



Migration Behaviour of Rural Youth in Haryana

Abhilash Singh Maurya¹, Bhavesh², Ayush Mishra^{3*} and Joginder Singh Malik⁴

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, School of Agriculture, Lovely Professional University, Jalandhar-144411, Punjab, India

²PG Scholar, Department of Agronomy, CCS HAU, Hisar-125004, Haryana, India

³Research Scholar, ⁴Professor, Department of Extension Education, CCS HAU, Hisar-125004, Haryana, India

*Corresponding author email id: ayush96.mishra@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Migration, Rural, Youth, Perception, Behaviour

<http://doi.org/10.48165/IJEE.2022.58320>

ABSTRACT

Rural to urban migration has become an unavoidable event in the last 25 years with increased industrialization, growing service industry, better food security, access to improved healthcare and educational facilities in the cities apart from the rising ambitions of the youths. Agriculture always had a vital role in a village economy but this sector has not been financially rewarding in the past few decades and as a consequence of which, young generations from villages are leaving their family enterprises and migrating to cities for acquiring modern education and skills to secure a job in private sector. The study was conducted to find out the migration behaviour of rural youth in Bhiwani and Hisar districts of Haryana. A sample size of 192 rural youths i.e., 96 fully migrated & 96 partially migrated, were selected for the study. Findings revealed that unstable income, lesser employment, repeated crop failures were the push factors responsible for migration of rural youths. Higher wages, better jobs and better standard of livings in cities were the major pull factors motivating rural youths to migrate towards cities. Further, socio-economic & psychological variables such as age, education, farm size, non-farm skills, income expectancy, comfort expectancy, risk orientation, self-reliance & self-confidence had significantly positive correlation whereas, farm size, stimulation expectancy and affiliation expectancy had negatively significant relationship with migration behaviour of rural youth. Also, regression analysis showed that, seventeen independent variables selected for the study could explain 59.40 per cent variation in the migration behaviour of rural youths.

INTRODUCTION

Youth is the time of life when one is young. It's the time period between the childhood and maturity (Merriam Webster). Youth form the basis for any future development programmes related to socio-economic growth or sustainability. Their importance can be realized from the fact that the 2011 was declared as the International Year for Youth by United Nations General Assembly. India is a land of young people. It possesses the largest proportion of young population in the world. As per 2011 Census, there are about 550 million youth including adolescents in India (Draft National Youth

Policy, Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports, 2012). That's why, it is even more important for India to use this demographic dividend to the best of its capacity.

Rising urbanization is regarded as a sign of growth and progress of a country. The urbanization in India is expected to reach 40.00 per cent by 2030 as (UN World Urbanization Prospects, 2005). The absolute increase in the population of urban areas between the periods of 1991-2001 was 31.20 per cent while in the rural areas, the increase in population was only 17.90 per cent (NSSO, 2008). Rural to urban migration has become an unavoidable event in the last 25 years with increased industrialization, growing service

industry, better food security, access to improved healthcare and educational facilities in the cities apart from the rising ambitions of the youths. As per the UN Migration Agency (IOM) any person who is moving or has moved across a national territory or within a State away from his/her native place is a migrant, regardless of whether the person has legal status to do; the nature of movement (voluntary or involuntary), the causes of this movement and the length of the stay in the migrated place.

Agriculture always has a vital role in a village economy but this sector has not been financially rewarding in the past few decades due to several risk factors that affects farmers (Hari et al., 2013). Also, lack of adequate literacy, lack of knowledge on agricultural information and technology and lack of enough skills in handling the modern agricultural technologies in youth means they cannot achieve the desired level of production (Chinchmalatpure & Tekale, 2019). As a result, rural youths are leaving their family enterprises and migrating to cities for acquiring modern education and skills to secure a job in private sector rather than working in fields (Maurya et al., 2021). Unless significant change is made in the way farming is done and agriculture becomes a profitable enterprise, it would be difficult to retain or attract rural youth in agriculture (Som et al., 2018). Keeping the above facts in mind, this study wants to find the factors influencing the migration behaviour in rural youths.

