

REASONS FOR MIGRATION OF RURAL YOUTH TO URBAN AREAS

¹M. Kiran, ²E. Mutturaj Yadav, ³K.B. Namratha, ⁴V. Jagadeeswary
and ⁵K. Satyanarayan

^{1,2}MVSc Scholar, ⁴Assosiate Professor, ⁵Professor and Head
Department of Veterinary and Animal Husbandry Extension Education,
Veterinary College, Hebbal, Bengaluru KVAFSU, Bidar

³MVSc Scholar, Department of Livestock Product Technology, Veterinary College,
Hebbal, Bengaluru, KVAFSU, Bidar
E-mail: kiranvet1212@gmail.com

Abstract: Since the mid-1990s, migration of workforces from rural to urban areas has accelerated in South India accompanied by remarkable urban-based economic development. The purpose of this paper is to investigate the reasons for such rural urban migration in detail, especially amongst rural youth of Karnataka state. Following ex-post facto research design and random sampling method, the data was collected from 50 respondents belonging to 16 districts of Karnataka using a structured interview schedule. Majority of the respondents were of young age (56%), living in a nuclear family (90%) and possessed medium land holding (34%) with agriculture as their main occupation (48%). Majority of the respondents belonged to low income category (76%), with male as family decision makers (74%). Improvement in the standard of living (76%) and availability of employment with better remuneration in urban areas (72%) were the most important reasons for migration of rural youth towards urbanized areas. The solutions to the problems of rural-urban migration include, provision of group amenities like water, electricity, cinemas, roads and telephones in rural areas. Adoption of scientific agricultural practices, establishment of colleges and other institutions of higher studying in rural areas may help in reducing the mobility towards urban areas.

Keywords: Rural- urban migration, remuneration, and adoption.

Introduction

Our 70% population lives in the rural areas and their main source of livelihood is agriculture (Ritesh Dwivedi, 2012). Labour is the single most important factor in determining national income. Poverty is the main obstacle for the development of any country, but it is a very grave phenomenon where a section of society is unable to fulfill the basic necessities of life like bread, cloth, house and education. In rural areas people don't get an employment, their main livelihood is mostly agriculture and in some cases seasonal employment in agriculture, that's why workers face a lot of problems. The landless poor who mostly belong to lower castes, indigenous communities and economically backward regions constitute the major portion of Migrants. A study by Arup Mitra and Mayumi Murayama (2008) revealed that,

77% of the population i.e. nearly 840 million Indians live on less than Rs.20 a day. Indian agriculture became non remunerative, taking the lives of 100,000 peasants during the period from 1996 to 2003, i.e. a suicide of an Indian peasant every 45 minutes. Hence, the rural people from the downtrodden and backward communities and backward regions of Karnataka travel to far distances seeking employment at the lowest rungs in construction of roads, irrigation projects, commercial and residential complexes and buildings.

Rural-urban migration has negative consequences. It leads to overpopulation of the urban areas. Rural -urban migration slows down the rate of development of the rural areas. With this background the following study on reasons for migration of rural youth to urban areas was taken up.

Materials and Methods

Ex-post facto research design was adopted in this research and random sampling method was used to select the respondents. A total of 50 respondents belonging to 16 districts of Karnataka namely Ramanagara, Mandya, Haveri, Hassan, Utara Kannada, Bangalore, Mysore, Tumkur, Davanagere, Chikamaglore, Chikabalapura, Chamarajanagara, Chitradurga, Bellary, Vijayapura and Kolar were selected and the primary data was collected using a structured interview schedule. Secondary data were obtained from existing literature. The statistical tools used for data analysis were simple frequency and percentage.

Results and Discussion

Findings from the study showed that 56 per cent of the respondents belonged to the age group of 21-30 years (young age), 30 per cent were within the age group of 31-40 years (middle age) while 14 per cent were of old age (41 years and above). It revealed that majority of the migrants belonged to young age group. The findings were in consonance with Zainab Gimba *et al.* (2001). Findings from the study showed that 90 per cent of the respondents were living in nuclear family and 10 per cent in joint family. This showed that most of the migrants belonged to nuclear family and these findings were similar to the observations reported by Mariapia Mendola (2006).

Findings from the study showed that 34 per cent of the respondents were medium (2.5-5acres) land holders, 26 per cent were small (< 2.5acres), 26 per cent were landless and 14 per cent were large (>5acres) land holders. Among the land holders, majority (70.00%) of the farmers cultivated fodder for feeding their animals where as 19 per cent purchased and 11 per cent of the farmers cultivated as well as purchased the fodder for feeding their livestock. This showed that most of the migrants were medium and they cultivated fodder for livestock.

Table 1 revealed that, majority (46.00%) of the respondents themselves carried out the farm activities whereas only 13 per cent used paid labour and 41 per cent used both own as well as paid labour to carry out their farm activities. Findings from the study showed that 48 per cent of the respondents main occupation was agriculture followed by business (28.00%), both agriculture and animal husbandry (14%) and only animal husbandry (10.00%). Findings from the study showed that 76 per cent of the respondents income was low, followed by medium (22%) and high (2%). It was observed from Table 1 that in majority of the households, male were the decision makers (74.00%), followed by participation of all the family members in decision making process (12.00%), female (8.00%) and children (6.00%) decision makers. Findings from the study showed that 56 per cent of the respondents sought information through informal sources where as 44 per cent acquired information through formal sources.

