Rural Migration A Significant Cause Of Urbanization: A District Level Review Of Census Data For Rajasthan

Jayant Singh,

Assitant Professor,

Department of Statistics

University of Rajasthan, Jaipur, India

Jayantsingh47@rediffmail.com

Hansraj Yadav

Deputy Director,

Regional Office for Health & FW, Jaipur, India

hansrajyadav@yahoo.com

Florentin Smarandache

Chair of Department of Mathematics, University of New Mexico, Gallup,USA

fsmarandache@yahoo.com

Introduction

Migration plays an important role in urbanization of a state. In general more the migration higher the urbanization rate though it many not necessarily true in all the situations but in general it is witnessed that migration have a fairly large share in urbanization. A district level analysis for Rajasthan state is attempted to comprehend Urbanization due to migration their interlinkages and association.

Urbanization Trend in Rajasthan State

The share of urban population inched up to 23.38% according to census 2001 from 15.06% in the census 1901 in the Rajasthan state. Number of towns in the Rajasthan state increased to 216 in the census 2001 against 133 in the 1901 census which is 62.4% growth in this period whereas at national level this growth has been 169.36% in this same period. Share of state urban population in the country urban population dropped to 4.6% from 5.98% over a century period whereas in terms of number of town state share also slipped to 4.18% from 6.94% in this same period. Therefore it can be clearly claimed that the state has to go a long way to match with national figures on account of characteristics of urbanization whether it is growth in urban population or towns, however there has been a meager improvement in the percentage share of state urban population in the national urban population as it grow to 4.1% to 4.52%, 4.52% to 4.62% and than to 4.64% in last three successive census periods.

District Level Analysis for Rajasthan

The migrants contribution in urbanization is on the rising over the decades as 16.4% of the total migrants in the Rajasthan settled in urban areas during the period 1971-80 which went up to 22.4% for the duration 1981-1990 and further advanced to 25.4% in the duration 1991-2000. This trend is evident invariably for all the districts of the state though the contribution in urbanization by the migrants vary from district to district, for some district the share of migrants moving to urban areas in total migrant is very impressive though for others it is not that much high.

In Barmer districts 7.7%, 7.1% & 4.0% of total migrants moved to urban areas in last three decades i.e. 1991-2000, 1981-90 & 1971-1980. This percentage share for Jalore was 9.6, 8.1 & 4.7%, and for Banswara 9.1,7.9 & 4.7% and these district had poor share of migrants to urban areas.

On the other side there are districts like Jaipur, Ajmer, Kota & Bhilwara where the percentage share of migrants settling in urban areas to the total migrants is comparatively very high. This percentage share of urban migrants in three last successive decades for these districts is given in table placed on next page

District / period	1991-2000	1981-90	1971-1980
Kota	56.8	54.3	50.7
Jaipur	53.2	48.5	35
Ajmer	41.4	35.6	28.7
Bhilwara	31.1	25.0	14.8
Jodhpur	26.8	18.7	12.4

Urbanization and Migration

Contribution of urban migrants in total migrants is considered as extent of urbanization by the migration in a particular category. Districts are classified in the groups where % of migrants attributing to urbanization is <20%, 20-50 and >50% for all the three durations 1971-80,1981-90 and 1991-2000 and the result is summarized below:

Range of urbanization by migrants (in%)	2001	1991	1981
	Number of Districts		
<20	10	16	28
20-50	20	14	3
>50	2	2	1

Its is evident from above classification that there is considerably shift in last three census period as number of district having high urbanization due to migration has gone up in almost all the categories of urbanization range due to migration.

Total Urbanization & Urbanization due to Migration:

An Indicator, Urbanization rate, for this comparative analysis is defined as below

Migration is an important part of the urbanization and in many cases it is attributing predominately in the urbanization. Urbanization Indicator based on two rates is defined below

1. Total Urbanization rate: is the percentage of population living in urban areas to the total population

2. Urbanization rate due migration: is the percentage share of urban migrants to the total migrants.

The comparative investigation for the last decadal period i.e. 1991-2001 between these two indicator rates is performed in coming paragraphs.

State urbanization rate is the share of urban population to the total population at state level and similarly it is calculated for districts level. Now theses two rates are compared at state and districts level to analyze the urbanization trend and its association with the migration.

At state level 23.4% of the total population is urbanized as compared to 22.9% of migrants are coming to urban areas thus at state level the urbanization rate for migrants is in line of the total urbanization rate. Barmer and Jalore are two district having migrants urbanization rate below 20% as the urbanization rate of the migrants to theses districts are mere 15 & 19%f.

