Determinants of internal migration: A Case study of urban informal sector of Punjab

Neena Malhotra *, Pushpa Devi

Punjab School of Economics, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, India

Abstract

Migration is a universal phenomenon. Internal migration in India, particularly interstate and rural urban streams have increased in volume and importance over time. Internal migration in India does not fill demand and supply gaps only but acts as an instrument of survival for millions of poor population concentrated in the states of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh etc. The present study tries to identify important determinants of internal migration in urban informal sector of Punjab. The study is based on primary survey of 500 respondents, 250 each in Ludhiana and Amritsar, the two largest cities of Punjab. Push and Pull factors in internal migration have been identified by applying Logit and Probit regression models. Majority of the internal migrants are young Hindu males who have migrated to Punjab during last fifteen years. Most of the migrant workers in urban informal sector are either illiterate or have low level of education and hence they have no option except for working in the informal sector. Most of these migrants belong to Uttar Pradesh and Bihar and they come to Punjab because of better employment opportunities and wages. The study finds that better work and help from earlier migrant friends and relatives are the major pull factors in internal migration in India. Internal Migration is basically driven by push factors like lack of job opportunities for young males, family problems, agriculture not being profitable, unemployment and landlessness. Among caste and religion variables, the Hindus and OBCs are more likely to migrate.

Keywords: Internal Migration; Migrant Workers; Logit; Probit

* Corresponding author. *E-mail address:* malhotradrneena@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Mobility is an important part of human existence. However, all types of human mobility are not migration (NSSO, 2010). Migration is a movement from one place to another place for the purpose of taking up permanent or semi-permanent residence. Migration is classified as internal or international depending on whether the movement is happening within or across national boundaries. Internal migration always plays an important role in economic development of the country or region. This type of migration occurs mainly because of the uneven development of regions or states (Misra, 1998). Uneven development is the main reason for migration along with factors like unemployment, poverty, fragmentation of land and large family size etc. (DeJong and Fawcett, 1981; Cherunilam, 1987).

Internal migration in India, particularly interstate and rural urban streams have increased in volume and importance over time. Internal migration in India does not only fill demand and supply gaps but acts as an instrument of survival for millions of poor population concentrated in the states of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh etc.

An individual's decision to migrate depends upon a number of factors such as age, gender, education, employment, marital status, and position in the household and household characteristics such as the income level, wealth, religion, and caste(de Haas and Fokkema, 2010; Tsegai, 2007).Migration studies consistently find that age is a major factor determining the probability of migration. Migration probability is seen to fall with age and rise with educational attainment of migrant (Shwartz, 1976; Borjas, 2004). In internal migration, distance is another factor which has encouraged people to migrate. The probability of migrating is inversely related to the distance. Majority of the migrants prefer short distance migration because they remain aware of job opportunities, living condition, language and place of destination. The greater the distance, the information about the job opportunities is less so persons will migrate less. Distance also increases transport cost of migration. Based on the human capital model, high unemployment rates in origin location should increase the net benefits from migrating and push workers away. An unemployed person must assess the probability of gaining employment at the potential destination. Unemployment rates in destination areas reduce the probability that an unemployed person will migrate there (McConnell and Brue, 1986; Faist, 2000).

There are different factors which encourage people to migrate and such factors are economic, social, political and cultural but migration is primarily encouraged by economic factors (NSSO, 1998). In a large number of developing countries, low agricultural income, agricultural unemployment and underemployment are considered as basic factors pushing the migrants towards prosperous or dynamic areas with greater job opportunities. Economic factors which encourage migration may be termed as push factors and pull factors.

As per the 2001 Census, the total number of internal migrants was 309 million or nearly 30 per cent of the total population. As per NSSO 2007-08 there are 326 million migrants in India. About 42.3 million migrants migrate from other states (33 % from rural areas and 67% from urban areas). Large numbers of migrant workers migrate from Uttar Pradesh (10.6 million) followed by Bihar (7.05 million), Madhya Pradesh (2.93 million) and Karnataka (1.98 million). Maharashtra, Delhi, Gujarat, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Punjab and Haryana are the main migration destination states. These are economically developed regions. Migration takes

place as a response to demand supply mismatch in labour markets. Migrant workers migrate from the economically less developed areas to comparatively more developed areas (NSSO, 2010).

1.1. Review of literature

Most of the migrant studies have found that both push and pull factors play an important role in labour migration. The pull factors which encourage the migrant workers to migrate new places are high wages, better employment opportunities, increased industrialization, skill formation, better work environment, opportunities for better education, availability of improved infrastructure, provision of basic amenities, improved quality of life. On the other hand the major push factors compelling the migrant workers to quit from the agricultural areas are poverty, unemployment and underemployment, low productivity, low income, crime at native place, corruption and low level of living (Kumar and Sidhu, 2005; Bhagat, 2009; Chakraborty and Kuri 2013; Gimba and Kumshe, 2011; Malhotra 2015; Malhotra and Devi, 2016; Kohli, 2010; Sridhar et al., 2010; Taralekar et al., 2012).