The major reasons of rural-urban migration of youths were identified as, to improve their standard of living (76%), availability of more remunerative employment in urban areas (72%), modernization of rural areas with industrialization (72%), shortage of feed and fodder (60%), higher education of youth in rural areas (54%), encroachment of farming areas by real estate with attractive prices (54%), lack of interest in labor intensified activities (54%), lack of remunerative price for the agricultural output/produce (52%), lack of proper educational facilities in the villages (52%) and division/partition of family type from joint to nuclear (50%). The results were in line with those reported by Zainab Gimba *et al.* (2001).

Other reasons opined for rural youth migration to urban areas by less than 50 per cent of respondents were failure of government in reaching the farmers in accessing the welfare schemes meant for them (46%), lack of manpower in the family to carry on agriculture (42%), failure of monsoons (40%), exploitation by middle man/brokers in marketing the produce (40%), to possess year round work (38%), disasters like drought and floods (38%), constraints in availability of resources like water, electricity, seeds, fertilizers. (38%), farming not providing social status/identification in the society/respect (36%), lack of basic facilities in the villages (30%) and disease outbreaks (24%) (Table 2).

Table 1. Socio-economic characteristics of the respondents

SI No.	Socio-economic characteristics	Category	Respondents, N=50	
			Frequency	Percentage
1	Age group	Young age (20-40years)	28	56.00
		Middle age (40-60)	12	24.00
		Old age (>60)	10	20.00
2	Family type	Joint family	5	10.00
		Nuclear family	45	90.00
3	Family size	2-4	37	74.00
		5-7	12	24.00
		8-10	1	2.00
4	Land holding(acres)	Small	13	26.00
		Medium	17	34.00
		Large	7	14.00
		landless	13	26.00
5	Fodder	Cultivated	25	70.00
		Purchased	7	19.00
		Both	4	11.00
6	Labour	Own	17	46.00
		Paid	5	13.00
		Both	15	41.00
7	Main occupation	Agriculture	24	48.00
		Animal husbandry	5	10.00
		Both	7	14.00
		Others	14	28.00
8	Income	<5lakh	38	76.00
		5-10lakh	11	22.00
		>10lakh	1	2.00
9	Decision making in family	Male	37	74.00
		Female	4	8.00
		Children	3	6.00
		All	6	12.00
10	Information seeking behaviour	Informal	28	56.00
		Formal	22	44.00

Table 2. Reasons for migration of rural youth to urban areas

SL No.	Reasons	Yes		No	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
01	Because of availability of more remunerative employment.	36	72.00	14	28.00
02	To improve the standard of living	38	76.00	12	24.00
03	Failure of monsoons	20	40.00	30	60.00
04	To possess year round work /unable to use the time in non cultivated	19	38.00	31	62.00

	seasons				
05	Failure of government in reaching the farmers in accessing the welfare schemes meant for them.	23	46.00	27	54.00
06	Modernization of rural areas with industrialization.	36	72.00	14	28.00
07	Disasters (Drought, Floods)	19	38.00	31	62.00
08	Higher Education of youth	27	54.00	23	46.00
09	Disease outbreaks	12	24.00	38	76.00
10	Shortage of feed and fodder	30	60.00	20	40.00
11	Encroachment of farming areas by real estate with attractive prices	27	54.00	23	46.00
12	Farming is not providing social status/identification in the society/respect	17	36.00	33	66.00
13	Lack of remunerative price for the output/produce	26	52.00	24	48.00
14	Lack of interest in Labour intensified activities	27	54.00	23	46.00
15	Division/partition of family type from joint to nuclear	25	50.00	25	50.00
16	Constraints in availability of resources like water, electricity, seeds, fertilizers etc.	19	38.00	31	62.00
17	Exploitation by middle man/brokers in marketing the produce	20	40.00	30	60.00
18	Lack of proper educational facilities in the villages	26	52.00	24	48.00
19	Lack of basic facilities in the villages	15	30.00	35	70.00
20	Lack of manpower in the family to carry on agriculture	21	42.00	29	58.00

Conclusion

The rate of rural-urban migration of youths is alarming in recent years. Unless the government provides the basic necessities of life to the rural areas and provide the productive youth in the rural areas with employment opportunities people will continuously drift in to the urban areas from the rural areas in search for better life and employment. In view of the negative consequences, Government should strive to provide social amenities and facilities in the rural areas and also provide jobs for the youths in the rural areas.

References

- [1] Arup Mitra and Mayumi Murayama. 2008. Rural urban migration: a district level analysis. Institution of Developing Economics. 137.
- [2] Mariapia Mendola. 2006. Rural out-migration and economic development at origin. Sussex Migration Working Paper. 40.
- [3] Ritesh Dwivedi. 2012. Migration: an overview and relevant issues. SMS Varanasi. 8(2): 12-15.
- [4] Zainab Gimba, Mustapha, G and Kumshe. 2001. Causes and effects of rural-urban migration in borno state: a case study of maiduguri metropolis. Asian Journal of Business and Management Sciences. 1(1): 168-172.