METHODOLOGY

Bhiwani and Hisar districts of Haryana were chosen randomly for the study. Additionally, two blocks Tosham and Bawani Khara were selected from Bhiwani district where as Hansi-1 and Hisar-2 were selected from Hisar district randomly. Further, four villages were chosen randomly, from each block. Also, 12 youths (6 fully migrated and 6 partially migrated) having education up to 12th standard were selected from each of the villages, thus a total of 192 youths (96 fully migrated and 96 partially migrated) were selected for the study. Rural youth in this study was operationalized as 15-30 years male from the village. Also, fully migrated youth was defined as a rural youth who has permanently moved out of his family's agricultural enterprise and relocated to a town or city for the purpose of acquiring new skills and getting a job while partially migrated youth was defined as a rural youth who temporarily relocates to a town or city in search of employment opportunities during lean periods while returns back to his village to take part in agricultural activities in peak seasons of such as harvest, sowing etc. Personal interview technique was used for the collection of data after developing well-structured interview schedule and analysis was done using MS Excel and Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, 26th version). For measuring the socio-economic and psychological characteristics of rural youth, seventeen variables were selected viz., age, education, occupation, farm size, farm skill, non-farm skill, proximity to town, prior migration experience, economic motivation, achievement motivation, risk orientation, self-reliance, self-confidence, income expectancy, comfort expectancy, stimulation expectancy and affiliation expectancy were selected for the study. Also, in order to study the migration behavior of rural youth, questions were asked to access the direct indicators, perception indicators and factors

influencing migration from both groups of respondents i.e., fully migrated and partially migrated youth. Further, correlation and regression analysis were done to understand the relationship between migration behavior and the socio-economic & psychological profile of the rural youths.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Direct indicators of migration behaviour

Table 1 reveals that, for nature of migration the average mean score for fully migrated youths (3.00) was higher than the score for partially migrated youths (1.54). For nature of work table 1 reveals that both fully and partially migrated youth had similar average mean score. The main factors responsible for this could be the fact that the partially migrant youth return to their native place to participate in agricultural activities during peak seasons. Also, it is evident from table 1 that the average mean score in terms of work place distance from the village was higher for fully migrated youth (2.91) as compared to partially migrated ones (2.43). This could be explained by the fact that fully migrated youth who don't wish to return back, relocate to industrialized hubs like Delhi, Bahadurgarh, Rohtak, etc. In comparison, the partially migrant youths prefer to labor in places nearby to his native village, as it would allow them to seasonally return to take part in agricultural activities.

Also, for migration decision making the fully migrated youths (2.06) scored higher than partially migrant youths (1.68). The primary reason for this could be that fully migrant youths has more (previous) movement familiarity w.r.t. to partially migrated youths and that increase their self-decision making. Further table 1 reveals that for migration network the average mean score of partially migrated youths were higher (2.41) than fully migrated youths (1.71). The seasonal involvement of partially migrant youths in agriculture would make them take temporary breaks from their work in towns which would require the partially migrant youths to build a strong interpersonal link to get knowledge about new job openings and places to live.

The data in Table 1 reveals that for family migration norm, fully migrant youths (2.43) scored higher than partially migrant ones (2.28). The major reason behind it could be that the income from work in town, post migration would act as an additional financial support in lean periods. Moreover, it can be concluded from table 1 that in case of intention to re-migrate the average mean score for fully migrated rural youth (2.84) was higher as compared to partially migrated rural youths (2.28). In spite of the fact that the fully migrant youths are permanent immigrants, they still possess the desire to return back to their villages.

Perception indicators of migration behaviour

Table 2 reveals that in case of aspirations, the average mean score for the fully migrant youths (2.60) was higher than the partially migrant youths (2.47). Fully and partially migrated rural youth have the ambitions of accomplishing a respectable social and financial position, possession of property and materials. Further, in terms of creativity Table 2 reveals that for fully (2.10) and partially migrant youths (2.06) the average mean score was

Table 1. Direct indicators of migration behavior

S.No.	Indicators	Mean scores	
		FM (96)	PM (96)
	Direct indicators		
1	Nature of migration	3.00/3.00	1.54/3.00
	Temporary	-	44 (48.83%)
	Circular	-	52 (54.17%)
	Permanent	96 (100.00%)	-
2	Nature of work	1.00/2.00	1.00/2.00
	Agriculture	-	-
	Non-agriculture	96 (100.00%)	96 (100.00%)
3	Work place distance from village	2.91/4.00	2.43/4.00
	Up to 25 km	03 (03.13%)	15 (15.63%)
	25-50 km	17 (17.71%)	40 (41.67%)
	50-100 km	32 (33.33%)	26 (27.08%)
	More than 100 km	44 (45.83%)	15 (15.63%)
4	Decision making (Migration)	1.68/3.00	2.06/3.00
	Self	35 (36.46%)	29 (30.21%)
	Family members	43 (44.79%)	32 (33.33%)
	Others	18 (18.75%)	35 (36.46%)
5	Migration network	1.71 /3.00	2.41/3.00
	Family or relatives	35 (36.46%)	10 (10.42%)
	Friends/neighbors	54 (56.25%)	37 (38.54%)
	Agencies	07 (07.29%)	49 (51.04%)
6	Family migration norm	2.43/3.00	2.28/3.00
	Motivate to migrate	52 (54.17%)	43 (44.79%)
	No idea	24 (25.00%)	37 (38.54%)
	Do not encourage to migrate	20 (20.83%)	16 (16.67%)
7	Intention to re-migrate	2.84/5.00	2.28/5.00
	Intend to return in one year	16 (16.67%)	18 (18.75%)
	Intend to return within five years	32 (33.33%)	46 (47.92%)
	Intend to return within 5 to 10 years	16 (16.67%)	19 (19.79%)
	Intend to return after 10 years	14 (14.58%)	13 (13.54%)
	No intention to return	18 (18.75%)	-