The size of net migration of the developed states has been found to be much higher than that of the backward states. Poor and backward states actually show large population mobility, which is primarily in search of a livelihood. Majority of the migrant workers migrate to industrially developed states like Maharashtra and West Bengal. Similarly, the major out migration states are the backward states of Uttar Pradesh and Bihar (Piplai et al., 1969; Mitra and Mayumi, 2008; Vipul Kant Singh et al., 2011; Chakraborty and Kuri, 2013).

Lusome and Bhagat (2006) study finds that the reason for migration among the males is employment and among the females is marriage. Male migrants who move out for work during their young age tend to return to their origin place at old ages, which reduces the effectiveness of urbanization as a measure of economic or industrial growth (Rele, 1969; Vipul Kant Singh et al., 2011; Jothy and Kalaiselvi, 2011; Shandilya and Singh, 2012)

Skeldon (1986) study finds that majority of the migrants enter the informal sector and hence create their own employment. Bhattacharay (1996) study finds that informal sector played an important role in rural urban migration. A large number of unskilled workers are migrating to work in the informal sector. Many studies also find that the size of rural to urban migration was directly linked with the spread of urban informal sector. The job opportunities available in urban informal sectors encourage migrant workers to migrate from rural to urban areas (Bairagya, 2012; Banerjee, 1983; Chakraborty and Kuri, 2013). Misra, and Mohd. Saif Alam (2014) study finds that the employers in the informal sector prefer migrants because it is easier to exploit migrant workers as they may have lesser information about the labour market of the destination place.

2. Database and methodology

The present study is based on primary survey. For collecting the primary data, a detailed questionnaire dealing with different aspects of internal migration was prepared. The sample comprises of 500 respondents, 250 each from Amritsar and Ludhiana two largest cities in Punjab. As there is no compiled data on migrants in each city,

the method followed is convenient sampling and snowball sampling. Many migration studies have used snowball sampling. In snowball sampling an initial migrant worker is selected usually as per convenience. After being interviewed, the migrant workers are asked to identify other migrant workers. This method is used to gain access to other migrant workers due to location difficulties associated with tracking them. The major advantage of snowball sampling is that it substantially increases the likelihood of locating the migrant workers. Data has been collected by personal interview method and the survey was conducted during the period of September 2014 to May 2015.

2.1. Chi square test

Chi- square test is also known as test of goodness of fit. Chi- square is a non-parametric test and is important in social science research. It is used to test if the deviation between observation (experiment) and theory may be attributed to chance (fluctuations of sampling) or if it is really due to the inadequacy of the theory to fit the observed data. It is denoted by χ^2.

Under the Null Hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the observed and theoretical or hypothetical values, i.e. there is good compatibility between theory and experiment, Karl Pearson proved that the statistic

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[\frac{(O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i} \right] \qquad (1)$$

$$= \frac{(O_1 - E_1)^2}{E_1} + \frac{(O_2 - E_2)^2}{E_2} + \cdots \ldots \ldots \cdot \frac{(O_n - E_n)^2}{E_n} \qquad (2)$$

Follow χ^2 distribution with V= n-1, d.f. Where $O_1, O_2, \ldots \ldots \ldots O_n$ are the observes frequency and $E_1, E_2, \ldots \ldots \ldots E_n$ are the corresponding expected or theoretical frequencies obtain under some theory and hypothesis.

In this survey level of significance has been taken at 1 percent. If calculated value of the χ^2 is greater than the tabulated value, it is said to be significant. In other words, the discrepancy between the observed and expected frequencies cannot be attributed to chance and we reject the null hypothesis. On the other hand If calculated value of the χ^2 is less than the tabulated value, so null hypothesis is rejected and it is not significant at 1 percent level.

2.2. Identification of push and pull factors

In our survey migrant workers have given a large number of reasons affecting migration decision. Some of these reasons can be categorized as push factors while others are pull factors. Therefore, the respondents who chose both push and pull factors can be classified as a set of people for whom both the push and pull factors were important for migration.

Hence to separate the purely push from the purely pull factors, we define a variable Y_i, for each individual migrant, where

$$Y_i = \frac{(\text{Number of Pull reasons for migration chosen})}{(Total\ Number\ of\ reasons\ for\ migration\ )}$$

Hence the variable Yi varies from 0 to 1, with the value 0 indicating that the individual's reasons for migration are "only push" in nature, and with the value 1 referring to "only pull" factors. For sake of classification we can divide the range of possible values that Yi can take, into five parts:

Yi = 0; "Only Push"

0 < Yi < 0.5; "Mainly Push"

Yi = 0.5; "Both Push and Pull"

0.5 < Yi < 1; "Mainly Pull"

Yi = 1; "Only Pull"

For Statistical analysis values ranging for 0 to .5 are taken as push factor and greater than .5 to 1 are taken as pull factor. In order to identify the socio-economic factors affecting migration, we have used Logistic Regression and Probit Regression Analysis.

