

Urbanisation and Migration Trends in India

Dr. Lalit Kumar

Assistant Professor of Geography

Government Post Graduate Nehru College, Jhajjar (Haryana)

Introduction

Unequal infrastructural growth all across the country has divided modern India into mainly urban and rural. The differences are blatantly apparent with regards to the electric supply, quality of education and health facilities, transportation, drinking water and other basic facilities. During the last decades though, with cooperation of the state and central governments, efforts have been made to up-link villages with roads. But merely road up-linking is not enough for the population living in the villages. Ensuring the quality of services is more necessary than facilitating local development. For example: The quality of education has deteriorated in the village primary schools despite government's efforts to upgrade the schools by recruiting teachers with higher qualifications. Meal distributions during the school hours have scarcely been able to raise the quality of learning as well as the number of learners. Few deprived or marginalized (either below poverty-line, education-ignoring households or will no option other than primary schools) families are sending their children to the government run primary schools. Education is one of example. However, most of the mechanisms set by public sector have been proved to be ineffective in the rural areas.

Villagers have been left with few options, no other than opening grocery stores, medical stores and health facility providers and other public need based outlets along the roadsides. Villages are shrinking due to lack of community supportive facilities. Even there is no extra land

for playgrounds or other community needs in most of the villages. Potential lack of infrastructure and employment opportunities may be the determining factors favouring rural population to migrate to urban areas.

The problem of infrastructural deficiency cannot be tackled without proper solutions. Urban areas have their own problems. Due to unplanned structure of cities, it is a complex process to identify completely the migrants and also detect the problems that arise on a daily basis. Greater research as well as significant restructuring of the system of governance, legal and administrative framework are required in a manner that standard reform measures can be implemented.

Urbanization refers to a change of residence (places) from traditional rural economies to a modern industrial one. It is a progressive concentration (Davis, 1965) of a population in an urban unit. Quantification of urbanization is exceedingly difficult. It is a long-term process. Davis has explained urbanization as a process (Davis, 1962) of switch from spread out pattern of human settlements to one of concentration in urban centers.

It is a finite process—a cycle through which a nation passes as they evolve from agrarian to industrial society (Davis and Golden, 1954). Accordingly, three stages in the process of urbanization are mentioned. Stage one is the initial stage characterized by rural traditional society with predominance in agriculture and

dispersed pattern of settlements. Stage two refers to an acceleration stage where basic restructuring of the economy and investments take place in building social overhead capitals including transportation, communication (Datta, 2006). Proportions of urban population gradually increase from 25 per cent to 40 per cent, 50 per cent, 60 per cent and so on. Dependence on primary sector gradually dwindles. The third stage is known as terminal stage where urban population exceeds 70 per cent or more. At this stage, level of urbanization remains more or less same or constant (Davis, 1965). Rate of growth of urban population and total population becomes same at this terminal stage.

A change in the usual place of residence can take place either permanent or semi permanent or temporary basis or seasonal. However, there is no standard source of data either for internal or international migration (Bell, 2003; United Nations, 2002). Some social scientists have surveyed particular districts, area and states and have also reported about migration scenarios. A recent survey shows that census is the largest source of information on internal migration at the cross-country level. A study shows that 138 countries collected information on internal migration in their censuses compared to 35 through registers and 22 from surveys (Bell, 2003).

Migration can be measured in a number of ways with two most common forms of data being events and transitions. The former are normally associated with population registers, which record individual moves while the latter is generally derived from censuses comparing place of residence at two points in time. Population registers in fact count the migrations while the census counts the migrants.

In India, it is very complex to accurately identify migrants because they are not required to

be registered either at their place of origin or their destination. This exacerbates problems including illegal settlements and other terrorist activities such as bomb explosions at public places. This is in contrast to the practice in China where migrants are required to register themselves with the local authority (Zhu, 2003). In lack of registration of migrants, Census and National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO) are the two main sources of migration data in India. Census provides data on migrants based on place of birth and place of last residence. If the place of birth or place of last residence is different from the place of enumeration, a person is defined as a migrant (Bagat, 2005). On the other hand, if the place of birth and place of enumeration is the same, the person is a non-migrant. Migrants defined on the basis of place of birth or place of last residence are called lifetime migrants because the time of their move is unknown (Visaria, 1980). It has also been observed that the migrants from rural areas retain attachment to their native place. They continue to maintain links with their families and villages through regular visits and sending remittances (Singh et al., 1980). However, the lifetime migration based on census definition does not provide information on the number of moves made by a migrant.

