



REVIEW OF RESEARCH

ISSN: 2249-894X

IMPACT FACTOR : 5.7631(UIF)

VOLUME - 14 | ISSUE - 3 | DECEMBER - 2024



A STUDY ON RURAL-URBAN MIGRATION IN KARNATAKA

Dr. Vijayakumar V.

**Associate Professor , Dept of Sociology , Govt First Grade College ,
KR Puram Bangalore.**

ABSTRACT

Migration is a complex and dynamic process in which persons move from one place to another through time and space Human migration is the intricate and ever-changing process of people moving over time and geography. It is a massive population movement that is frequently carried out in dangerous circumstances. People move for a variety of reasons, including better work possibilities, the need for political freedom, better living conditions, the desire to get wealthy rapidly through mining and other chances, and a more accepting culture toward all religions. In addition to being a simple human movement, migration from rural to urban, rural to rural, and urban to urban is a key component in the explanation of the constantly shifting space-content and space-relations within a nation. It is an essential mechanism that brings about changes in the population's distributional pattern and is fundamental to comprehending how people are distributed.



KEYWORDS: *Internal Migration; Distributional pattern; Hazardous.*

INTRODUCTION

Migration is a significant element in altering the size and composition of the population of a region or a country, therefore it is essential to demographers as well as human geographers, sociologists, economists, and others. In the course of development, the study of internal migration has particular significance. Internal migration is inherently linked to a process of change taking place within the social structure. The purpose of this article is to examine migration patterns in the research region, both rural and urban. It is commonly acknowledged that internal migration—which is defined as the movement of individuals within a nation's smaller units—plays a crucial role in the process of economic development. Any nation's struggle with economic development stems from the labor force's steady shift from the traditional agricultural sector to the expanding modern-urban industrial sector. Since labor will be moved from low-productivity, low-income occupations and areas to high-productivity, high-income occupations and areas, this process is seen as socially beneficial. Industrialization is therefore predicted to grow more quickly. Migration from rural to urban areas takes on particular importance in this scenario.

Migration from rural to urban areas both contributes to and is a consequence of changes in the productive systems. There is disagreement among social scientists who have studied the subject on the effects of migration. One perspective holds that mobility is an essential component of economic expansion, an equilibrating factor that promotes industrialization, enhances income distribution, and

drives technological advancements in agriculture. Contrary to the previous opinion, it is maintained that there is a loss of rare entrepreneurial and creative talent when relatively more resourceful, competent, and educated individuals move away from rural areas. Their shift entails a significant exodus of human capital from the rural sector, which could have a negative impact on agricultural incomes and productivity and exacerbate rural inequality.

Research on the migration patterns from rural to urban areas in developing nations indicates that these migration patterns are still higher than those of urban industrial employment prospects. Unplanned and unchecked rural-urban migration in low-income nations has resulted in a multitude of issues, including elevated rates of urban poverty and unemployment, as well as challenges with housing, transportation, sanitation, water supply, and environmental pollution. Due to their restricted funding, metropolitan local administrations are unable to handle these issues. In order to lessen the intensity of rural-urban mobility, several governments in these nations have been implementing policies and programs for rural development and urban-industrial dispersal concurrently. While the latter aims to decongest cities, the former aims to create social amenities and employment opportunities inside the rural area itself. There hasn't been much success with these initiatives. Understanding the dynamics of the internal migration process becomes necessary to improve the effectiveness of the programs. To put it another way, understanding the process of rural-urban migration—that is, knowing who migrates, why they migrate, and what they do—becomes crucial.

OBJECTIVES

1. To analyse the trends in rural-urban migration in general
2. To explore the major challenges of rural-urban migration in Karnataka
3. To know Impact of Rural development programme on migration
4. To formulate policies for migrant peoples.

METHODOLOGY

The present study is based on secondary data gathered from census reports, research journals, newspapers and also from the website. The study is geographically restricted to Karnataka state in India. The scope of the study is to analyse the trends in rural-urban migration and factors responsible for rural to urban migration.

The analysis is at the macro-level, based on secondary data that has been collected from census reports (migration table of 2011), district census handbook, gazetteer, administrative reports, books, journals and internet. The census data were particularly helpful in analyzing the broad past trends that motivate these movements and their impact on the origin and destination is lacking. The data analysis was done on computer, excel and ArcGIS, to show the thematic maps and flow of migration maps.