2.3. Logit regression Analysis

Logit regression model is used when dependent variable is binary, which takes the values 0 or 1. Logit regression estimates the probability of dependent variables y=1. The logit model can be specified as:

$$P_i = E(Y = 1|X_i) = \beta_1 + \beta_2 X_i \qquad (1)$$

Where X_i is the explanatory variables and Y is dependent variables. Now consider the following representation:-

$$P_i = E(Y = 1|X_i) = \frac{1}{1+e^{-(\beta_1+\beta_2 X_i)}} \qquad (2)$$

For ease of exposition we write (2) as

$$P_i = \frac{1}{1+e^{-Z_i}} = \frac{e^z}{1+e^z} \qquad (3)$$

Where Z_i is $\beta_1 + \beta_2 X_i$

Equation (3) represents what is known as the logistic distribution function.

If P_i, the probability that an event occurs, is given by (3) then (1-P_i), the probability that an event not occurs, is

$$P_i = \frac{1}{1+e^{Z_i}} \qquad (4)$$

Therefore, we can write

$$\frac{P_i}{1-P_i} = \frac{1+e^{Z_i}}{1+e^{-Z_i}} = e^{Z_i} \qquad (5)$$

Now if we take the natural log of (5), we obtain following result.

$$L_i = ln\left(\frac{P_i}{1-P_i}\right) = Z_i$$
$$= \beta_1 + \beta_2 X_i \qquad (6)$$

2.4. Probit Regression Analysis

In order to understand the factors which determine the decision to migrate, we estimated a probit model where the dependent variable is continuous and has the range [0, 1]. The theoretical background for the probit model is as follows:

$$I_i = \beta_1 + \beta_2 X_i \qquad\qquad\qquad (1)$$

Where, I_i is a latent variable and X_i is the explanatory variables

$$P_i = P(Y = 1|X) = P(I'_I \le I_I) = P(Z_i \le \beta_1 + \beta_2 X_i = F(\beta_1 + \beta_2 X_i) \qquad (2)$$

Where, $P(Y = 1|X)$ means the probability that an event occurs given the values of the X_i, explanatory variables and Z_i is the standard normal variable, i.e., Z N-(0, α^2). F is the standard normal cumulative distribution a function, when written explicitly in the present context is:

$$F(I_i) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{I_i} e^{Z^2/2} \, dz$$
$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\beta_1+\beta_2 X_i} e^{Z^2/2} \, dz \qquad\qquad (3)$$

Since P represents the probability that an event will occur. It is measured by the area of the standard normal curve from -∞ to I_i

Now to obtain information on I_i, the utility index, as well as on β_1 and β_2, we take the inverse of (2) to obtain:

$I_i = F^{-1}(I_i) = F^{-1}(P_i)$

$= \beta_1 + \beta_2 X_i$

Where F^{-1} is the inverse of normal cumulative distribution functions.

In order to identify important factors causing migration, Logit and Probit regression models are used. The coding of various variables is given in table 1.

Table 1. Coding of Variables

Variable	Code
Dependent variable Y_i	Decision to migrate (Push=0, Pull=1)
Independent variables	Reasons for Migration
Age at the time of migration	0-24 = 0, 25 and above =1
Religion	Hindu =1 , Otherwise = 0
Caste _SC	SC = 1,Otherwise = 0
Caste _OBC	OBC = 1, Otherwise = 0
Illiterate	Illiterate = 1, Otherwise = 0
Primary	Primary = 1, Otherwise = 0
Middle	Middle=1,otherwise= 0
Matric	Matric =1,otherwise=0
Senior Secondary	Senior Secondary=1, otherwise= 0
Graduation	Graduation=1, otherwise= 0
Number of family members	2-10
Better work	Better work=1, otherwise=0
Friends & Family	With the help of family or friends=1, otherwise=0
Lack of job in native	Lack of job in native place=1, otherwise =0
Family Problem	Family Problem=1, otherwise=0

Agriculture not profitable	Agriculture not profitable=1,otherwise =0
Unemployment	Unemployment=1, otherwise 0
Landownership	No land in the native place=1, otherwise=0

Source: Author's Calculation

3. Findings of the study

3.1. Socio economic background of the migrant workers

It was found that out of 500 respondents, around 38 percent of workers belonged to the age group of 21-30 and another 29 percent of workers were in the age group of 31-40. The remaining 12 percent, 16.4 percent and 5.2 percent were in the age group of less than or equal to 20 years, 41-50 years and greater than 51 years respectively. Age distribution of workers in the sample is given in table which clearly shows that 49.6 percent of the migrants are below the age of 30, while another 28.8% are in the age group of 31-40. Thus, majority of the migrant workers covered in the study are young people below the age of 40 years. Youngest person covered in the sample was 15 years old and the oldest migrant covered in the sample was 65 years old.

