	15000 and above	6.7 [20]
Note: [n]-Number of respondents			

After migration at destination place respondents reported their monthly income has greater than before in all levels, the high proportion of migrants reported nearly 65 percent of their monthly income increased to 5000-9900 rupees, and 23 percent of migrants reported Rs.10000-14900 income for

month. Such type of discrimination in economic development has provided a major framework of migration for explaining labor migration [Massey et.al, 1993]. Within this perspective, the income/wage differentials between origin and destination are generally seen as the main motive for migration [Dang et.al, 1997].

Table 6: presents the percentage distribution of the male migrants according to their type of work and wealth Index. Almost all respondents [99%] reported that they are working and six percent of the migrants reported that they are performing another work apart from their regular work for additional income. The distribution of migrants by wealth Index shows that more than half [57%] belong to moderate wealth quintile; in contrast, only 21 percent of the migrants in the high wealth quintile and 22 percent of them belongs to low wealth quintile. Vast majority [69.3%] stayed more than 5 years in the current place. Looking by their marital status, 92 percent of the migrants married and not staying with wife are staying in the current place for more than 5 years which is alarmingly high than unmarried migrants [55%] and migrants married and staying with wife [61%]. Nearly 59 percent of the migrants reported that 26-50 percent of their income as remittance to their families, while 24 percent of them reported up to 25 percent of their income while 17 percent reported more than 50 percent of their income as

being remitted to their families. It clearly shows that, more than half of the migrants are sending 26-50 percent of their income as remittance irrespective of their marital status. This finding also supported by Dayal and Karan [2003] in Jharkhand, 98 percent of migrants reported that an improvement in their lives and income levels after migration.

Table 6: Migrants work status and remittance characteristics at destination place [in %]

Characteristics	Unmarried [n]	Married but not staying with wife [n]	Married staying with wife [n]	Total Percent[n]
Work for Income				
Yes	100.0 [100]	100.0 [100]	98.0 [98]	99.3 [298]
No	0.0 [0]	0.0 [0]	2.0 [2]	0.7 [2]
Overtime work for Additional Income				
Yes	7.0 [7]	9.0 [9]	2.0 [2]	6.0 [18]
No	93.0 [93]	91.0 [91]	98.0 [98]	94.0 [282]
Wealth Index at current place				
Low	21.1 [20]	18.0 [18]	27.0 [27]	22.0 [65]
Moderate	51.6 [49]	75.0 [75]	44.0 [44]	56.9 [168]
High	27.4 [26]	7.0 [7]	29.0 [29]	21.0 [62]
Duration of stay in current place				
Less than 12 months	10.0 [10]	2.0 [2]	8.0 [8]	7.0 [21]
1 to 2 years	12.0 [12]	3.0 [3]	5.0 [5]	6.7 [20]
2 to 5 years	23.0 [23]	3.0 [3]	25.0 [25]	17.0 [51]
More than 5 years	55.0 [55]	92.0 [92]	61.0 [61]	69.3 [208]
Remittance				
<=25 % of income	28.0 [23]	18.1 [17]	30.6 [11]	24.1 [51]
26 -50 % income	53.7 [44]	67.0 [63]	50.0 [18]	59.0 [125]
51+ % income	18.3 [15]	14.9 [14]	19.4 [7]	17.0 [36]

Note: [n]-Number of respondents

6. Conclusion

On the whole analysis of the study reveals that, who migrated from rural areas of Andhra Pradesh to Bhiwandi industrial City area of Mumbai those migrants' migrated in search of livelihoods to Bhiwandi due to less employment opportunities, gloomy village life, underprivileged social and economical conditions at their native place.

7. Policy Recommendations

As a result of this study, it is hereby recommended that policy makers in Andhra Pradesh to minimize the burden in urban areas in prevent the occurrence of rural-urban migration the study recommends that policy makers in Andhra Pradesh by making available sufficient employment, socio-economic and infrastructural amenities such as : higher income earning jobs, financial institutions, educational facilities, health services, good housing condition, motor able roads for the agriculture farms and 24 hours power supply to irrigation water pumpus.etc for the rural residents.

Similarly, transportation of traditional agriculture to modern agriculture this will enable the youth to engage in agriculture as the system will make farming interesting.

Self employment schemes, small & medium scale industries, food processing industries, handmade item training & it treading centers in rural areas that will be absorb the rural working population and these steps will also help to reduce to rural-urban migration. Government rural development departments should be encouraged to establish rural enterprises and also be made effort for financial support to the rural enterprises this would support in increasing their productivity and provide some more employment to the rural population.

Providing proper training to unskilled population in the suitable occupations, on the condition of that loans to start their trained work by government this can be minimize rural-urban migration, over population burdens in the urban areas and also these steps can make rural economic activity physically powerful.

References

- [1] Gursharan Singh Kainth, (2011), "*Push and Pull Factors of Migration: A Case Study of Brick Kiln Migrant Workers in Punjab*" MPRA Paper No. 30036, posted 10. April 2011 08:44 UTC; Online at <http://mpa.ub.uni-muenchen.de/30036/>
- [2] Omonigho T. Okhankhuele, (2013), "*Causes and Consequences of Rural-Urban Migration Nigeria: A Case Study of Ogun Waterside Local Government Area of Ogun State, Nigeria*", source; British Journal of Arts and Social sciences ISSN: 2046-9578, Vol.16 No. I [2013]; © British Journal Publishing, Inc. 2013.
- [3] Anh Dang, Sidney Goldstein and James McNally (1997), "*Internal Migration and Development in Vietnam*". Source: International Migration Review, Vol. 31, No. 2 [summer, 1997], pp. 312-337 Published by: The Center for Migration Studies of NewYork; URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2547222> .Accessed: 27/10/2014 06:19
- [4] Altenburg. S [2009], "*Rural- Urban migration a necessity to survive*" seminar paper in the context of 'spatial development and planning from an international perspective' copyright@ 2009 GRIN verlG GmbH Druck and Bindung; ISBN: 978-3-656-03789-7; this book at: <http://www.grin.com/ene/e-book/180759/rural-urban-migration>
- [5] Madhumathi. M, [2013], "*Migration for Domestic Work- A Case of Female Domestic Workers in Bangalore*" ; *International Journal of Social Science & Interdisciplinary Research*; ISSN 2277- 3630 IJSSIR, Vol.2 [1], January [2013] Online available at; www.indianresearchjournals.com
- [6] Baljinder Kaur, J.M. Singh, et al [2011], "*Causes and Impact of Labour Migration: A Case Study of Punjab Agriculture*". *Agricultural Economics Research Review*"; Vol. 24 [Conference Number] 2011 pp 459-466
- [7] *Census of India. 2001, source; Data Highlights Migration Tables [D1, D1 [Appendix], D2 and D3 Tables]*