Indian census provides information on place of birth for each person right from 1881 census. The name of district was recorded if the person was born in the district other than the district of enumeration. Similarly, the name of the province was recorded if the person was born in a province other than province of enumeration. Until 1951 census, the district was the lowest administrative unit of defining the place of birth. Based on this information it was possible to identify inter-district and inter-state migration, but was not possible to identify intra-district migration. However, since 1961 census,

it has been possible to measure intra- district migration as village or town was considered the unit of defining the place of birth (Srivastava, 1972). It was possible for the first time to study the rural urban origin of migrants defined in relation to place of birth and four streams of migration viz. (i) rural to urban, (ii) urban to urban, (iii) urban to rural and (iv) rural to rural (Bose, 1976; Skeldon, 1986). The duration of residence was also ascertained in 1961 census. Place of last residence was added in 1971 census and the reasons of migration related to place of last residence were also asked since 1981 census.

Currently developed countries are characterized by high levels of urbanization and some of them are in the final stage of the urbanization process and subsequently are experiencing a slowing down of urbanization due to a host of factors (Brockhoff, 1999; Brockhoff and Brennam, 1998). A majority of the developing countries, on the other hand, started experiencing urbanization only since the middle of the 20th century.

The main objective of this study is to identify the process of urbanisation in India with emphasis on level, ratio of urban and rural, rate of migration using the Indian Census data 1901-2001. It makes an effort to trace the pattern of urbanization, urban problems and future projection of population of urban and cities and related policy issues as well.

Data and Methodology

In the present paper, data have been taken from the Census of India 1991 to 2001 and NSSO. Univariate and bivariate tables have been used for presentation of data. In light of the present scenario of migration from 1901 to 2001

census as discussed above, the present paper overviews the recent trends of mobilisation for infrastructural investment and analyses their impact on the structure of settlements and also a future projection of urbanization pattern.

Results and Discussion

In this section, data has been analysed to ascertain and illustrate the fluctuation and expansion of the urban population.

Urbanization in India

Table 1 shows the percentage of the urban population to the total population and the difference in urban population over the previous decades. It shows that the urban population of India increased more than ten times from 25.8 million in 1901 to 285.4 million in 2001. The increment is more in the past four decades in comparison to the beginning four decades. The reason behind this might be the development of better infra-structure and other life supportive facilities including education, hospital services and massive growth in employment opportunities. Industrialization is attracting greater numbers of rural people to the urban areas, other than unequal infra-structural growth in the villages, comparative deterioration in agriculture based livelihood (as due to growth of population, population burden on land is constantly increasing and land holding size is shrinking) are also compelling them to move out from the village. Decreasing land holding size is compelling the rural population to open shops and other grocery stores, which is contributing in increasing the number of towns. The Table also shows that percentage wise highest urban population growth was recorded during 1971-1981.

Table 1
Urbanisation In India In Different Census Years

Census year	Per cent of Urban Population to total population	Urban population (million)	Difference in urban population over the previous decade	No. of towns
1901	10.85	25.8		1827
1911	10.29	25.9	0.1	1815
1921	11.18	28.1	2.2	1949
1931	11.99	33.5	5.4	2072
1941	13.86	44.1	10.6	2250
1951	17.29	62.4	18.3	2843
1961	17.97	78.9	16.5	2365
1971	19.91	109.1	30.2	2590
1981	23.34	159.4	50.3	3378
1991	25.71	217.6	58.2	3768
2001	27.78	285.4	67.8	3934

Trend and Future Estimation

Table 2 shows the trend and future estimation of urban-rural ratio to rural population. The trend of urbanization is calculated through time series analyses and urban-rural ratio (U/R*100) is used to measure urban ratio to rural ratio. From above table it is clear that the percentage of the rural population gradually decreases from 89% to 72% over a century, whereas, the percentage of the urban population has increased from 11% in 1901 to 28 % in 2001. By the year 2051,

it is projected that more than 36% of the total population will be residing in urban area, while urban-rural ratio may increase to more than 56% by 2051. Trend of urbanisation can be seen from the Graph-A. If, according to the projections, the Urban- Rural ratio for India in 2051 will turn out to be 56, it means that against every 100 ruralites there will be 56 urbanites in India. However, according to literature (Mathur, 2004), the process of urbanization in India is likely to persist until 2030 AD at least, unless, it is estimated to achieve a level of 50 per cent urbanization.