It was found that out of 500 respondents, 78.6percent migrant workers belonged to age group of less than and equal to 24 years. The remaining 12 percent, 6.4 percent, 2.4 percent and 0.6 percent were in the age group of 25-30 years, 31-35 years, 36-40 years and greater than 40 years respectively (table 2). Thus, the table shows that majority of the workers covered were up to the age of 24 years when they decided to migrate. Hence age is an important factor in the migration decision (table 2).

In the total sample survey, migrant workers in the urban informal sector in Punjab, women constitute only 6.6 percent, while the male migrant workers share is 93.4 percent. Thus, majority of the economically active migrant workers are men while women migrants constitute a smaller proportion in the urban informal sector (table 2).

The 89.4 percent migrant workers belonged to Hindu religion and only 10.6 percent migrants were Muslim. Majority of the Hindu migrants are either SCs or OBCs. Out of 447 Hindu migrants in the total sample, 37.8 percent people belonged to Scheduled castes (SC), 37.1 percent belonged to Other Backward Castes (OBC) and 25.1 percent belonged to general category (table 2). Most of the workers in the urban informal sector were either illiterate or were having low levels of education attainment. This clearly highlights the poor human capital base of the urban informal sector workers. The study finds that migrant workers in urban informal sector in Punjab who have low level of education tend to be more mobile and easily get jobs in the informal sector. If the migrant has a low level of education, they have no chance of getting a job in the formal sector and hence resort to informal sector for meager sustenance (table 2).

Out of the 500 migrant workers, 77 percent of the migrant workers in the sample were married and 23 percent were unmarried. Table shows that most of the migrant workers were married and they areliving in another city due to responsibility of their families (table 2).

Table 2. Socio Economic Background of the Migrant Workers

Current Age Distribution		
	Frequency	**Percent**
Less than & equal to 20	60	12
21-30	188	37.6
31-40	144	28.8
41-50	82	16.4
Greater than 50	26	5.2
Total	500	100
Age at time of Migration		
Less than & equal to 24	393	78.6
25-30	60	12
31-35	32	6.4
36-40	12	2.4
Greater than 40	3	0.6
Total	500	100
Distribution of Workers by Gender		
Male	467	93.4
Female	33	6.6
Total	500	100
Religion Composition of Migrant Workers		
Muslim	53	10.6
Hindu	447	89.4
Total	500	100
Caste composition of Hindu Migrant workers		
Scheduled castes (SC)	169	37.8
Other Backward Castes (OBC)	166	37.1
General	112	25.1
Total	447	100
Education Level of Migrant Workers		
Illiterate	162	32.4
Primary	94	18.8
Middle	111	22.2
Matriculation	85	17
Secondary	41	8.2
Graduation	7	1.4
Total	500	100
Marital Status of Migrant Workers		
Married	383	76.6
Unmarried	117	23.4
Total	500	100
.	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Nuclear	434	86.8
Joint	66	13.2
Total	500	100
Distribution of Migrant workers by Family Size		
Less than & equal to 4	117	23.4
5 to 8	357	71.4
8+	26	5.2
Total	500	100
Average Family size	**5.6**	

Source: Field Survey

Family size influences the migration decision in several ways. As the family size increases the possibly of migration will increase. According to census 2001, the average family size in India is 5.6. It was found that out of 500 respondents, about 87 percent migrants belonged to nuclear families and 13.2 percent migrant workers belonged to joint family system. Table presents that out of 500 respondents, 71.4 percent workers had the family size of 5-8 members and 23.4 percent workers had the family size of up to 4 members. Only 5.2 percent respondents had family size of more than 8. The average family size was 5.6(table 2).

Table 3. Origin Place and Occupation of Migrant Workers

	Frequency	Percent
Origin Place of Migrant Workers		
Uttar Pradesh	274	54.8
Bihar	172	34.4
Himachal Pradesh	18	3.6
Madhya Pradesh	6	1.2
West Bengal	15	3
Jharkhand	6	1.2
Haryana	1	0.2
Orissa	5	1
Rajasthan	1	0.2
Tamil Nadu	1	0.2
Uttaranchal	1	0.2
Total	500	100
Occupation of Migrant Workers in their Origin Place		
Unemployed	369	73.8
Labourer	38	7.6
Farmer	45	9
Electrician	5	1
Agriculture worker	21	4.2
Mason	3	0.6
Tailor	3	0.6
Painter	3	0.6
Driver	4	0.8
Vegetable Vendor	1	0.2
Worker in Shop	2	0.4
Bangle Seller	1	0.2
Conductor	1	0.2
Barber	3	0.6
Pan Shop	1	0.2
Total	500	100

Source: Field Survey

Out of the 500 respondents, 54.8 percent workers were from Uttar Pradesh, followed by 34.4 percent from Bihar. About 4 percent workers belonged to Himachal Pradesh and 1.2 percent from Madhya Pradesh, 3 percent from West Bengal and 1.2 percent from Jharkhand. Thusmore than half of the migrant workers were coming from the state of Uttar Pradesh followed by Bihar. Only few migrant workers belonged to other states (table 3).