comparatively similar. Also, from Table 2 it is evident that, in terms of occupational mobility, fully migrant youths (2.60) scored higher than partially migrant youths (2.08). This could be due to the fact that fully migrated rural youth is more perceptive to learning new skills and traveling to new places to take up the jobs as compared to partially migrated youth.

Also, it is evident from Table 2 that, for the social comprehensiveness the average mean score was comparatively higher for fully migrant youths (2.20) as compared to partially migrant youths (1.80). The fully migrant rural youths easily adjust to their new work culture and environment while the partially migrant rural youths wish to remain inside his own community of people (from their native place). For the parental and peer support, the score of fully migrant youths (02.32) was higher than partially migrant youths (02.06). Large numbers of the fully migrated rural youth have followed their friends who have migrated earlier. Also, the result depicts that for the remuneration from migration, the average mean score for fully migrant youths and partially migrant youths were similar, i.e., 02.67 and 02.60, respectively. It was understood from the replies of the respondents that remittances from migration have enhanced their living standards. The findings are supported by Anamica (2010), who stated that higher wages in urban areas are one of the biggest motivators of migration.

Push and pull factors responsible for migration of rural youths

The data presented in Table 3 shows that unsteady income from farming (92.71%) and lesser employment (90.63%) were the major reasons that pushed the rural youth to migrate. Further, regular crop failures as a result of adverse climatic conditions, peer pressure (67.61%) and small size of land holding (62.50%) were also responsible for the migration of rural youths.

The rural youth consider farming to be the last option for livelihood due to high risks from all these external factors that affects the crop production. Also, the higher educational qualifications and professional ambitions of the rural youths attract them towards building a career in private & corporate sectors. The findings are supported by Ramasubramaniam (2003) & Anamica (2010), which revealed that, inadequate revenue from farming and low employability in their native places are the primary push factors responsible for migration among rural youths.

Further, it can be concluded from table 3 that higher wages (96.35%), better jobs (93.75%), higher living standard (84.38%), work with less drudgery (78.65%) and skill acquisition (67.19%) were the primary pull factors which encouraged the migration among rural youths. The findings are similar to Kainth (2009), who revealed that, improved job prospects & relatively higher income offered in towns are the main pull factors encouraging rural youths to migrate.

Table 2. Perception indicators of migration behaviour

S.No.	Perception Indicators	Mean Score	
		FM	PM
1.	Aspiration	2.59/3.00	2.47/3.00
	To increase income	2.98	2.92
	To increase material possession	2.85	2.81
	To alter house or construct new house	2.17	1.99
	To purchase land	2.43	1.93
	To reach better social status	2.58	2.72
2.	Creativity	2.10/3.00	2.06/3.00
	Ambitious to go beyond tradition	2.41	1.91
	To take up the new task	2.49	2.31
	To revamp problems and assimilate ideas	1.88	1.89
	To work on different ideas at the same time	1.82	2.09
	To elaborate and expand the idea	1.93	2.09
3.	Occupational mobility	2.60/3.00	2.08/3.00
	I like travelling to unknown places in search of work	2.57	1.89
	I don't hesitate to take up jobs in new areas	2.43	1.84
	I don't hesitate to blend with peoples from unknown vicinity	2.82	2.21
	I easily get hold of the new traditions and customs	2.91	2.11
	I can easily learn new professional skills	2.26	2.29
4.	Migration intention	2.39/3.00	2.49/3.00
	I had a desire to relocate in past and I relocated	2.91	2.89
	I still have the desire to migrate	2.46	2.57
	I have a desire to relocate in future also	1.81	2.01
5.	Degree of social inclusiveness	2.20/3.00	1.80
	I prioritize living in the relocated place than my native village	1.89	1.61
	I feel assured of my safety in the relocated place	2.23	1.57
	I am very comfortable living with people from other communities	2.31	1.69
	I feel comfortable working with people from other communities	2.29	1.90
	I leave my family in village whenever I move to unknown places	2.27	2.21
6.	Parental and peer influences	2.32/3.00	2.06/3.00
	I migrated as my clan looked down on the farming	2.11	2.59
	I relocated as parents wanted me to leave farming	1.89	1.89
	I migrated as my friends migrated too	2.71	1.82
	I migrated as my parents want me to make earn better income like my neighbors and friends	2.15	1.81
	I migrated as families of prospective brides look down upon youths engaged in farming	2.72	2.21
7.	Remuneration	2.67/3.00	2.60/3.00
	Remuneration from migration has improved my economic status	2.79	2.81
	Remuneration from migration has made me financially independent	2.81	2.81
	Remuneration from migration has improved by ability to support the financial needs of my family	2.89	2.81

