Push and Pull factors of out-migration- A study in Uttarakhand

Neha[1] and Priyanka Pandey[2]

1-2 Ph.D. students, Department of Agricultural communication, College of Agriculture, GBPUA&T, Pantnagar, Uttarakhand and Department of Home science, CSA University of Agriculture and Technology, Kanpur Uttar Pradesh, India

Abstract
Migration has become a global phenomenon cause not only by economic factors, but also by social, political, environmental, and psychological factors. It commonly takes place because of the push factor due to fewer opportunities in the socio-economic situations and the pull factors that exist in more developed areas. The present study explored the push and pull factors of rural-urban migration that have migrated in Udham Singh Nagar district from other Himalaya foothills of Uttarakhand. A survey of 100 migrant families reported their socio, economic, and psychological push and pull factors for migration. Prominent factors of out-migration documented in this study were unemployment, and better job opportunities in urban areas. These were perceived as both, push and pull factors of out-migration. Therefore, it is important to take relevant steps to minimize the out-migration and attract the migrants to come back to their respective villages. Thus, we can conclude that such scenario of external conditions under which people migrate, can't be evaluated without taking the migrants' attitudes and choices into account. For that reason, policy makers and agriculture scientists should come forward for the development of infrastructural facilities and capacity development of migrant people. Therefore, employment can be augmented and granted to the local people in rural areas.
Keywords: Migration, Push and pull factors, and hill agriculture.

I.   Introduction

Rural-Urban migration is the most crucial component of internal migration in any country. It is an outcome of regional inequality, in terms of economy, lack of employment opportunities resulting low living standards in rural area (Islam, 2006). There are three components of population change namely- mortality, fertility, and migration. In recent time, migration is a major cause of basic social change. Industrialization in urban area is the dominant single consequence of migration. Urban region is attracting large sections of rural population in the wake of economic (pull factor) for better opportunities such as employment, and other amenities, whereas poverty and pressure on land in the village also push the population out of their ancestral homes (Saif-ur-rehman, 1975). Development of urban cities is intrinsically related with rural-urban migration, as the huge labor requirement of urban centers is fulfilled by the labors from the rural areas (Harris 1970).

Migration is defined as the change of residence from one civil division to another for a specific period of time or on a permanent basis. Migration may occur for various reasons and its determinants or factors may vary from country to country or even within a country. The major factors of rural-urban migration are socio-economic, demographic and cultural factors. Factors those tend to encourage an outflow from the place of origin are called "push" factors, while factors attracting people towards the place of destination are called "pull" factors of migration. High unemployment rate, low income, high population growth, unequal distribution of land, demand for higher schooling, previous migration patterns and displeasure with housing have been identified as a number of the prominent factors of rural out-migration (Billsborrow *et al.,* 1987; Nabi, 1992; and Sekhar, 1993).

It is estimated that by 2030, the gross number of the urban population in developing countries will have doubled. Consequently, the demographic impact, rural-urban migration will have impact on the both patterns of urban growth at the destination and land use in the region of the migrant' native place. Urban recline with respect to agriculture, it has been shown to take agricultural lands out of production, whereas in rural area agricultural is left uncultivated (Bren *et al.*, 2017).

The central Himalayan foothills in Northern India are characterized by marginal agricultural productivity, rural poverty (Rais *et al.,* 2009; Guha, 2000; and Mamgain *et al.,* 1993) high vulnerability to natural disasters (Singh, 2017, and Satendra *et al.,* 2015), but still agriculture is the primary occupation of livelihood for 65% of the population (Census,2011). In Uttarakhand, with majority of the other Indian states,

---

80% of the migration flows were intra-state. Udham Singh Nagar district is located in Tarai belt and has grown differently than other district in Uttrakhand. Thus, this district has attracted numerous migrants from the surrounding rural districts.