Out of the 500 respondent's 73.8 percent workers were unemployed and 26.2 percent were employed. It is seen from the table 7.8 that among those who were employed, only a small proportion was farmers while the remaining were labourers or working in the informal sector. Availability of job opportunity and better quality of job condition play an important role in the decision of migration process. Pre migration occupation also enables us to understand the causes of migration (table 3).

3.2. Results of chi square test

Chi square is a test of goodness of fit. For all the values of the characteristics the chi square values are significant i.e. age, sex, religion, education, marital status and type of family of the respondents. Chi square values are significant at 1 percent of level.

Table 4. Results of chi square test

Characteristics	Chi square Value	Tabulated value	Degrees of freedom	Significance
Age	170.8	13.277	4	Significance*
Sex	376.172	6.635	1	Significance *
Religion	310.472	6.635	1	Significance*
Education	176.272	15.1	5	Significance *
Marital Status	141.512	6.635	1	Significance*
Type of Family	270.848	6.635	1	Significance *

*Source: Author Calculation Note: *1 % level of significance*

3.3. Migration detail and reasons for migration

Out of 500 respondents, 95 percent of the migrant workers have their first migration to Punjab. The share of migrant workers migrating into Punjab as second orthird destination is very small (table 5). It was found that out of 500 respondents, 65.6 percent of migrant workers claimed that they came to Punjab from their place of origin after 2000. During the period 1981 to 90 only 15.2 percent migrant workers migrated and during 1991-2000, 19.2 percent people migrated to urban informal sector in Punjab. Overall more than 30 percent migrant workers are those who have almost permanently settled in Punjab. These migrant workers have been living in destination place for a long time (table 5).

Table 5. Migration Detail

Migrate to	Frequency	Percent
Foot Printing Migration		
City I (Destination)	475	95
City II	20	4
City III	3	0.6
City IV	2	0.4
Total	500	100
Year of Migration		
1981-1990	76	15.2
1991-2000	96	19.2
2001-2010	257	51.4

2011	71	14.2
Total	500	100
Occupation on Arrival		
Labour	102	20.4
Fruit seller	48	9.6
Factory	41	8.2
Painter	39	7.8
Vegetable vendor	41	8.2
Domestic worker	26	5.2
POP	24	4.8
Electrician	18	3.6
Street Food Vendor	12	2.4
Rickshaw Puller	18	3.6
worker in the shop	10	2
Mason	28	5.6
Pan shop	13	2.6
Tailor	16	3.2
Cook	3	0.6
Mali	2	0.4
Auto Driver	10	2
Barber	7	1.4
Plumber	12	2.4
Tile Fitter	1	0.2
Welder	11	2.2
Cloth Seller	7	1.4
Sales man	11	2.2
Total	500	100
How Did You Find First Job?		
Friend	289	57.8
Relatives	183	36.6
Contractor	18	3.6
Self	10	2
Total	500	100
When You Moved to the City, Did You Have a Job?		
Yes	410	82
No	90	18
Total	500	100

Source: Field Survey

Immediately after arrival at the place of migration, migrants tend to do the jobs which are easily available. Usually they follow the profession of their friends and relatives who have already migrated and are their immediate support. Out of 500 respondents, 20.4 percent worked as labourer, 9.6 were percent fruit sellers, 8.2 percent were factory workers, 7.8 percent were painter and 8.2 percent were vegetable vendors. Rest of the migrants followed various professions in the informal sector as per their qualification and job availability (table 5).

A family contact is one of the factors that pull people to shift from the place of origin to another state. Family contacts with the already settled migrants in the place of destination are not only helpful in reducing the cost of job search but also improve the quality of information about the urban employment prospects. Out of the 500 respondent, 57.8 percent migrant workers got their first job with the help of friend, 36.6 percent with the

help of theirrelatives and 3.6 with the help of contractor. Only 2 percent migrant workers found their first job themselves (table 4). Out of 500 respondents, 82 percent of the sample migrants did have a job on arrival in the city and only 18 percent migrants had to wait for some days or weeks to get their first job on arrival. Thus, most of the migrants move to the city in the expectation of assured work opportunities (table 5).

The data on reasons for migration indicate the importance of economic factors in decision to migrate. While explaining the reasons for migration, migrants gave multiple factors. The most important factor is prospects of better income which motivated migrants to shift. This pull factor is closely associated with push factors like lack of job opportunities and unemployment in native place. Besides, better work and landlessness were other important factors. The data on reasons for migration indicate the importance of economic factors in decision to migrate. Table 5 divide the various reasons for migration into push and pull factors that encourage migration from the origin areas to the Punjab. The migrant workers were attracted to Punjab due to a better income (90.6 %) and better work (70.6 %). The major reason for migration from the origin place was unemployment (73.8%) and no job in native place (75.4 %). The other reason for migration from the origin place was no land in native place (64.8 %), Poverty (31.4 %), family problem (23.4 %) and agriculture not profitable (7.2%). Migrant workers generally have more than one reason to migrate.

