

Migration, Poverty and Vulnerability in the Informal Labour Market in India

ANINDITA SENGUPTA*

This paper investigates the relationship between poverty and migration with the 64th round household level data on employment and unemployment and migration particulars in India collected from the National Sample Survey Office (NSSO) in 2007-08. The paper examines whether out-migration of rural workers is a gainful option to reduce poverty. By applying the logit model, the study also investigates the effect of rural urban migration on poverty among the in-migrant households living in urban areas in the probabilistic sense. The study explores probable reasons behind migration, either temporary or permanent, in urban locations. It is observed that lack of education, pressure of big family size, small landholding and inadequate agricultural income push rural workers to out-migrate to the cities in search of jobs.

Keywords: Rural-Urban Migration, Poverty Analysis, Logistic Regression Model, India

JEL Classification: J61, I32, C25

I. INTRODUCTION

The process of global integration and associated structural reforms has accelerated the pace of urbanisation and rural–urban migration in a new shape in Asia, particularly in India and China. It was believed that the process of globalisation would lead to inflow of foreign capital as well as increase indigenous investment creating employment opportunities within or around the metro cities. Following the neoclassical framework (Harris-Todaro 1970 and Todaro 1976), it was also expected that the window of migration will provide an opportunity to labourers in backward regions and remote rural areas to shift rapidly to growing regions and dynamic urban centres in the hope of improving their economic wellbeing. However, such a dramatic improvement did not take place for workers in the developing countries in Asia. A significant part of the

* Assistant Professor in Economics, Hooghly Women’s College, Hooghly, West Bengal, India.

The author is deeply indebted to Dr. Panchanan Das, Associate Professor of Economics, University of Calcutta, for his invaluable guidance and immense contribution to the econometric analysis of this paper.

rural out migrants failed to enter into modern sector of big cities partly because of their skill deficiency and partly because of the exclusive nature of urbanisation in these countries and they had somehow been absorbed in informal sector activities of the small towns of the peripheries (Kundu 2009). Unskilled migrants from rural areas remain poor because of lack of decent jobs for them. This kind of rural urban migration raised urban poverty without reducing the rural poverty (Bremner 1996).

Migration of different types has increased significantly during the post reform period in India. While there has been an increase in long-distance permanent migration, the rate of increase in the short-distance temporary and circular migration has also been remarkable. Migration across states and across districts within the states in India has increased at an unprecedented rate during the last two decades (Sengupta 2012). In India, in most of the cases, rural-urban migration works not for better expected wage by following the Harris-Todaro (1970) mechanism as such but for searching any type of work to maintain even subsistence level of living (Deshingkar 2010). Rural-urban migration of this kind may purely be seasonal, or cyclical or permanent, and perhaps it is a routine livelihood strategy in the countryside, not just because of the response to shocks such as drought, floods and earthquakes (de Haan 2000, Deshingkar and Start 2003, Rogaly and Coppard 2003). Kundu and Sarangi (2007) demanded that slower growth and low income generating capacity of agriculture along with the lack of alternative livelihood opportunities forced the rural people to migrate out to the cities. But the absorption of the migrants created a serious stress in the urban centres without improving the situation of the migrants.

Against this backdrop, this paper attempts to investigate the relationship between poverty and migration with the 64th round household level survey data on *employment and unemployment and migration particulars* in India collected by the National Sample Survey Office (NSSO) in 2007-08, under the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India. The paper examines whether out-migration of rural workers is an alternative gainful option to reduce poverty by looking into the labour market behaviour in India after one and a half decades of economic reforms in the country. The paper also investigates the effect of rural urban migration on poverty among the in-migrant households living in urban areas in probabilistic sense by applying logit model. For the analyses of rural poverty of out-migrant families and urban-poverty of in-migrant families, we have selected rural out-migrant households and urban in-migrant households respectively from the sample households captured in the 64th round survey. The study also analyses the probable reasons behind migration, either temporary or permanent, in urban locations. As the cost of living in the

urban centres is extremely high for the poor migrants, it may be nearly impossible for them to stay there on a permanent basis. Thus it is plausible to assume that a major part of the rural migrants are of temporary in nature with greater risk of being below the poverty line. Therefore, an analysis about the nature of temporary migration in urban informal labour markets in India and its underlying causes has become imperative.