STUDY AREA

Karnataka State is located in Southwestern Part of India. Originally known as the State of Mysore, it was renamed Karnataka on the first of November 1973. It covers an area of 191.976 sq.Kms of the total geographical area of India. It is situated in the western part of the Deccan peninsula of the Indian union. Karnataka state is located within 11° 30'North and 18° 30'North latitudes and 74° East and 78° 30' East longitudes. The state is bounded by the Maharashtra state in the North, Goa, and Arabian Sea on the West. It has common boundaries with Andhra Pradesh on the East, with the Tamil Nadu and Kerala on the South. The state consists of 31 districts and 240 taluks

REASONS FOR MIGRATION

Migration can occur for a wide range of reasons. For the first time, data on migration causes were obtained from the 2011 census. Data on the reasons for migration, broken down by type and migrant stream, were given in 2011. These reasons were divided into five categories: work, education, moving to be closer to family, marriage, and other reasons. As data were further classified into business and natural disaster categories, the scope of the census was further expanded. The family relocated in

2011, the census was updated due to natural disasters, the new name was adopted upon birth, and the household moved with it. The idea of place of last residence serves as the foundation for the reason for migration data, which is helpful in understanding the driving forces behind human movement. Motives behind

Karnataka-The migration scenario

District-wise migration in Karnataka as per 2011 census

Karnataka is the eighth largest state in India, and predominated by diversity of geographical, socio-economic characters. Due to this diversity it is important to study the migration pattern in Karnataka at district level. Inter-district migration relates to those migrants who move from one district to another district within the state. This movement is accelerated due to socio-economic factors like growth of industry, agricultural development and urbanization.

Sl.No	Districts/State		Persons	Percentage to total	Male	Female
1.	Belagavi	Rural-Urban	259,566	6.50	5.63	7.30
		Urban-Rural	197,474	10.60	10.74	10.50
2.	Bagalkot	Rural-Urban	105,377	2.64	2.11	3.12
		Urban-Rural	61,881	3.32	3.32	3.32
3.	Bijapur	Rural-Urban	86,244	2.16	1.96	2.34
		Urban-Rural	53,798	2.90	2.70	3.01
4.	Bidar	Rural-Urban	68,715	1.72	1.39	2.02
		Urban-Rural	32,278	1.73	1.12	2.14
5.	Raichur	Rural-Urban	63,385	1.60	1.41	1.74
		Urban-Rural	39,561	2.12	1.74	2.38
6.	Koppal	Rural-Urban	42,708	1.07	0.94	1.18
		Urban-Rural	41,722	2.22	2.05	2.36
7.	Gadag	Rural-Urban	70,565	1.77	1.43	2.07
		Urban-Rural	40,025	2.15	2.27	2.06
8.	Dharwad	Rural-Urban	140,570	3.52	3.27	3.74
		Urban-Rural	60,506	3.25	3.61	3.00
9.	Uttara Kannada	Rural-Urban	65,380	1.64	1.39	1.86
		Urban-Rural	146,928	7.90	9.20	7.00
10.	Haveri	Rural-Urban	75,369	1.90	1.64	2.11
		Urban-Rural	54,763	2.94	2.81	3.02
11.	Bellary	Rural-Urban	133,378	3.34	3.10	3.57
		Urban-Rural	53,429	2.87	2.45	3.15