Table 6. Reason for Migration

	Frequency	Percentage
Reasons for Migration		
Better work	353	70.6
Better Income	453	90.6
Friends and Family	80	16
No job in native place	377	75.4
Family Problem	117	23.4
Poverty	157	31.4
Agriculture not Profitable	36	7.2
Migration with husband	33	6.6
Unemployment	369	73.8
No land	324	64.8
Who took the Migration Decision		
Yourself	288	57.6
Spouse	32	6.4
Parents	114	22.8
Relatives	36	7.2
Friend	30	6
Total	500	100
Persons Accompanying Migrants at the time of Migration		
Alone	275	55
With family	72	14.4
Relatives	66	13.2
Friend	87	17.4
Total	500	100
Movement of Families of Migrants		
Yes	204	40.8
No	296	59.2
Total	500	100

Time Gap Between Migration and Family Relocation		
within One Year	72	35.3
1 - 5	82	40.2
6 -10	35	17.2
11- 15	9	4.4
More than 15 Years	6	2.9
Total	204	100
Reason for Family Migration		
Family Problem	83	40.7
Feeling Loneliness	31	15.2
Food Problem	13	6.4
Migration with Husband	33	16.2
No One Can Take Care of Family	28	13.7
No Work at Origin Place	4	2
Better Education for Children	12	5.9
Total	204	100

Source: Field Survey

Out of the 500 migrant workers, 57.6 percent migrant workers took the migration decision themselves. In 22.8 percent cases migration decision was taken by the parents. However in 6.4 percent, 7.2 percent and 6 percent cases migration decision was taken by the spouse, relatives and friends respectively (table 6).Out of the 500 respondents nearly 55 percent migrants workers migrated alone; the rest were either accompanied by the family (14.4%) or friends (17.4%) and relatives (13.2%) (table 6).

Out of 500 respondents, almost 41 percent migrant workers stated that their families also moved to city. Out of 204 respondents who reported that their families have moved to the city with them, about 35 percent migrants claimed that their families have moved to the city within one year, whereas 40 percent migrants brought their families between 1-5 years. The main reason for bringing their families to city were: family problem (40.7%), feeling loneliness (15.2 %), food problem (6.4 %), migration with husband (16.2 %), no one can take careof their family (14 %), no work at origin place (2%)and better education for children (5.9 %).

The most important problem faced by migrants is that they do not have any government document of their identity at the place of migration. It is difficult for them to have important government documents at new place. It is seen from the table 6 that out of 500 respondents, 17.8 percent migrant workers have ration card. 21.8 percent migrant workers have voter card and only 6.6 percent workers have driving license. A large number of migrants already have aadhar card (40%). These documents are important for availing various social welfare policies of government like subsidized food supplies, health insurance and other forms of social security. At present majority of Indians have Aadhar cards hence it is important that all identity proofs are connected with aadhar cards.

Table 7. Migrant Workers Access to Important Government Documents of Identity Proof

Documentation	Frequency	Percent
Ration Card	89	17.8
Voter Card	109	21.8
Driving License	33	6.6
Aadhar Card	200	40.0
Pan Card	34	6.8

Source: Field Survey

3.4. Landownership in origin place

It is seen from the table 7 that out of 500 respondents, about 35 percent migrant workers claimed that they have land in their origin place. It is seen from the table that in majority of the cases family members manage the work back home. Majority of the migrants are having the land less than and equal to 2 acres. Only 11.9 percent respondents had land in the range of 2-5 acres and 4.5 percent migrants had land more than 5 acres.

Table 8. Landownership in Origin Place

Land ownership of	Amritsar +Ludhiana	
	Frequency	**Percent**
Yes	176	35.2
No	324	64.8
Total	500	100
Work Management in the Origin Place		
Brother	40	22.7
Contractor	11	6.3
Father	58	33
Self	5	2.8
Son	19	10.8
Wife	43	24.4
Total	176	100
Area of Land (in acres)		
Less than andequal to 2	147	83.5
2-5	21	11.9
5 and above	8	4.5
Total	176	100

Source: Field Survey

3.5. Results of logit and Probit Model

The results of the Logistic Regression and Probit Regression Analysis find that age at time of migration, Religion, better work opportunities and help of friends and relatives show positive and significant relationship with the migration decision whereas lack of job opportunities, family problem, agriculture not profitable, unemployment and land ownership in the native place show negative and significant impact on decision to migration in the logit model as well as in probit models. The study finds that migrant workers who belong to OBC are more likely to be pulled towards urban areas rather than pushed out of their origin place. Lack of job opportunities, family problem, agriculture not profitable unemployment and land ownership in the native place pushed migrants toward the urban areas. Thus, study finds that push factors play important role in migration decision because migrants belong to economically backward states.