Migration, at least theoretically, can reduce poverty and vulnerability of the migrant-households by improving their earning capacity. However, there has been intense debate in the literature on the reasons behind migration among the poor and effects of such mobility on poverty. The orthodox school viewed migration largely as the mobility of distressed and poor agricultural people. According to this view, rural-urban migration aggravates urban poverty without improving the living conditions of the rural migrants. The fate of poor migrant workers is always caught in the transition from pre-capitalist to capitalist modes of production and they can never experience upward social movement (Breman 1994). The exploitation of migrant workers by market intermediaries and their consequent inability to break out of poverty has been noted by many structuralist researchers (Olsen and Ramanamurthy 2000, Reddy 1990). Sen and Hulme (2002), for example, observed that migration is caused by chronic poverty, although they did not find a significant direction of causality between migration and poverty. Skeldon (2003) also found roughly similar observations, but the impact of migration on poverty varied by level of development of the locations of destination. Some other studies, however, observed migration as the process for supplementing the level of subsistence (de Haan 2000, Deshingkar and Start 2003, Rogaly and Coppard 2003, Narain, Gupta and Veld 2005). Some of them viewed that migration improved earnings of the migrant households reducing their level of poverty and vulnerability. Kundu (2009) observed that poverty of migrants declined significantly with the increase in the size of urban centre. Bhanumurthy and Mitra (2006) had shown that even when the incidence of urban poverty increased as a result of the rural-urban migration, the incidence of overall poverty declined because of the fall in rural poverty at a higher proportional rate following out-migration during the post-reform period.

This paper contributes to the ongoing debate on the relationship between poverty and migration in the literature by focussing on some specific issues of out migration from rural to urban centres in the context of labour market behaviour in India. The rest of the paper is organised as follows. Section II describes the data used in this exercise including the sample design followed by the NSSO in collecting the data and also deals with the methodological issues

related to the estimation of logit model. Empirical results are analysed in section III. Section IV highlights some policy implications of the study. The major findings are summarised and some concluding observations are made in section V.

II. METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES AND SOURCES OF DATA

In analysing the effect of different socio-economic factors on probability that a migrant-household being poor we have taken education, experience, family size, landholding, religious, social and gender dimensions of the household as controlled variables. Education, skill and experience influence highly the probability of getting jobs and ultimately the probability of households being poor. Large family-size and small landholding are believed to put some extra pressure on the households and induce migration. In India, the religious minorities, backward castes and female-headed households are assumed to be more poor and vulnerable than the others. In this paper we have looked into the differential effects of migration on poverty by religion, caste and gender in the rural economy. The empirical analysis has been carried out to investigate whether migration to the big cities is the best option for the rural families to reduce their poverty. We observe that, in many cases, rural workers migrate not for higher wage expectation but for getting jobs of any type throughout the year.

Migration could have been consequential to either pull or push factors depending largely on the types of migration. While permanent migration is assumed to be induced by pull factors, temporary migration is generally influenced by push factors. Permanent migrants are conventionally assumed to be educated and skilled. A rural-urban wage differential pulls up economic wellbeing of the skilled workers as a consequence of permanent rural-urban migration. On the other hand, the depth of poverty and the seasonal character of employment in the rural economy push the working poor towards temporary out migration for their survival. While better job with higher pay is the most prominent reason behind permanent migration, economic deprivation is one of the most critical factors for temporary migration decisions. Large family size and high consumption expenditure of the household are believed to put economic pressure on the income-earning members in rural households and induce temporary migration. Minorities, backward class people and female-headed households are among the poorest ones in rural areas. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that a major portion of temporary migrants belong to those categories. Educational qualification and experience are believed to influence significantly the status of migrants and the nature of job they get in the destinations.

The unit level data from the 64th round survey (schedule 10.2) on 'Employment and Unemployment and Migration Particulars' in India have been used in this paper. The sample households are selected following multi-staged stratified random sampling technique. This survey covers 79,091 households in 7,984 villages and 46,487 households in 4,704 urban blocks. A lot of information such as present place of residence, reason for migration, period of staying out, etc. have been collected for out-migrants. The household characteristics like household size, household industry, occupation, religion, social group, household type, land possessed, migration particulars of the households during the last 365 days and so on are also available in the data schedule. Different information of the households relating to migration along with some other characteristics, namely age, sex and educational level of every person within a household have been recorded. The advantage of using this data set is that a migration schedule was canvassed in detail along with consumption expenditure and employment in schedule 10.2 of this round. The analysis begins with simple cross classification of the number of migrant households and incidence of poverty by adjusting with sampling weight calculated with the help of multiplier as available in the data set, by their socio-economic, including locational characteristics. The sampling design of NSS is supposed to be appropriate for generating estimates of consumption expenditure and poverty at the state and region levels.