Table 2

Trend Of Urbanisation

Census year	Percentage of Urban to total popn.	Trend (% of urban popn. to total)	% rural population to total popn.	Urban-Rural *Ratio (per cent)
1901	10.85	8.07	89.15	12.17
1911	10.29	9.92	89.71	11.47
1921	11.18	11.76	88.82	12.59
1931	11.99	13.60	88.01	13.62

1941	13.86	15.44	86.14	16.09
1951	17.29	17.29	82.71	20.90
1961	17.97	19.13	82.03	21.91
1971	19.91	20.97	80.09	24.86
1981	23.34	22.82	76.66	30.45
1991	25.71	24.66	74.29	34.61
2001	27.78	26.50	72.22	38.47
2011		28.16		39.20
2021		30.19		43.25
2031		32.03		47.13
2041		33.88		51.23
2051		35.72		55.57

Stream and Volume of Internal Migration

Table 3 shows that stream and volume of internal migration by place of last residence 1991 and 2001 in (duration 0-9). It is clear from the table that most of the female migrants migrating from rural to rural through marriage migration in intra state (68.6%) and interstate (32.7%) as well as international migration. While, the total

percentage of migrant rural to urban in interstate migrants (38%) is greater in comparison to rural to urban in intrastate migrants, past studies have also been reported that a number of migrants have been migrating within the district, within the state as well as within the nation. This is the reason for the larger number of migrants being categorized as intrastate migrants.

Table 3

Stream And Volume Of Internal Migration By Place Of Last Residence

Type	of Migration	Migration stream	Males (%)	Females (%)	Total (%)
1.	Intra state migrants	Rural to Rural	41.6	68.6	60.5
		Rural to Urban	27.1	13.6	17.6
		Urban to Rural	8.6	5.6	6.5
		Urban to Urban	18.3	9.7	12.3
		Unclassified	4.4	2.6	3.1
2.	Inter state migrants	Rural to Rural	20.7	32.7	26.6
		Rural to Urban	44.7	30.9	37.9
		Urban to Rural	6.1	6.4	6.3
		Urban to Urban	25.9	27.5	26.7
		Unclassified	2.6	2.5	2.6
3.	International migrants	To Rural areas	48.8	57.6	53.0
		To Urban areas	51.2	42.4	47.0
G. Total			32,896,986	65,404,356	98,301,342

Reasons for Migration

Table 4 shows the reasons for migration, and the percentage of migrants at their last residence with duration (0-9 years). Most of male migrants (37.6%) cited Work/ Employment as the main reason. About 44 per cent of the total migrants, cited ‘Marriage’ as the reason for migration, and finally, ‘Moved with households’ was cited as another reason with 21 per cent of the total migrants migrating for this reason indicator. The rationale behind this is that a greater number of educated, skilled and also unskilled people move to other states for better opportunities, to earn larger incomes, and in search of job respectively. The percentages of male and female migrants that ‘Moved with households’ were found to second highest 25 per cent and 19 per cent respectively. It may be due to fact that most migrants want to move with their families from their native places. In the year 2001 the migration scenario has changed. While past studies (Singh and Yadav, 1991) reported that higher single male migrants in comparison to those who ‘Moved with households’, they maintained a connection

to their place of origin by sending remittances. A study reveals that more educated, skilled and larger income holders are likely to migrate (2001 census report).