Migrants urbanization rate for Jaipur (73.6%), Kota (68.2%), Ajmer (53.8%) and Udaipur (50%) districts are above 50% thus the more than half of the migrants to these districts are settling in urban areas. Bikaner and Churu are the only districts observed the migrants urbanization rate lower than total urbanization rate. This difference was more than 32% for the

Udaipur and Banswara districts and for seven districts it was more than 20%. The classification of number of districts based on the range of these two urbanization rate is classified in coming table

Range of Urbanization rate		>50%	40-50%	30-40%	20-30%	<20%
Combined (Male & female)	Total Urbanization rate	1	2	2	8	19
Male		1	1	2	9	19
Female		1	1	3	7	20
Combined (Male & female)	Urbanization rate due to migration	4	5	8	13	2
Male		12	8	4	9	12
Female		2	2	11	10	7

Clearly the migration witnesses a better urbanization rate and there are more districts classified in higher range of urbanization rates than the number of district classified according to total urbanization rate of the districts.

Technique of non-parametric test is used for district level analysis of the urbanization to see that migration to different districts is having same population. District are ranked on the basis of the total urban population and urban population due to migration and these formed two groups of Non-parametric test and Wilcoxon - Mann/Whitney Non parametric Test is employed for equality of K universes for total population and Male & Female population and results of the analysis done in Megastat is as below:

TOTAL		
n	sum of ranks	
32.00	698.00	Group 1
32.00	1382.00	Group 2
64.00	2080.00	Total
	1040.00	expected value
	74.48	standard deviation

	-4.59	Z
	0.00	p-value (two-tailed)
MALE		
n	sum of ranks	
32.00	612.00	Group 1
32.00	1468.00	Group 2
64.00	2080.00	Total
	1040.00	expected value
	74.48	standard deviation
	-5.74	Z
	0.00	p-value (two-tailed)
FEMALE		
n	sum of ranks	
32.00	775.00	Group 1
32.00	1305.00	Group 2
64.00	2080.00	Total
	1040.00	expected value
	74.48	standard deviation
	-3.55	Z
	.0004	p-value (two-tailed)
GROUP1 URBANISATION IN TOTAL POPULATION		
GROUP2 URBANISATION BY MIGRATION		

Clearly above district level analysis reveals that total urbanization and urbanization due to migration differs significantly for total, male and female population and districts have significant impact on total urbanization & urbanization due to migration. Thus the relative magnitude of total urbanization and urbanization due to migration differ significant for the districts for both genders and combined.

Discussions:

Migration witnesses a better urbanization rate and there are more districts classified in higher range of urbanization rates than the number of district classified according to total urbanization rate of the districts. At state level,

the rising contribution of rural migrants in urbanization is witnessed in three successive decades.

Scale of the urbanization for some of the district that are already having higher urbanization due to rural migrants is speeding up and these district have grown tremendously due to high rate of rural migrants settling in urban areas. This in turn is resulting in big is getting bigger in recent census over previous censuses and the gap in urbanization due to rural migrants is increasing for the district that already had high urbanization from rural migrants than to districts which had small rural migrants settling in urban area. .

References:

- Gupta, Kamla (1996): Urbanisation and Urban growth in India, in Census as Social Document, (Eds) S.P. Mohanty and A.R. Momin, Rawat Publications, Jaipur and New Delhi

- Kaur, Gurinder. 1996. Migration Geography. New Delhi: Anmol Publications.

- National Institute of Urban Affairs (1988): Report of the National Commission on Urbanization. Vol-2.

- Oberai, A.S. and H.K.Manmohan Singh. 1983. Causes and Consequences of Internal Migration: A Study of Indian Punjab. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

- Oberai, A.S., Pradhan H.Prasad and M.G.Sardana. 1989. Determinants and Consequences of Internal Migration in India: Studies in Bihar, Kerala and Uttar Pradesh. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

- Registrar General of India. (1988): Report of the Expert Committee on Population Projections, Occasional Paper No. 4 of 1988.

- Skeldon, Ronald. 1986. “On Migration Patterns in India during the 1970s.” Population and Development Review. Vol.12, No.4.

- Visaria, Pravin. 1997: Urbanisation in India, in Gavin Jones and Pravin Visaria edited Urbanisation in large developing countries – China, Indonesia, Brazil and India, Clarendon Press. Oxford