In order to find out whether out-migration is the best possible option for the rural families to reduce their poverty, the risk of poverty of rural households with out-migrant members is analysed with the help of a logit model. To estimate the relationship between poverty and migration, a variety of possible correlates of rural poor out-migrant households including general education, household size, land-holding, household type dummy, religion dummy, caste dummy, temporary out-migrant dummy, gender dummy, age, and age squared are used.

In a logit model the probability of an out-migrant household being poor follows logistic distribution:

$$P_{poor_rural_out-migrant} = \frac{e^{\beta_i X_i}}{1 + e^{\beta_i X_i}} \quad (1)$$

where, $P_{poor_rural_out-migrant}$ = Probability of being below poverty line for an out-migrant family in rural areas

X_i = Explanatory factors which influence poverty of out-migrant households in the rural areas

The probability of being above poverty line for any out-migrant family in rural areas, therefore, can be written as:

$$1 - P_{\text{poor_rural_out-migrant}} = \frac{1}{1 + e^{\beta_i X_i}} \quad (2)$$

From (1) and (2) we have,

$$\frac{P_{\text{poor_rural_out-migrant}}}{1 - P_{\text{poor_rural_out-migrant}}} = e^{\beta_i X_i} \quad (3)$$

i.e.,

$$L_i = \ln\left(\frac{P_{\text{poor_rural_out-migrant}}}{1 - P_{\text{poor_rural_out-migrant}}}\right) = \beta_i X_i \quad (4)$$

Following equation (4), we can write the urban poverty equation of our analysis as:

$$\begin{aligned} L_i = & \beta_1 + \beta_2 EDU + \beta_3 HHSIZE + \beta_4 LAND + \beta_5 HHTYPE + \\ & \beta_6 MUSLIM + \beta_7 ST + \beta_8 SC + \beta_9 OUTMIGR_TEMP + \\ & \beta_{10} FEMALE + \beta_{11} AGE + \beta_{12} AGESQ + u_i \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where

$P_i=1$ if the rural out-migrant household is below the poverty line

$P_i=0$ if the rural out-migrant household is above the poverty line

If we put these values directly into the equation (5), where L , i.e. the logit is the log of odds ratio, we can write,

$L_i = \ln(1/0)$ if the rural out-migrant household is below the poverty line

$L_i = \ln(0/1)$ if the rural out-migrant household is above the poverty line

u_i is the he stochastic error term.

The variable EDU is mean year of schooling of the head of the family, $HHSIZE$ is household size; $LAND$ is the area of landholding, and $HHTYPE$ is household type dummy variable, equal to 1 for agricultural households and 0 for other households. $MUSLIM$ is the dummy variable for a specific religious group,

equal to 1 for Muslims and 0 otherwise; *SC* and *ST* are the dummy variable for scheduled caste and scheduled tribe households, equal to 1 for a *SC* and *ST* and 0 otherwise. *OUTMIGR_TEMP* is the dummy variable for temporary out-migrants, equal to 1 for households with temporary out-migrant members and 0 otherwise. *FEMALE* is the gender dummy variable, equal to 1 for female-headed households and 0 otherwise. The coefficients β_{11} and β_{12} measure the effect of age on the probability of poverty of a rural out-migrant household and the rate of change of this effect with increase in age, respectively. Age is included here as a proxy variable of experience.

To find out the main reasons behind the poverty of the in-migrant families in the urban areas, situation of poor in-migrant households in urban areas is analysed with the help of a similar type of econometric model using a range of possible explanatory factors of urban poor in-migrant households including general education, household size, land-holding, casual worker dummy, religion dummy, caste dummy, temporary in-migrant dummy, gender dummy, unskilled worker dummy, age, and age squared. The relation to be estimated is specified as:

$$\begin{aligned}
 L_i = & \delta_1 + \delta_2 EDU + \delta_3 HHSIZE + \delta_4 LAND + \delta_5 WORKER_CASUAL \\
 & + \delta_6 MUSLIM + \delta_7 ST + \delta_8 SC + \delta_9 INMIGR_TEMP \\
 & + \delta_{10} FEMALE + \delta_{11} WORKER_UNSKILLED \\
 & + \delta_{12} AGE + \delta_{13} AGESQ + v_i
 \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where

$L_i = \ln(1/0)$ if the urban in-migrant household is below the poverty line

$L_i = \ln(0/1)$ if the urban in-migrant household is above the poverty line

v_i is the stochastic error term.