Dejong (2000) also concluded that higher wage expectancy is one of the prime reasons responsible for migration. The results are also in line with Kumari et al., (2022) who observed that male members migrate to towns in search of better jobs.

Relationship between socio-economic and psychological profile of rural youth with their migration behavior

Table 4 reveals that the independent variables viz. age, education, proximity to towns, non-farm skill, migration experience, self - reliance, self -confidence, economic motivation, risk orientation, income and comfort expectancy had significantly positive correlation with the migration behaviour, while farm size, stimulation, and affiliation expectation have significantly negative relationships with migration behaviour. The findings are in line with Anamica (2010), who stated that migration behavior is positively influenced by risk orientation & economic motivation of youths.

Dejong (2000) also stated that migrated youth has high comfort expectancy and low affiliation expectancy. The results are also supported by Sharma (2007), who revealed that migration behaviour is higher among the villages (youths) that are closer to the towns. Moreover, from the R^2 value of 0.594, it can be concluded that seventeen independent variables selected for the study accounts for 59.40 per cent deviation in behaviour of migrant youths.

CONCLUSION

Comparison of fully and partially migrated youths reveal that former tends to move to a greater distance from his native village and shows higher occupational mobility as compared to the later. In terms of factor influencing migration, unstable income, lesser employment, repeated crop failures are the primary push factors responsible for migration of rural youths whereas higher wages, better jobs and better standard of livings in cities are the major pull

Table 3. Push and pull factors responsible for migration of rural youths

S.No.	Factors Responsible	Fully Migrated (n=96)		Partially Migrated (n=96)		Total (n=192)		
		F	%	F	%	F	%	Rank
I	Push Factors							
1.	Small farm size	59	61.46	61	63.54	120	62.50	IV
2.	Unstable income	87	90.63	91	94.79	178	92.71	I
3.	Lesser employment	91	94.79	83	86.46	174	90.63	II
4.	Repeatedly crop failure due to natural calamities	51	53.13	79	82.29	130	67.71	III
5.	Humdrumness in agriculture	49	51.04	59	61.46	108	56.25	V
6.	Social discrimination	41	42.71	35	36.46	76	39.58	VII
7.	Debt	43	44.79	64	66.67	107	55.73	VI
8.	Peer pressure	79	82.29	51	53.12	130	67.71	III
9.	Lack of social amenities	29	30.21	21	21.88	50	26.04	VIII
II	Pull Factors							
1.	Availability of better jobs	91	94.79	89	92.71	180	93.75	II
2.	Higher wages	93	96.88	92	95.83	185	96.35	I
3.	Better standard of living	83	86.46	79	82.29	162	84.38	III
4.	Better infrastructure facilities	69	71.88	51	53.13	120	62.50	VI
5.	Work with less drudgery	73	76.04	78	81.25	151	78.65	IV
6.	Safety and Eco friendly environment	39	40.63	39	40.63	78	40.63	VIII
7.	Better social linkage	49	51.04	37	38.54	86	44.79	VII
8.	Skill acquisition	62	64.58	67	69.79	129	67.19	V

*Multiple responses

Table 4. Relationship between socio-economic and psychological profile of rural youth with their migration behavior