Table 9. Estimated Regression Equation for the Determinants of Decision to Migration by Migrant Workers

Variables	Logistic Regression				Probit Regression Analysis		
	B	**S.E.**	**Sig.**	**Exp(B)**	**B**	**S.E.**	**Sig.**
Age at the time of migration	3.451	1.422	**0.015**	31.537	1.893	0.778	**0.015**
Religion	5.801	2.208	**0.009**	330.493	3.027	1.251	**0.016**

Caste _SC	0.153	1.180	0.897	0.858	0.198	0.644	0.759
Caste _OBC	2.017	1.153	**0.080**	0.133	1.285	0.640	**0.045**
Family Size	0.242	0.277	0.382	1.274	0.138	0.154	0.370
Illiterate	1.383	0.921	0.133	0.251	0.705	0.491	0.151
Primary	0.124	0.887	0.889	0.883	0.102	0.487	0.834
Middle	0.606	0.990	0.541	1.832	0.344	0.564	0.542
Matric	-0.425	1.346	0.752	0.654	-0.366	0.722	0.613
Senior secondary	-0.986	1.281	0.442	0.373	-0.525	0.695	0.450
Graduation	4.143	8.643	0.632	63.003	2.289	5.786	0.692
Better work	2.889	1.343	**0.031**	17.983	1.675	0.730	**0.022**
With the help Friend & Relative	5.284	1.522	**0.001**	197.129	2.778	0.747	**0.000**
Lack of job in Native	-8.336	1.861	**0.000**	4169.844	-4.627	0.966	**0.000**
Family Problem	-9.179	3.006	**0.002**	9691.288	-4.924	1.627	**0.002**
Agriculture not profitable	-5.574	2.221	**0.012**	263.493	-3.085	1.207	**0.011**
Unemployment	-6.562	1.680	**0.000**	707.986	-3.542	0.853	**0.000**
Land Ownership	-6.002	1.678	**0.000**	404.424	-3.257	0.875	**0.000**
Constant	-35.112	8.374	**0.000**		-18.899	4.224	**0.000**
Pseudo R^2	**0.8002**				**0.8014**		

Source: Author's Calculation

4. Conclusion

Thus, from the above discussion it is clear that majority of the internal migrants are young Hindu males who have migrated to Punjab during last fifteen years. Most of the migrant workers in urban informal sector are either illiterate or have low level of education and hence they have no option except for working in the informal sector. Most of these migrants belong to Uttar Pradesh and Bihar and they come to Punjab because of better employment opportunities and wages. The study finds that better work and help from earlier migrant friends and relatives are the major pull factors in internal migration in India. Internal Migration is basically driven by push factors ikle lack of job opportunities for young males, family problems, agriculture not being profitable, unemployment and landlessness. Among caste and religion variables, the Hindus and OBCs are more likely to migrate.

5. Limitations

The study is based on primary data. The accuracy of the findings depends upon the truthfulness of the respondents. Despite our best efforts, it is quite difficult to get information from the respondents as they are hesitant and, in some cases, doubt the intentions of the researchers. Punjab is a unique state in the sense that it is witnessing a lot of internal in-migration as well as international out-migration of local Punjabi community. Thus, a comparative analysis of internal in-migration and international out-migration from Punjab is required.

References

Bairagya, I. (2012), "Employment in India's informal sector: size, patterns, growth and determinants", *Journal of the Asia Pacific Economy*, Vol.17 No.4, pp. 593-615

Banerjee, B. (1983), "The Role of the Informal Sector in the Migration Process: A Test of Probabilistic Migration Models and Labour Market Segmentation for India", *Oxford Economic Papers*, Vol. 35 No. 3, pp. 399-422.

Bhagat R. (2009), "Internal Migration in India: Are the underclass More Mobile?" in the *26th IUSSP General Population proceedings of the international conference* in *Morocco,* 27 September- 2 October 2009, pp. 1-21

Bhattacharya, P. (1998), "The Informal Sector and Rural-to-Urban Migration: Some Indian Evidence", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 33 No. 21, pp. 1255-1262.

Borjas, G.J. (2004), *Do Foreign Students Crowd out Native Students from Graduate Programs*? NBER Working Paper No. 10349, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge.

Chakraborty, D. and Kuri, P.K. (2013), "Rural-Urban Migration and Urban Informal Sector in India: An Inter-State Analysis", *International Journal of Current Research*, Vol. 5 No. 4, pp. 950-956.

Cherunilam, F. (1987), *Migration: Causes, Correlates, Consequences, trend and Policies,* Himalaya Publication House, Delhi

De Haas, H. and Fokkema, T, (2010), *"*Intra-Household Conflicts in Migration Decision making: Return and Pendulum Migration in Morocco", *Population and Development Review*, Vol. 36 No. 3, pp. 541-561.