WORKER_CASUAL is the dummy variable for in-migrant casual workers, equal to 1 for casual workers and 0 otherwise. *INMIGR_TEMP* is the dummy variable for temporary in-migrants, equal to 1 for temporary in-migrant households and 0 otherwise, *WORKER_UNSKILLED* is the dummy variable for unskilled migrant workers, equal to 1 for unskilled workers, 0 otherwise. The rest of the symbols have usual meaning as described above.

Situation of temporary as well as permanent rural-urban migrants in the informal labour market is analysed with the help of a logit model using a number

of explanatory variables including general education, household size, land-holding, household type, religion dummy, caste dummy, gender dummy, unskilled worker dummy, monthly per capita consumption expenditure, age, and age squared. For this purpose, the estimated equation is specified as:

$$\begin{aligned}
 L_i = & \mu_1 + \mu_2 EDU + \mu_3 HHSIZE + \mu_4 LAND + \mu_5 HHTYPE + \\
 & \mu_6 MUSLIM + \mu_7 ST + \mu_8 SC + \mu_9 FEMALE + \\
 & \mu_{10} WORKER_UNSKILLED + \mu_{11} MPCE + \\
 & \mu_{12} AGE + \mu_{13} AGESQR + w_i
 \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where

$L_i = \ln(1/0)$ if the household has migrated temporarily

$L_i = \ln(0/1)$ if the household has migrated permanently

w_i = stochastic error term

MPCE= monthly per capita consumption expenditure of the migrant family.

III. EMPIRICAL RESULTS

In our empirical exercise the sample for the rural out-migrant families includes 5,946 households. The poverty of rural out-migrant families has been analysed by estimating a logit model as specified in equation (5) with log-odds of a rural out-migrant household being poor as the dependent variable and a variety of socio-economic factors as independent variables. The estimated coefficients and the corresponding marginal effects for rural out-migrant households are shown in Table I. The likelihood ratio chi-square of 1205.15 with a p-value of 0.0000 indicates that our model as a whole fits significantly better than a model with no predictors.

Our empirical results suggest that the chance of a rural household with any family member migrated out on temporary basis being poor had been significantly high as compared to the household with permanent migration. In other words, family members of temporary out-migrants were more vulnerable than the family members of permanent out-migrants, not rejecting the hypothesis as stated above. Education, measured by year of schooling, had a negative and highly significant coefficient, implying that the longer the period of education, the lower was the probability of being poor through out-migration. Similarly, the larger the household size, the higher had been the probability of the family of out-migrant to be poor. The marginal effect on poverty in probabilistic sense of

an out-migrant's family increased significantly as size of landholding decreases. The chance of being poor of a out-migrant's family was significantly higher for the households related to land based activity as compared to non-agricultural households. Out-migration, however, had no significant differential impact on poverty for Muslim households. The marginal effects on poverty were significantly higher both for tribal people and scheduled caste families as compared to other social groups. Out-migration actually aggravated the poor living conditions for both the rural tribes and scheduled castes in the countryside. There had been no significant differences between female- and male-headed households in the rural economy in terms of effects of migration on household's poverty. Age had a negative and highly significant coefficient, implying that the higher the age of the head of the family, the lower is the probability of any out-migrant family to be poor. The squared of age had a positive and highly significant coefficient, implying that poverty of the out-migrant family declines at an increasing rate with the increase in age of the head of the family.

We have also analysed the poverty of urban in-migrant families by estimating a logit model as specified in equation (6) with data for 3,522 households living in urban centres. The estimated results are shown in Table II. The statistics shown in the lower panel of Table II confirm the goodness of fit of the model. There had been no significant difference between the effects of in-migration of temporary and permanent basis on poverty at the household level. Education had the similar effect on poverty of in-migrant urban households as for the out-migrant rural households shown in Table I. The longer the period of schooling, the lower is the probability of family, both in-migrant and out-migrant, to be poor. Larger household size increased the probability of the urban in-migrant household being poor. Contrasting to the case of out-migrant households, the size of landholding had insignificant effect on poverty of in-migrant family in probabilistic sense. Workers absorbed on casual basis, particularly in the informal sector, are conventionally more deprived than other workers in the urban economy. But in the case of in-migrant urban households, there had been no significant difference in relative deprivation between casual workers and other workers. The differential effect of in-migration on poverty between religious minorities and others had also been insignificant as in the case of rural out-migrant households. Similarly, scheduled tribes in urban centres through migration were not more deprived as compared to other social groups, including the upper caste households. But the level of wellbeing of the scheduled caste in-migrant families was significantly lower than the level of wellbeing of