Migrants and their Educational Level

Table 5 shows the percentage distribution of migrants and their educational level. The Table indicates that the percentages of all educational levels, beside illiterate females, were found to be approximately the same for both: migrants and non-migrants households. The percentage of illiterate females were found to be higher for migrant households in comparison to non-migrant households. The percentage of illiterate males in non-migrant households is approximately two times (17.2 per cent) than that of the males in migrant households. This may be due to fact that illiterate migrants were not required at destination places because skilled or comparatively educated persons are only required at destination places. The female migrants have been working in houses doing domestic chores; the other reason for female migration in the study, was migration due to marriage.

Table 4

Reasons for Migration of Migrants By Last Residence With Duration

Reasons of migration	Percentage of Migration		
	Male	Female	Total
Work/Employment	37.6	3.2	14.7
Business	2.9	0.3	1.2
Education	6.2	1.3	3.0
Marriage	2.1	64.9	43.8
Moved after birth	10.4	4.8	6.7
Moved with households	25.1	18.9	21.0
Other	15.7	6.7	9.7
Total	(32,896,986)100.0	(65,404,356)100.0	(98,301,342)100.0

Source: Census of India 2001 Table D3.

Table 5
Educational Level of Migrants and Non-Migrants

Education Level	Percentage of Migrants		Percentage of Non-Migrants	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Illiterate	9.40	35.74	17.24	30.30
Under Primary	9.39	9.73	10.09	9.19
Primary	14.77	16.21	17.15	16.13
Middle	19.16	14.21	19.80	16.81
Secondary	21.80	10.99	18.50	12.57
Higher Secondary	9.86	7.12	9.33	8.66
Graduation & above	15.14	5.74	7.74	6.17
Not accounted	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.10
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Census of India, 2001

Variation in Migration Profile (1991-2001)

Table 6 indicates the variation in migration profile between the years 1991 and 2001 for some important states based on migrants by last residence (0-9 years). Rate of out migration Kamlesh Kr. Shukla et al.50 was found to be high (3.4) for Bihar and it is followed closely by Delhi (3.3). The reasons is that Bihar’s migrants have marginal land or no land to sustain a livelihood and Delhi’s migrants are economically strong and they wanted to migrate for a better opportunity to earn a larger income. Shukla (2002) has reported earlier in the study of UP state that two types of

migration trends were found to be more prevalent, those who has marginal land or no land and other who are economically strong. In the case of Bihar, the rate of migration was exceedingly high (3.4%) in the 2001 census whereas it was found to be 1.9% in 1991 census. Growth rate of the net migration in 2001 was found to be very high (343 per cent) for Haryana. From the table, the percentage growth rate of in-migration was found to be substantially higher (76 per cent) in comparison to out migration (4.7 per cent) in Haryana. This is eye-opening concern to the government body and the policy makers.

Table 6

Variation in Migration Profile Between 1991-2001 for A Few Important States Based on Migrants

By Last Residence (0-9Years)

State	Types of migration	2001 Census	1991-Census	Variation (%) (1991-2001)
Maharashtra	Total in-migrants	3280006	1643418	99.6
	Out-migrants	896,988	770030	16.5

	Net migrants	2383018	873388	172.8
	Rate of out-migration	0.93	0.98	
Delhi	Total in-migrants	2,222041	1587492	40.0
	Out-migrants	457919	281946	62.4
	Net migrants	1764122	1305546	35.1
	Rate of out-migration	3.3	3.0	
Gujarat	Total in-migrants	1140618	714870	59.6
	Out-migrants	451458	305738	47.7
	Net migrants	689160	409132	68.4
	Rate of out-migration	0.9	0.74	
Haryana	Total in-migrants	1258119	712783	76.5
	Out-migrants	588001	561504	4.7
	Net migrants	670118	151279	343.0
	Rate of out-migration	2.8	3.4	
UP	Total in-migrants	1492799	787289	89.6
	Out-migrants	4165419	2457996	69.5
	Net migrants	2672620	1670707	60.0
	Rate of out-migration	2.5	1.86	
Bihar	Total in-migrants	1023579	363117	181.9
	Out-migrants	2857573	1226839	132.9
	Net migrants	1833994	863722	112.3
	Rate of out-migration	3.4	1.90	