S.No.	Socioeconomic and psychological character	Fully Migrated Correlation coefficient	Partially Migrated Correlation coefficient	Total Correlation coefficient
1	Age	0.239*	0.449**	0.311**
2	Education	0.291**	0.398**	0.353**
3	Occupation	0.109 ^{NS}	0.009 ^{NS}	-0.076 ^{NS}
4	Farm size	-0.309**	0.169 ^{NS}	-0.243**
5	Farm skill	-0.671**	0.007 ^{NS}	-0.065 ^{NS}
6	Non-farm skill	0.259*	0.351**	0.289**
7	Proximity to town	0.531**	-0.097 ^{NS}	0.287**
8	Prior migration experience	0.289**	0.329**	0.331**
9	Economic motivation	0.335**	0.409**	0.430**
10	Achievement inspiration	0.140 ^{NS}	-0.004 ^{NS}	0.063 ^{NS}
11	Risk orientation	0.279*	0.290**	0.369**
12	Self-reliance	0.239**	0.569** ^S	0.396**
13	Self confidence	0.339**	0.006 ^{NS}	0.229**
14	Income expectancy	0.609**	0.599**	0.604**
15	Comfort expectancy	0.641**	0.146 ^{NS}	0.477**
16	Stimulation expectancy	-0.541**	-0.159 ^{NS}	-0.430**
17	Affiliation expectancy	-0.589**	-0.136 ^{NS}	-0.448**
	R ²	0.663	0.515	0.594

factors motivating rural youths to migrate towards cities. Further, socio-economic & psychological variables such as age, education, farm size, non-farm skills, income expectancy, comfort expectancy, risk orientation, self-reliance and self-confidence show positively significant correlation with migration behaviour whereas, farm size, stimulation expectancy and affiliation expectancy have negatively significant relationship with migration behaviour. It can be implied from the study that reduced profits in agriculture and lack of employment in rural areas are responsible for this trend in migration behaviour of rural youths, where they are leaving their native places in search of a better life.

REFERENCES

- Anamica, M. (2010). Migration behaviour of dryland farmers – An ex post facto study. Unpub. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, TNAU, Coimbatore.
- Chinchmalatpure, U. R., & Tekale, V. S. (2019). Aspiration of rural youth towards agriculture. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*, 55(2), 25-30.
- De Jong. (2000). Expectations, gender, and norms in migration decision-making. *Population Studies*, 54, 307-319.
- Hari, R., Chander, M., & Sharma, N. K. (2013). Comparison of educational and occupational aspirations of rural youth from

- farming families of Kerala and Rajasthan. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*, 49(1&2), 57-59.
- Hossain, M. Z. (2001). Rural-urban migration in Bangladesh: A micro-level study paper Presented at 24th IUSSP General Conference. Salvador, Brazil, Available at: www.iussp.org/Brazil2001/s20/S28_P02_Hossain.pdf.
- Kainth, G. S. (2009). Push and pull factors of migration: A case of brick kiln industry of Punjab State. *Asia Pacific Journal of Social Sciences*, 1(1), 82-116.
- Kumari, K., Singh, K. M., & Ahmad, N. (2022). Impact of migration on women empowerment: a situational analysis of North-Bihar. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*, 58(1), 101-105.
- Maurya, A. S., Malik, J. S., & Yadav, R. N. (2021). Relationship between profile of rural youth and attitude towards agriculture. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*, 57(3), 12-15.
- Merriam-Webster (n.d.). Social media. In Merriam-Webster.com dictionary. Retrieved Jan 2, 2022 from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/youth>.
- National Sample Survey Organization. (2008). Migration in India 2007-2008. NSS 64th round, Ministry of Statistics & Programme Implementation, Government of India, pp 1-429.
- National Youth Policy (2012). Exposure draft. Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports, Government of India. pp. 1-29. Retrieved March, 10, 2020, from [Youth Policy.pdf\(mcrhrdi.gov.in\)](http://YouthPolicy.pdf(mcrhrdi.gov.in)).
- Ramasubramanian, M. (2003). Developing strategies for sustainable dry farming. Unpub. Ph.D. Thesis, TNAU, Coimbatore.
- Sharma, A. (2007). The changing agricultural demography of India: evidence from a rural youth perception survey. *International Journal of Rural Management*, 3(1), 27-41.
- Som, S., Burman, R. R., Sharma, J. P., Padaria, R. N., Paul, S., & Singh, A. K. (2018). Attracting and retaining youth in agriculture: challenges and prospects. *Journal of Community Mobilization and Sustainable Development*, 13(3), 385-395.
- United Nations Migration Agency (IOM). Migrant. Retrieved Feb 5, 2022 from [https://www.un.org/en/globalissues/migration#:~:text=The%20UN%20Migration%20Agency%20\(IOM,the%20causes%20for%20the%20movement](https://www.un.org/en/globalissues/migration#:~:text=The%20UN%20Migration%20Agency%20(IOM,the%20causes%20for%20the%20movement).
- United Nations World Urbanization Prospects The 2005 Revision. <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.445.9975&rep=rep1&type=pdf#:~:text=The%202005%20Revision%20of%20World,in%20the%20world%20in%202005>.