other in-migrant families. Female dummy has a negative and highly significant coefficient, implying that female-headed in-migrant households were significantly less poor than male-headed in-migrant households. No significant difference had been observed between unskilled workers and other workers among the in-migrant urban households in terms of the marginal effects of migration on probability that a household being poor. Work experience, measured by age of the household head, had a dissimilar effect of in-migration on poverty compared to the case of out-migration. However, the poverty level of the in-migrant family increased at a decreasing rate with the increase in age of the head of the family.

TABLE I
LOGIT ESTIMATES OF POVERTY OF RURAL
OUT-MIGRANT HOUSEHOLDS IN INDIA

Variables	Coefficients	Marginal Effects	z-statistic	P>z
<i>Intercept</i>	0.311813		0.78	0.438
<i>EDU</i>	-0.25856	-0.012	-15.09	0
<i>HHSIZE</i>	0.367012	0.018	19.38	0
<i>LAND</i>	-0.35519	-0.017	-10.97	0
<i>HHTYPE</i>	1.088031	0.057	9.99	0
<i>MUSLIM</i>	0.139227	0.007	0.98	0.328
<i>ST</i>	0.462598	0.025	3.69	0
<i>SC</i>	0.469138	0.026	3.61	0
<i>OUTMIGR_TEMP</i>	0.830467	0.04	8.38	0
<i>FEMALE</i>	0.011129	0.0005	0.07	0.943
<i>AGE</i>	-0.13568	-0.006	-7.81	0
<i>AGESQ</i>	0.001022	0	5.68	0

LRChi²(11)=1205.15

Prob>Chi²=0.0000

Pseudo R²=0.279

Source: Author's calculations.

TABLE II
**LOGIT ESTIMATES OF POVERTY OF URBAN IN-MIGRANT
 HOUSEHOLDS IN INDIA**

Variables	Coefficients	Marginal Effects	z-statistic	P>z
<i>Intercept</i>	-3.890		-5.2	0
<i>EDU</i>	-0.266	-0.021	-17.48	0
<i>HHSIZE</i>	0.260	0.02	9.81	0
<i>LAND</i>	-0.058	0.004	1.48	0.14
<i>WORKER_CASUAL</i>	0.171	0.012	1.26	0.209
<i>MUSLIM</i>	-0.215	-0.016	-1.33	0.183
<i>ST</i>	0.120	0.01	0.64	0.525
<i>SC</i>	0.488	0.044	3.38	0.001
<i>INMIGR_TEMP</i>	0.091	0.007	0.82	0.414
<i>FEMALE</i>	-2.150	-0.094	-8.19	0
<i>WORKER_UNSKILLD</i>	-0.325	-0.028	-1	0.317
<i>AGE</i>	0.159	0.012	4.88	0
<i>AGESQ</i>	-0.002	0.0001	-5.18	0
LRChi2(12)=679.38				
Prob>Chi2=0.0000				
Pseudo R2=0.229				

Source: Author's calculations.

Finally, the study locates the possible determining factors for rural-urban migration on temporary basis by carrying out similar type of estimation as for finding out the effects of migration on poverty. The sample for the urban in-migrant families includes 6,088 households. We have analysed the situation of temporary as well as permanent rural-urban migrants in the informal labour market where the probability of migration of a household from rural to urban areas on temporary basis is treated as a dependent variable and a host of possible socio-economic correlates including the level of wellbeing of the household in terms of monthly per capita expenditure. The estimated relationship is specified in equation (7) and the estimated coefficients along with the corresponding measure of marginal effects are shown in Table III. The likelihood ratio chi-square of 150.83 with a p-value of 0.0000 indicates that our model fits wells.