II.   Materials and Methods

As Uttarakhand is located in the Himalayan foothills between 30º15' N and 79º 15' E at elevations between 1500–7816 meters. Hilly region has many apparently typical push-factors for migration, while Udham Singh Nagar district has many features of a typical urban-pull attractor as it is located in Tarai belt of Uttarakhand. A total of 100 migrant households in Udham Singh Nagar district were interviewed by the researcher using an interview schedule in field conditions. Non-probability sampling was used for the selection of respondents, as there was no information regarding full population of migrated persons. Therefore, snowball sampling technique was found most appropriate to dissociate the personal reasons for migrating from the native place. Appropriate statistics such as frequency and percentage were used for the analysis of data.

III.   Results And Discussion

The findings of the study have been divided into three sections, i) Profile characteristics of the respondents, ii) Push factors of out-migration, and iii) Pull factors of out-migration. For the present study age, marital status, family type, education qualification, occupation, annual income, and landholding of the respondents were independent variables. Whereas, push and pull factors of out-migration were dependent variables.

3.1 Profile characteristics of the respondents

Univariate data with respect to age, marital status, family type, education qualification, occupation, monthly income, and landholding is presented in this section, which is contextualizing the study and providing the detailed profile characteristics of respondents.

Table 3.1. Distribution of respondents based on profile characteristics

Attributes	Category	Percentage
Age	Young age (Up to 23 years)	9
	Middle age (23-37 years)	68
	Old age (Above 37 years)	23
Marital status	Married and migrated without their wife and children	17
	Married and migrated with their wife children	75
	Unmarried	8
Family type	Joint	11
	Nuclear	87
	Extended	2
Educational qualification	Uneducated and illiterate	19
	Primary school	33
	High school	13
	Intermediate	11
	Graduate and above	24
Occupation	Farmer	9
	Business	29
	Service/Job	38
	Labour	24
Monthly income	Low (Up to Rs. 51,780)	31
	Medium (Rs. 51,780-1,10,012)	57
	High (Above Rs. 1,10,012)	12
Landholding	Small (Up to 2.50 acres)	39
	Medium (2.51 to 5.0 acres)	47
	Large (Above 5.0 acres)	14

From the above table 3.1, it is evident that majority of the respondents (68 %) belonged to middle age (23-37 years) category, followed by 23 percent belonged to old age (Above 37 years) category, and the remaining nine percent of the respondent in young age category. Further, majority of the respondents (75%) were married and migrated with their wife and children, followed by 17 percent were married and migrated without their wife and children, while only eight percent of the respondents were unmarried. it is also observed from the table that majority of the respondents (87%) had nuclear family type, followed by 11 percent had joint family, while only two percent had extended family. Majority of the respondents were educated up to primary school, followed by 24 percent had education up to graduation level and above, 19 percent were uneducated and illiterate. Further, 13 percent were educated up to high school, followed by 11 percent had education up to intermediated. It is noticed from the table that majority of the respondents (38%) were engaged in service/job,

followed by 29 percent were engaged in business, 24 percent were engaged in labour work, while remaining nine percent were engaged in farming. It is evident from the table that majority of the respondents (57%) had medium level (Rs.51, 780-1, 10,012) of annual income, followed by 31 percent of the respondents having low level (Rs. 51,780) of annual income, while only 12 percent of the respondents had high level (Rs.1,10,012) of annual income. Majority of the respondents (47%) of the respondents had medium landholding, followed by 39 percent possessed small size landholding, while only 14 percent had large landholding.

3.2 Push factors of out-migration

For the present study, push factors included were social factors; such as parent and family, support of relatives/friends, economic factors; such as unemployment, low wages, and poverty, and psychological factors; such as self motivation, and Social alienation due to lack of social solidarity in the community.