States-wise Change in Growth and Migration

Table 7 shows that states-wise change in growth and migration. From the Table it is evident that Punjab, Haryana and Maharashtra which are top the in list of State Domestic Urbanisation and Migration Trends in India 51 Product (SDP) per capita and where the poverty percentage is low, attract migrants from other states, whereas Bihar which has high population growth rate has high levels of poverty and poor State domestic product has out-migration exceeding in-migration by 31 per 1000 persons. West Bengal is another state,

which receives more migrants from other states. The reason behind this is that there are number of migrants from Bangladesh as Bangladesh refugees. In the case of Gujarat, the rate of in-migration is also high. This may be due to its industrial base, which draws people to move from other states. Maharashtra and Haryana have received a greater number of migrants in comparison to other states. In the case of Haryana, net-migration was found to be very high (79 per 1000 population), approximately twice that of Maharashtra. Haryana state has been attracting migration from other districts, states as well as other countries. This may be due to

the fact that this area is comparatively a highly developed area with a number of industries, shopping malls, call centers and so forth. The districts from Haryana which are responsible for this, are: Gurgaon, Faridabad, Rewari, Hissar, Panipat, and Sonipat. The Gurgaon districts especially have been attracting a large number

of people from other areas because of a good environment, the standard of living, as well as a greater availability of jobs for skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled workers. Another reason attributed to high in-migrations from nearby states may be the close proximity to Delhi, the capital of India.

Table 7

States-Wise Variations In Growth And Migration

Major states	Poverty	Population growth 1991-2001 (% per year)	SDP per capita 1997-98 (Rs. Per year)	Net migration (per 1000 population)
Andhra Pradesh	18.8	1.21	10590	1
Assam	39.6	–	–	–5
Bihar	46.9	2.43	4654	–31
Gujarat	15.4	2.05	16251	19
Haryana	11.8	2.50	17626	79
Himachal Pradesh	17.5	1.63	10777	–
Karnataka	25.6	1.60	11693	–8
Kerala	14.5	1.01	11936	6
Madhya Pradesh	36.8	2.07	8114	10
Maharashtra	28.7	2.06	18365	44
Orissa	46.3	1.49	6767	6
Punjab	11.8	1.82	19500	25
Rajasthan	20.4	2.53	9356	7
Tamil Nadu	20.1	1.07	12989	–2
Uttar Pradesh	33.0	2.29	7263	–8
West Bangal	32.1	1.66	10636	27

Source: Migration in India 1999-2000 Report No. 470 NSSO 55th round July 1999-June 2000. Sep. 2001, p. 20.

Future Projection of Cities

Table 8 shows that there are 23 million plus cities in India where about 37 per cent of the total population lives. As per 2001 census there are 12 newly added million plus cities. These are Agra,

Meerut, Nasik, Jabalpur, Jamshedpur, Asansol, Dhanbad, Faridabad, Allahabad,

Amritsar, Vijaywada, Rajkot. By looking at the trend it can be projected that the future population of Mumbai will be about 20 mil-

lion in year 2011, while Delhi will have approximately more than 15 million inhabitants in the same year. In the future, the growth rate of the population of Delhi may be increase at a slower rate due to development of the NCR.

Like National Capital Region regions such as, Gurgaon, Noida, Ghaziabad and Faridabad and so forth. The growth rate of some urban places have such as, Bangalore, Hyderabad, Surat, Delhi and Pune, been very high.