TABLE III
**LOGIT ESTIMATES OF TEMPORARY RURAL-URBAN
 MIGRATION IN INDIA**

Variables	Coefficients	Marginal Effects	z-statistic	P>z
<i>Intercept</i>	1.587888		4.94	0
<i>EDU</i>	-0.00014	0	-0.02	0.986
<i>HHSIZE</i>	0.000969	0.0002	0.08	0.935
<i>LAND</i>	0.02566	0.006	1.64	0.101
<i>HHTYPE</i>	-0.24637	-0.061	-3.88	0
<i>MUSLIM</i>	0.310156	0.075	3.79	0
<i>ST</i>	0.579019	0.14	8.63	0
<i>SC</i>	0.278384	0.068	3.62	0
<i>FEMALE</i>	0.145579	0.036	1.64	0.102
<i>WORKER_UNSKILLD</i>	-0.36331	-0.087	-1.93	0.053
<i>MPCE</i>	0.000122	0	2.43	0.015
<i>AGE</i>	-0.05831	-0.014	-5.16	0
<i>AGESQ</i>	0.000547	0	4.56	0
LRChi2(12)=150.83				
Prob>Chi2=0.0000				
Pseudo R2=0.018				

Source: Author's calculations.

The estimated results displayed in Table III suggest an inverse relationship between poverty and rural-urban migration on temporary basis. We have taken monthly per capita expenditure (MPCE) the as a proxy for wellbeing. The higher the value of MPCE, the lower will be the probability of a household being poor. MPCE has a positive and highly significant coefficient, implying that the higher the MPCE, the higher is the probability of migrating temporarily. The level of education had no significant effect on the probability that a household could temporarily migrate from rural to urban areas. While the larger household size worked as a push factor for rural-urban migration, the impact was very much insignificant for temporary migration. Larger landholding size induced larger probability of migrating temporarily, while the probability of temporary migration was significantly lower for agricultural households (actual cultivators and agricultural workers together) than the non-agricultural households. This

result suggests that for the households with larger land size, the owner engages himself in cultivation during the harvest period and migrates to the urban areas for supplementary income during the slack season. Small farmers, on the other hand, with their marginal land-holdings cannot afford to cultivate their own plots of land using modern technologies. They often lease out those plots to bigger farmers and permanently migrate to the cities in search of jobs. The probability of migrating temporarily was higher for Muslim households than for other religions. The chance factor for temporary migration was significantly high both for the tribal people and for the people within scheduled castes families. Dummy variable for female headed households is positive and statistically significant at 10 per cent level, implying that the probability of migrating temporarily for female headed households was higher than that of others. Unskilled worker dummy has a negative coefficient, implying that the probability of migrating temporarily for households with unskilled worker members was significantly lower than other households. Age has a negative and highly significant coefficient, implying that the higher the age of the head of the family, the lower is the probability of migrating temporarily. The square of Age has a positive and highly significant coefficient implying that chances of temporary migration decline at an increasing rate with the increase in age of the head of the family.

IV. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

According to the results of our analysis, education has a significant dampening effect on probability of poverty for a migrant household. Therefore, the Government should spread education more effectively, especially in remote rural areas. Special programme for skill enhancement should also be undertaken so that migrant workers find better paid jobs in the urban areas. Our results also show that larger household size puts some extra pressure on the migrant household and the probability of being poor increases and such families can only afford to stay temporarily in urban destinations. Under these circumstances, the Government needs to undertake programmes and policies to ensure that each and every member of the household receive proper education and training to receive a well-paid job after migration. It is often observed in Indian society that whenever the household size is large, female members are ignored in terms of education and training and male members enjoy those privileges. Government should take proper measures so that female members can also get proper education and training and can get well-paid jobs in urban destinations. Agricultural households are found to be more vulnerable and poor than the non-agricultural ones. These

households suffer from high seasonality, low productivity and inadequate income generation in agricultural sector. Poverty and vulnerability induce them to migrate in the urban areas in search of non-agricultural work in the urban areas. Most of them are habituated to do only agricultural works for generations. Therefore, they do not have proper skill to perform non-agricultural works in the urban destinations after migration. Government should arrange free skill development programmes for rural people so that they become well-equipped to get skilled jobs in the urban areas. Situation of women, religious minorities like Muslims and backward caste people is found to be more vulnerable. Government should take necessary action to promote development of these sections of the society. Our study reveals that most of the jobs available in urban informal sector are roughly of the same quality, i.e. low-skilled, low-paid and temporary in nature. Indeed, due to the gradual shrinkage of the formal sector, it has been nearly impossible to get permanent salaried jobs in the urban areas. Limited job opportunities in the formal sector are only available for highly educated and skilled people. Therefore, the government needs to create opportunities of permanent salaried jobs in the urban areas.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study is a modest attempt to analyse the vulnerability and poverty of rural-urban migrants in India. We have estimated logistic regression of poverty of rural out-migrant families and poverty of urban in-migrant families. We also analyse the situation of temporary as well as permanent migrants in urban informal labour market using a logistic regression model. For our analyses, we have used the NSS 64th round (2007-08) household level information on employment, unemployment and migration particulars in India.