12.	Chitrdurga	Rural-Urban	60,906	1.53	1.48	1.50
		Urban-Rural	35,306	1.90	1.73	2.00
13.	Davangere	Rural-Urban	100,669	2.52	2.38	2.64
		Urban-Rural	46,071	2.47	2.37	2.54
14.	Shimoga	Rural-Urban	102,465	2.57	2.44	2.68
		Urban-Rural	75,431	4.05	4.10	4.01
15.	Udupi	Rural-Urban	74,678	1.87	1.64	2.08
		Urban-Rural	119,643	6.42	7.55	5.66
16.	Chikmagalur	Rural-Urban	44,085	1.10	0.99	1.21
		Urban-Rural	51,424	2.76	2.74	2.77
17.	Tumkur	Rural-Urban	119,786	3.00	2.80	3.18
		Urban-Rural	74,176	3.98	3.80	4.10
18.	Bangaluru	Rural-Urban	1,459,747	36.58	42.86	30.9
		Urban-Rural	115,911	6.22	7.68	5.24
19.	Mandya	Rural-Urban	60,208	1.51	1.32	1.67
		Urban-Rural	54,855	2.94	2.73	3.08
20.	Hassan	Rural-Urban	91,258	2.29	2.14	2.42
		Urban-Rural	42,170	2.26	2.04	2.41
21.	Dakshina Kannada	Rural-Urban	225,369	5.65	5.09	6.15
		Urban-Rural	123,106	6.61	7.46	6.03
22.	Kodagu	Rural-Urban	16,032	0.40	0.39	0.41
		Urban-Rural	46,461	2.49	2.79	2.29
23.	Mysuru	Rural-Urban	160,305	4.02	3.97	4.05
		Urban-Rural	63,085	3.39	3.24	3.48
24.	Chamarajanagara	Rural-Urban	28,656	0.72	0.55	0.87
		Urban-Rural	23,048	1.24	1.08	1.34
25.	Kalaburagi	Rural-Urban	103,319	2.59	2.38	2.77
		Urban-Rural	46,731	2.51	1.69	3.06
26.	Yadgiri	Rural-Urban	36,140	0.90	0.70	1.09
		Urban-Rural	20,195	1.08	0.81	1.26
27.	Kolar	Rural-Urban	59,146	1.48	1.40	1.55
		Urban-Rural	31,424	1.69	0.99	2.15
28.	Chikkaballapura	Rural-Urban	52,871	1.32	1.21	1.42
		Urban-Rural	31,914	1.71	1.35	1.95
29.	BangaluruRural	Rural-Urban	45,199	1.13	1.12	1.14
		Urban-Rural	47,282	2.54	2.34	2.67
30.	Ramanagara	Rural-Urban	38,536	0.96	0.88	1.03
		Urban-Rural	32,226	1.73	1.48	1.90
	Karnataka	Rural-Urban	3,990,632		1,893,247	2,097,385
		Urban-Rural	1,862,824		749,754	1,113,070

Table 2.
Rural-Urban Migration in Karnataka - 2011

Migrate to	Person	Male	Female
Rural-Rural	2.75	2.87	2.68
Urban-Rural	4.41	4.89	3.38
Urban-Urban	3.57	3.76	3.38
Rural-Urban	2.35	1.94	2.63

To know about trends in rural-urban and urban-rural migration in Karnataka, district-wise data on migration based on place of last residence has been collected from Census report 2011 which is presented in Table 1 and table 2. Along with total persons migrated, the table also presents percentage of male and female migration between rural and urban areas. According to 2011 census, the percentage of rural-urban migration of each district when compared to the total rural-urban migration of Karnataka state, the highest rural-urban migration is found in Bangaluru Urban district with 36.58 percent

followed by Belagavi district with 6.50 percent and Dakshina Kannada district with 5.65 percent, while Kodagu district has recorded the lowest with 0.40 percent. The trends in urban- rural migration show that, Belagavi district has recorded highest urban-rural migration with 10.60 percent followed by Uttara Kannada district with 7.9 percent and Dakshina Kannada district with 6.61 percent. The data also reveal that, except Bangaluru Urban, Kalaburagi, Hassan, Bellary and Davanagere districts, all other districts have relatively more urban-rural migration than rural- urban migration. Thus, it is clear from the data that, Bangaluru Urban district has attracted more number of migrants than other districts in the state and majority of the migrants moved to Bangaluru mainly for employment opportunities. The share of male and female rural-urban migrants in total rural-urban migration of the state indicates the same trend i.e., Bangaluru urban district with 42.86 percent and 30.90 percent male and female migrants respectively.

MAJOR CHALLENGES OF MIGRATION

While migration in general, and movement from rural to urban regions in particular, is beneficial to urban agglomerations economically, migrants in urban areas face numerous obstacles.