Table 8

Million-Plus Cities in India and Future Projection

Rank	City	Population (million) in different year				Future pop. (million) in some year	
		1951	1971	1991	2001	2011	2021
1	Mumbai	2.97	5.9	12.6	16.4	19.75	23.23
2	Kolkata	4.67	7.4	10.9	13.2	14.95	16.86
3	Delhi	1.44	3.7	8.4	12.8	15.15	18.09
4	Madras	1.54	3.2	5.4	6.4	7.50	8.57
5	Hyderabad	1.13	1.8	4.3	5.5	6.75	7.99
6	Bangalore	0.79	1.7	4.1	5.7	6.90	8.21
7	Ahmedabad	0.88	1.7	3.3	4.5	5.30	6.21
8	Pune	0.61	1.1	2.5	3.8	4.50	5.37
9	Kanpur	0.71	1.3	2.1	2.7	3.10	3.56
10	Nagpur	0.48	0.9	1.7	2.1	2.50	2.90
11	Lucknow	0.50	0.8	1.6	2.3	2.70	3.19
12	Surat	0.24	0.5	1.5	2.8	3.30	4.03
13	Jaipur	0.30	0.6	1.5	2.3	2.75	3.30
14	Kochi	0.18	0.5	1.1	1.4	1.70	2.00
15	Coimbatore	0.29	0.7	1.1	1.5	1.70	1.96
16	Vadodara	0.21	0.5	1.1	1.5	1.80	2.13
17	Indore	0.31	0.6	1.1	1.6	1.85	2.17
18	Patna	0.32	0.6	1.1	1.7	1.95	2.30
19	Madurai	0.37	0.7	1.1	1.2	1.40	1.57
20	Bhopal	0.10	0.4	1.0	1.5	1.80	2.16
21	Vishakhapatnam	0.11	0.4	1.0	1.3	1.60	1.90
22	Varanasi	0.37	0.6	1.0	1.2	1.40	1.60
23	Ludhiana	0.15	0.4	1.0	1.4	1.70	2.03

Conclusions

Due to unequal development throughout the country, migration trends and patterns are unequal. This is indicative of a distressing level, because imbalanced migration is detrimental to a variety of services. It was found that highest percentage of migration to Maharashtra occurred from Bihar followed by Uttar Pradesh. It was also found that most developed states like Haryana and Maharashtra are the best destination for the migrants. Planned urbanization is necessary to pace with modernization and industrialization, otherwise unequal migration trends and patterns pose a major challenge in times to come.

On the basis of the present study the basic feature of urbanization in India can be highlighted as: By the year 2051, it is projected that more than 36 per cent of the total population will be residing in urban area, while urban-rural ratio may increase by more than 56 per cent by 2051. Two types of migrants were found to be more prevalent, those who have (economically weak) marginal land or no land and others who are economically strong. Urbanisation may occur without industrialization and strong economic base (Datta, 2006). Migration is mainly a product of demographic explosion and poverty is also important cause behind rural to urban migration. Fast urbanisation leads to massive growth of slums followed by misery, poverty, unemployment, exploitation and inequalities. Urbanisation occurs not only because of pull factor but also due to push factor. Poor quality of rural-urban migration leads to poor quality of urbanization (Bagat, 1992)

References

1. Bagat, R. B., 1992, Components of Urban Growth in India with Reference to Haryana Findings from Recent Censuses. *Nagarlok*, 25(3): 10-14.
2. Bagat, R. B., 2005, Conceptual issues in Measurement of internal migration in India. Paper presented in XXVth IUSSP International Conference held in Tours, France, 18-23 July.
3. Bell, Martin, 2003, Comparing Internal Migration between Countries: Measures, Data Sources and Results, Paper presented in Population Association of America 2003, Minneapolis, May 1-3, 2003.
4. Bose, A., 1967, Internal Migration in India, Pakistan and Ceylon, In: Proceedings of the World Population Conference, Vol. IV, Selected Papers & Summaries.
5. Brockerhoff, M., 1999, Urban Growth in Developing Countries: A review of projections and predictions. *Population and Development Review*, 25(4): 757-778.
6. Brockerhoff, M. and Brennam, E., 1998, The poverty of cities in Developing Regions. *Populations and Development Review*, 24(1): 75-114.
7. Census of India, 2001, Series 1, Provisional Population Totals, Paper 1 of 2001, Registrar General and Census Commissioner, India.
8. Census of India, 1989, Geographic Distribution of Internal Migration in India 1971-81. Registrar General and Census Commissioner, India.
9. Census of India, 1991, Series 1, India, Part V-D Series, Migration Tables, Registrar, General and Census Commissioner, India.
10. Datta, Pranati, 2006, Urbanization in India 'Regional and sub Regional population dynamic population process in urban areas. European Population Conference, 21-24 June.
11. Davis Kingsley, 1962, Urbanisation in India—Past and Future. In: Turner, R. (ed.), *India's Urban Future*. University of California Press, Berkley.