We observe the existence of a highly significant and negative relationship between education and poverty of rural out-migrants and urban in-migrants. This is perfectly understandable because with increase in education chances of getting better paid permanent jobs increase and therefore chances of poverty decline. Larger household size puts some extra economic pressure on the family of the rural-urban migrants and therefore increases the probability of poverty in rural source as well as urban destination area. Smaller area of landholding in villages significantly reduces the chances of earning fair amount of money through agriculture and therefore increases the probability of out-migration in order to supplement the subsistence. Conversely, smaller area of urban landholding is a

common phenomenon with extremely high land price and therefore, it does not significantly raise the chances of poverty for urban in-migrants.

Our study reveals that agricultural migrant families have higher chances of being poor than non-agricultural migrant families. This proves the fact that agricultural labourers are the most vulnerable and poorest section in rural India. The result of our analysis shows that households of temporary out-migrants are significantly poorer than others in the rural areas. However, being a casual or unskilled in-migrant worker and being a temporary and not a permanent in-migrant in the urban areas do not imply higher chances of being poor. Such a result can only imply that although unlike well-off households, poorer ones in rural areas can only afford to migrate temporarily, in the urban areas, most of the jobs available in urban informal sector are roughly of the same quality, i.e. low-skilled, low-paid and temporary in nature. Therefore, there is very little difference between the economic status of in-migrants engaged in such activities.

Economic status of Muslim migrant families is not significantly different than others both in rural and urban areas. While scheduled caste migrant households are significantly poorer than others in rural areas, they are in a better position in urban areas. On the other hand, our study reveals that scheduled tribe migrant households are significantly poorer than others both in rural and urban areas. Although there is no difference in economic status between a male-headed and a female-headed migrant family in rural areas, female-headed migrant families have less chances of being poor than male-headed ones in urban areas. Our study further reveals that in the rural areas, with the increase in the age of the head of the out-migrant family, poverty declines at an increasing rate. On the contrary, in the urban areas, with the increase in the age of the head of the in-migrant family, poverty increases at a declining rate. As most of the informal sector jobs available for the migrant workers are highly labourious, the worker may find it increasingly difficult to continue with it with the increase in his age.

We have already observed that while in the rural areas, temporary out-migrant families are significantly poorer than permanent ones, in the urban areas, economic status of temporary and permanent in-migrant families is almost the same. To get a clearer picture, we have tried to investigate whether different socio-economic factors have different effects for temporary and permanent rural-urban migrants in India. Our analysis shows that although larger household size puts extra economic pressure on the family and induces rural-urban migration, migration is not necessarily temporary one. High monthly per capita consumption expenditure puts more pressure on poorer families, and these

families can only afford temporary migration. Therefore, in our study we observe a positive and significant relation between monthly per capita consumption expenditure and probability of temporary migration. Higher land-size encourages temporary migration. This is understandable, because the owner engages himself in cultivation during the harvest period and migrates to the urban areas for supplementary income during the slack season. Results of our analysis also reveal that agricultural households have a significantly low probability of temporary out-migration, i.e. a high probability of permanent out-migration. This implies that small cultivators, with their marginal land-holdings, cannot afford to cultivate their own plots of land using modern technologies. Therefore, they lease out those plots to bigger farmers and permanently migrate to the cities in search of jobs. Muslim households in the rural areas are found to opt for temporary rural-urban migration than the permanent one. Scheduled tribal, scheduled caste and female-headed households, being the poorest sections in the rural areas, are observed to go for temporary migration rather than permanent one. There is a common belief that less-educated workers do not find better jobs in the cities and therefore can only stay there temporarily. But we have shown that there is no clear evidence that less-educated workers opt for temporary migration and vice versa. Furthermore, our analysis shows that unskilled workers significantly prefer permanent migration over temporary one. This implies that low-paid informal sector jobs are increasingly being available for the low-educated and unskilled workers throughout the year. Therefore, availability of such jobs makes it possible for these migrant workers to stay in the cities permanently. Increase in age as well as experience raises the chances of getting better and permanent jobs in the cities and therefore, possibly reduces the probability of temporary migration.