Table 3.2 Distribution of respondents based on push factors of out-migration (n = 100)

S.No.	Push factors of out-migration	Percentage
I.	**Social factor**	
1.	Parents and family	7
2.	Support of Relatives / Friends	3
II.	**Economic factor**	
1.	Unemployment	34
2.	Low wages	11
3.	Poverty	26
III.	**Psychological factor**	
1.	Self motivation	17
2.	Social alienation due to lack of social solidarity in the community	2

From the above table, it is evident that the main push factor of out- migration is economic factor. Further, majority of the respondents (34%) reported that unemployment was the main cause of out-migration. This could be concluded that as rural population is mainly dependent on agriculture for their livelihood due to limited land or pressure on land, inadequate agricultural land, seasonal dependence on nature for agriculture, lack of education, population explosion, defective social system push them to migrate out from its native place. Further, 26 percent reported that poverty as the main push factor of out-migration, followed by only 11 percent of the respondents who reported that low wages as the push factor of out-migration. In the context of psychological factor; majority of the respondents (19%) reported self motivation as the push factor of out-migration, followed by only two percent told that social alienation due to lack of social solidarity in the community was the major push factor of out-migration. With respect to social factor; maximum percentage of the respondents (7%) reported that parents and family was the major push factor of out-migration, followed by only three percent told the main push factor of out-migration was support of relatives/friends.

The findings are line with Saif-ur-Rehman (1975) and Thet (2004) as they reported that economic factors such as employment and poverty were the main push factor of rural-urban migration. The findings are also in with Jatin (2010) who found employment as the main push factor of out-migration.

3.3 Pull factors of out-migration

For the present study, pull factors included were social factors; such as migrated friends' support, better public services (better road/railway and transport facility, medical and education facility, etc.), economic factors; better job opportunities, better living and working conditions, and high demand of labors in urban area, and psychological factors; absence of inferiority feelings due to discrimination based on religion.

Table 3.3 Distribution of respondents based on pull factors of out-migration (n = 100)

SI.No.	Pull factors of out-migration	Percentage
I.	**Social factor**	
1.	Migrated friends' support	3
2.	Better public services (better road/railway and transport facility, medical and education facility, etc.)	7
II.	**Economic factor**	
1.	Better job opportunities	54
2.	Better living and working conditions	22
3.	High demand of labors in urban area	13
III.	**Psychological factor**	
1.	Absence of inferiority feelings due to discrimination based on religion	1

From the above table, it is evident that the main pull factor of out-migration is economic factor. It is noticed from the table that majority of the respondents (54%) reported that better job opportunities was the main

pull factor of out-migration. This could be concluded that due to lack of village industries, poor infrastructure, lack of education, population explosion, they have migrated from their native place. It is evident from the table (3.1) that majority of the respondents are educated up to primary level, as in rural area due to lack of poor facilities they can't survive and sustain their family, while in urban area they have lot of opportunities for their survival. Due to this, they have migrated to the cities for better job opportunities. Further, 22 percent reported that better living and working conditions was the main pull factor of out-migration, while 13 percent of the respondents had migrated due to high demand of labors in urban area. With respect to social factor, majority of the respondents (7%) reported that better public services such as better road/railway and transport facility, medical and education facility, etc. were the main pull factor of out-migration, followed by only three respondents reported that they had migrated due to their migrated friends' support. In the context of psychological factor, only one percent of the respondent reported that absence of inferiority feelings due to discrimination based on religion was the main pull factor of out-migration.

The findings of the present study were line with Thet (2004) and Kainth (2010) as they reported that economic factors such as better opportunities for job and better living conditions were the major pull factors of out-migration. The findings are also in line with   Mamgain *et al.* (2015) who also found the better job opportunities was the main cause of out-migration.