- Despite the trend of expanding urban population, sustainable and inclusive urban development is not given enough attention in India's major cities, including Bengaluru.
- Permanent and semi-permanent migrants with higher levels of education and competence can overcome challenges and succeed as members of the metropolitan community. However, migrants are particularly vulnerable to discrimination in urban environments due to their seasonal and sporadic work, low levels of education, and other characteristics.
- Migration is viewed less as a development issue and more as a governance concern.
- The government must develop a comprehensive migration strategy that addresses every element of migrants, as there is currently none in place.
- The government must support rural communities in addition to metropolitan ones by implementing more inclusive and sustainable development initiatives. Providing Urban Amenities to Rural Areas (PURA), a concept created by A P J Abdul Kalam, could be a useful instrument for achieving this. It discusses the four key types of connectivity: economic, knowledge, electronic, and physical.
- Therefore, there is the need to review the urbanisation policy of the Government of Karnataka to reduce imbalance in the migration trends and enable balanced development of all the regions across the state.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Effective implementation of MNREGS and generating livelihood options at local level
- Ensuring farmer's access to seeds, fertilizer etc. at subsidized rates and also availability of loan at lower interest rate
- Adequate measure to generate employment at local level
- Ensuring easy access to good quality health care services and education for children
- Effective implementation of welfare policies, specially pertaining to income generation, health and education

CONCLUSION

There is a positive trend in rural-urban migration and a negative trend in urban-rural migration. The main cause of this is the abundance of infrastructure built in urban areas. Consequently, the primary cause of the rise in rural-urban mobility is urban agglomeration. This leads to a number of issues in India's metropolitan regions, including a dearth of public amenities, a failing environment, traffic jams, regional inequities, etc. Therefore, the government must support rural communities in addition to metropolitan ones by implementing more inclusive and sustainable development initiatives. Understanding migration trends at the state, national, and worldwide levels is made possible by the current study.

REFERENCES

- 1) Srivastava R. Labour Migration in India: Recent Trends, Patterns and Policy Issues. The Indian Journal of Labour Economics. 2011
- 2) Labour_migration_in_India_Recent_trends_patterns_and_policy_issues.
- 3) Harris JR, Todaro MP. Migration, unemployment and development: a two-sector analysis.
- 4) The American Economic Madhu GR, Uma HR. Rural To Urban Migration-Opportunities and Challenges. International Journal of Advanced Research. 2014;2(6):389– 394. Available from:
- 5) Lewis WA. Economic Development with unlimited Supplies of Labour. The Manchester School. 1954;22(2):139–191.
- 6) Michael JG. The Determinants of Labour Migration in Egypt. Journal of Regional Science. 1969;9(2). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9787.1969.tb01341.x>.
- 7) Mujumdar SP, Mujumdar I. Rural Migrants in an Urban Setting. and others, editor;Hindustan Publishing Corporation. 1978.
- 8) Ghaffari H, Singh SP. Rural-Urban Migration: A Search for Economic Determinant. Indian Journal of Economic. 2004;335(4):443–458.
- 9) Dubey A, Palmer-Jones R, Sen K. Surplus Labour, Social Structure and Rural to Urban Migration: Evidence from Indian Data.
- 10) The European Journal of Development Research. 2006;18:86–104. Available from: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09578810600572460>.
- 11) Mitra A. Migration, Livelihood and Well-being: Evidence from Indian City Slums. Journal of Urban Studies. 2010;47(7):1371–1390. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098009353621>.
- 12) Deshingkar P. Migration Remote Rural Areas and Chronic Poverty in India. Chronic Poverty Research Center. Overseas Development Institute. 2010. Available from: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/57a08b2aed915d3cfd000b98/WP163-Deshingkar.pdf>.
- 13) Hazra A. Rural India- Still Floating towards Cities. Kurukshetra, Journal on Rural Development. 2012;60(4):3–5.
- 14) Babu BV, Kusuma YS, Sivakami M, Lal DK, Marimuthu P, Geddam JB, et al. Living Conditions of Internal Labour Migrants: A Nationwide Study in 13 Indian Cities. International Journal of Migration and Border Studies. 2017;3(4):328–351. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJMBS.2017.086963>.
- 15) Bhat J, Nagesha B. Labour Migration in Karnataka-Some Issues and Challenges. Research Review International Journal of Multidisciplinary. 2018;3(5):201– 205. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1253464>.
- 16) Reja MS, Das B. Labour Migration Within India: Motivations and Social Networks. South Asia Research. 2019;39(2):125–142. Available from: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0262728019842018>.
- 12) Varun KB. What is the biggest reason for migration in India. The Hindu. 2019. Census report-2011: Registrar Gen