Our study is based on unit level data from the 64th round survey (schedule 10.2) on 'Employment and Unemployment and Migration Particulars' in India. It is a cross-sectional analysis which captures the relationship of probability of migration with a number of socio-economics factors during the one-year period, July 2007 to June 2008. The main limitation of our analysis with unit level data is that although as a cross-sectional analysis it is a nearly perfect representation of the population, due to the lack of comparability we cannot make any panel data analysis. Migration is a dynamic concept which changes over time and its relation with different explanatory factors may also change over the years. Our analysis could not be able to make any prognostication about the changes in the relationship between migration and different socio-economic explanatory factors over the years. Our study also opens up many areas of research on rural-urban

migration within India. One can make further extension of this study by making an inter-state comparison of the push and pull factors behind the rural-urban migration of workers between poor and relatively rich states.

REFERENCES

- Bhanumurthy, N. R. and A. Mitra. 2006. *Globalization, Growth and Poverty in India*. WIDER Research Paper 2006/41, UNU-WIDER, Helsinki.
- Breman, J. 1994. "Seasonal Migration and Co-operative Capitalism: Crushing of Cane and Labour by Sugar Factories in Bardoli." In *Wage Hunters and Gatherers*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- 1996. *Footloose Labour: Working in India's Informal Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- deHaan, A. 2000. "Migrants, Livelihoods, and Rights: The Relevance of Migration in Development Policies." Social Development Working Paper 4. London: DFID.
- Deshingkar, P. 2010. "Migration, Remote Rural Areas and Chronic Poverty in India." ODI Working Paper 323, CPRC Working Paper 163, Chronic Poverty Research Centre, Overseas Development Institute, London.
- Deshingkar, P. And D. Start. 2003. "Seasonal Migration for Livelihoods in India: Coping, Accumulation and Exclusion." Working Paper 220. London: ODI.
- Harris, J. and M. P. Todaro. 1970. "Migration, Unemployment and Development: A Two-sector Analysis." *American Economic Review*, March:126-142.
- Kundu, A. 2009. "Exclusionary Urbanisation in Asia: A Macro Overview." *Economic and Political Weekly*, 44(48): 48-58.
- 2009. "Migration and Urbanisation in India in the Context of Poverty Alleviation." Paper presented at an international conference and workshop on *Policy Perspectives on Growth, Economic Structures and Poverty Reduction*, Beijing, China, 3-9 June.
- Kundu, A. and N. Sarangi. 2007. "Migration, Employment Status and Poverty: An Analysis across Urban Centres." *Economic and Political Weekly*, 42(4): 299-306.
- Narain, U., S. Gupta and K. van 't. Veld. 2005. "Poverty and the Environment: Exploring the Relationship between Household Incomes, Private Assets, and Natural Assets." Working Paper 134. New Delhi: Centre for Development Economics, Department of Economics, Delhi School of Economics.
- Olsen, W. and R.V. Ramanamurthy. 2000. "Contract Labour and Bondage in Andhra Pradesh (India)." *Journal of Social and Political Thought*, 1(2).
- Reddy, D. N. 1990. *Rural Migrant Labour in Andhra Pradesh*. Report submitted to the National Commission on Rural Labour, Government of India.

- Rogaly B. and D. Coppard. 2003. "They Used to Go to Eat, Now They Go to Earn: The Changing Meanings of Seasonal Migration from Puruliya District in West Bengal." *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 3(3): 395-433.
- Sen, B. and D. Hulme. 2002. "Programme for Research on Chronic Poverty in Bangladesh: A Proposal April 2002-April 2006." Manchester: CPRC.
- Sengupta, A. 2012. *Migration of Labour in West Bengal Districts: 1991-2001 - Nature and Changes of Short Distance Migration during the First Decade of Reform*. Saarbrucken, Germany: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.
- Skeldon, R. 2003. "Migration and Poverty." Paper presented at the conference on *African Migration and Urbanization in Comparative Perspective*, Johannesburg, South Africa, June 4-7.
- Todaro, M. P. 1976. *Internal Migration in Developing Countries: A Review of Theory, Evidence, Methodology and Research Priorities*. Geneva. ILO.