IV.   Conclusion and suggestion

The present study tried to focus on various push and pull factors of out-migration. From the findings it could be concluded that social, economic, and psychological related factors determine the decision of out-migration. Out-migration has led to depopulation and land abandonment in rural areas, which has severe repercussions on the farming systems. Since the rural areas are devoid of infrastructural and institutional facilities, augmentation of employment is not possible, In addition, output from the traditional practices is not enough to carry livelihood sustainably. Consequently, migration has become common phenomena in Uttarakhand. If it continues like this, the out-migration will have severe adverse impacts on the rural areas and their economy. Therefore, it is important to take relevant steps to minimize the out-migration and attract the migrants to come back to their respective villages. Institutions related to capacity development should be set up at the local level, therefore employment can be augmented and granted to the local people. Further, the development of educational institutions can be seen as a precursor that can restrict the youth to out-migrate for better education. Modern technologies related to agriculture can enhance the yield of crops and employment opportunities. Therefore, policy makers and agriculture scientists should come forward for the development of infrastructural facilities and through it, employment can be augmented in rural areas.

References

[1].   Billsborrow, RE, McDevitt, TM, Kassoudji, S & Fuller, R.1987, The impact of origin community characteristics on rural-urban out-migration in a developing country. *Demography,* 24(2), 191-210.
[2].   Bren d', Amour, C., Reitsma, F., Baiocchi, G., Barthel, S., Guneralp, B., Erb, K.H., Haberl, H., Creutziga, F., & Seto, K.C. (2017). Future urban land expansion and implications for global croplands. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114 (34), 8939-8944.
[3].   Islam, N & Saleheen, M (2006). *Rural-urban linkage and migration issue in Bangladesh:* A secondary literature study, Centre for Urban Studies. *Dhaka University Journal of Earth and Environmental Sciences,* 3(1).
[4].   Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs. Census of India, 2011. Available on http://censusindia.gov.in/2011-Common/CensusData2011.html.
[5].   Guha, R. (2000). The unquiet woods ecological change and peasant resistance in the Himalaya. Expanded edition Bangalore: University of California Press.
[6].   Jatin,A. (2010). Labour migration and remittances in Uttarakhand: Case study report. Kathmandu: International Center for Integrated Mountain development. Availed on
[7].   Kainth, G. S. (2010). Push and pull factors of migration: a case study of brick kiln migrant workers in Punjab. Accessed on https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/30036/1/MPRA_paper_30036.pdf.
[8].   Mamgain, R. P., & Reddy, D. N. (2015). Outmigration from hill region of Uttarakhand: Magnitude. Challenges and Policy Options. Available at: *http://www. nird. org. in/SRSankaranChair/LEICERUC17.*
[9].   Nabi, AKMN (1992). Dynamics of internal migration in Bangladesh. *Canadian Studies in Population*, 19 (1), 81-98.
[10].   Rais, M., Pazderka, B., Vanloon, G. (2009). Agriculture in Uttakhand, India- Biodiversity, nutrition, and livelihoods. *Journal of Sustainable Agriculture,* 33, 319-335.
[11].   Saif-ur-rehman. (1975). Socio-economic and psychological factors in rural-urban migration: A case study in migration selectivity. *Pakistan economic and social review*, 12-27.
[12].   Satendra, A.K., Gupta, V.K., Naik, T.K.,Roy, S., Sharma, A.K. & Dwivedi, M. (2015). Uttarakhand disaster 2013. New Delhi: National Institute of Disaster Management. https://scholar.google.co.in/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Satendra+AK%2C+Gupta+VK%2C+Naik+TK%2C+Roy+S%2C+Sharma+AK%2C+Dwivedi+M.+Uttarakhand+Disaster+2013.&btnG=.
[13].   Sekhar, TV (1993). Migration selectivity from rural areas: Evidence from Kerala. *Demography India,* 22(2), 191-202.
[14].   Singh, P.V. (2017). Changing trends of agricultural development and its effects on environment of Uttarakhand hills (A challenge). *Scholarly Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies,* 4, 8608-8622.
[15].   Thet, K. K. (2014). Pull and push factors of migration: A case study in the urban area of Monywa township, Myanmar. *News from the World of Statistics*, 1(24), 1-14.