

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 trading 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://mpra.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]