DeJong, G.F. and Fawcett, J.T. (1981), "Motivations for Migration: An Assessment and aValue-Expectancy Research Model", in: DeJong, G.F. and Gardener, R.W. (eds.), *Migration Decision Making: Multidisciplinary Approaches to Micro level Studies in Developed and Developing Countries*, Pergamon Press, New York.

Faist, T. (2000), *The Volume and Dynamics of International Migration and Transnational Spaces*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Gimba, Z. and Kumshe, M.G. (2011), "Census and Effects of Rural Urban Migration in Borno State: A Case Study of Maiduguri Metropolis", *Asian Journal of Business and Management Science*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 168-172.

Gupta, A.K., Arora, D.R. and Aggarwal, B.K. (1988), "Sociological Analysis of Migration of Agricultural Labourers from Eastern to North-Western Region of India", *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations,* Vol. 23 No. 4, pp. 429-445

Gupta, I. and Arup, M. *(*2002*),* "Rural Migrants and Labour Segmentation: Micro-Level Evidence from Delhi Slums", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 37 No. 2, pp. 163-168.

Jothy, K. and Kalaiselvi, S. (2011), "Patterns of Internal Migration: An Analysis Using Census Data of Tamilnadu", *International Journal of Current Research*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 89-96.

Kohli, P. (2010), "Inter-State Immigration into Punjab during 1971-91" available at: https://ia902507.us.archive.org/14/items/InterstateImmigrationIntoPunjabDuring1971-91/Inter-stateImmigrationIntoPunjabDuring1971-91.pdf (accessed 24 June 2017)

Lusome, R. and Bhagat, R.B. (2006), "Trends and Patterns of Internal Migration in India: 1971-2001", Retrieved from www.scribd.com.

Malhotra, N. (2007), *Marketing research: An applied orientation*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.

Malhotra, N. (2015), "Factors in Internal Labour Migration in India", *ENVISION – International Journal of Commerce and Management,* Vol. 9, pp. 47-55.

Malhotra, N. and Devi, P. (2016), "Analysis of Factors Affecting Internal Migration in India", *Amity Journal of Economics,* Vol. 1 No. 2, PP. 34-51.

McConnell C.R. and Brue, S. (1986), *Contemporary Labour Economics*, McGraw Hill book company.

Misra, P. and Alam, M.S. (2014), "Urban Informal Sector & Migrants", *International Journal of Business and Administration Research Review*, Vol. 2 No. 4, pp. 72-86.

Misra, S.N. (1998), *Dynamics of Rural Urban Migration in India*, Anmol Publication Pvt. Ltd New Delhi

Mitra, A. and Mayumi, M. (2008), *Rural to Urban Migration – A district level Analysis from India,* IDE-JETRA Report No. 137.

Naresh K. and Sidhu, A.S. (2005), "Pull and Push Factors in Labour Migration: A Study of Brick-Klin Workers in Punjab", *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 41 No. 2, pp. 221-232.

NSSO (1998), *Migration in India 1993*, *NSS Report No. 430*, NSS 49th Round. Ministry of Statistics and Program Implementation, Government of India, New Delhi

NSSO (2010), *Migration in India 2007-2008*, *NSS Report No. 533 (64/10.2/2)*, NSS 64th Round, Ministry of Statistics and Program Implementation, Government of India. New Delhi.

Piplai, T. and Majumdar, N. (1969), "Internal Migration in India: Some Socio-Economic Implications", *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series B,* Vol. 31 No. 3/4, pp. 509-522.

Rele J.R. (1969), "Trends and Significance of Internal Migration in India", *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series B,* Vol. 31 No. 3/4, pp. 501-508.

Schwartz, A. (1976), "Migration, Age and Education", *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 84 No. 4, pp. 167-227.

Sethi, S, Ghuman, R. and Ukpere, W.I. (2009), "Socio-economic analysis of the migrant labourers in Punjab: An empirical analysis", *African Journal of Business Management* Vol. 4 No. 10, pp. 2042-2050.

Shandilya, S. and Singh, M. (2012), "Internal Migration in India", *Journal of Business Management & Social Sciences Research"*, Vol. 1 No. 3, pp. 66-69.

Skeldon, R. (1986), "On Migration Patterns in During the 1970s", *Population and Development Review*, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 759-779.

Sridhar, K.S., Reddy, A.V. and Srinath, P. (2010), "Is it Push or Pull? Recent Evidence from Migration in India", *South Asia Network of Economic Research Institutes*, Vol. 10, pp.1-17

Taralekar, R., Waingankar, P. and Thatkar, P. (2012), "A Study to Assess Pattern of Migration Across India Based on Census Data", *International Journal of Recent Trends in Science and Technology*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp 74-77.

Tsegai, D. (2007), "Migration as a Household Decision: What are the Roles of Income Differences? Insights from the Volta Basin of Ghana", *The European Journal of Development Research*, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 305-326.

Vipul Kant Singh et al. (2011), "Changing Pattern of Internal Migration in India: Some Evidence from Census Data", *International Journal of Current Research*, Vol. 3 No. 4, pp. 289-295.