

International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology

(An ISO 3297: 2007 Certified Organization)

Vol. 4, Issue 12, December 2015

Reasons for Migration of Population to Rural Areas

Dr. Ashok Kumar

Department of Economics, Government Degree College, Devprayag, India

ABSTRACT: Contemporary research on in-migration to rural areas – simply put, people moving from the city to the country - suggests that the demand is increasing and largely motivated by opportunities created by ecosystem services. This is particularly relevant since it represents an important shift from previous patterns of out-migration of rural communities, with consequent abandonment of natural and cultural values. Rural areas that witness the arrival of skilled in-migration movements have experienced the emergence of new types and forms of social interaction and organization, new forms of socio-ecological systems (SES) relationships, and potential opportunities to create value thanks to the inflow of new ideas, knowledge and skills. Results show that skilled in-migrants change their lifestyle and the relationship they establish with the ecological system. They have been promoting new products (e.g., touristic experiences and organic agriculture), interaction among the members of the community through cultural events, and new services, such as new schools and local associations. They are also responsible for an increasing diversity of activities and products in rural areas that contribute to new dynamics in local businesses, and its marketing in external local networks. These networks contribute to the reinforcement of synergies in urban-rural spaces establishing new relationships and dynamics, like an increase of urban visitors to rural communities, through new demands on rural initiatives, or through new services, like the direct delivery of fresh agricultural products to urban dwellers.

KEYWORDS: rural, urban, migration, community, visitors, socio-ecological, interaction, dwellers

I. INTRODUCTION

The global population is concentrating unprecedentedly into urban areas, raising concerns on global sustainability and human well-being.[1,2] There also exists a niche trend of migration from urban to rural areas particularly in countries with post-industrial economies. In addition to these common values, households with different demographic characteristics had different priorities: employment for singles in ages between 16 and 29; favorable environment for raising children for married couples in their 30s and 40s; not specific or 'lifestyle' for migrants in 50s; and staying with or near family for retirees over 60 years. Knowledge of heterogeneity in migrants and of their values, as described herein, will enable targeted policies and public services concerning migration. Conversely, there has been a relatively small but steady number of people who move from urban to rural areas in search of higher quality of life, particularly in countries with post-industrial economies. Geographers and demographers express this trend using different terms with slightly different connotations, such as counterurbanization, exurbanization or rural rebound, lifestyle migration, amenity migration or back-to-the-landers, referring to the traits and objectives of such migrants. [3,4]Counterurbanization explains spatial changes in settlements and associated migration patterns, particularly from urban centers towards their peripheries or more distant rural areas. Amenity migration specifies that a high quality living environment in rural areas 'pulls' migrants from urban areas, while lifestyle migrants, through migration, aim to enrich their lifestyle and redefine their identities. A lifestyle of spending holidays and life after retirement in such areas has become popular among urban residents, in which ownership of a rural second home is seen as a status symbol. Many even retired earlier to start up rural hotel businesses.[5,6] With migrant values orientated toward natural amenities, urban-to-rural migration in this period can be interpreted as amenity migration

After the bursting of the bubble economy in the mid-1990s, the national government and prefectures began focused policy efforts to promote migration. These included providing assistance to migrants to take up rural farming jobs, and from the 2000s, a series of exchange programs to expose urban youth to rural life and a rural revitalization staffing

International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology

(An ISO 3297: 2007 Certified Organization)

Vol. 4, Issue 12, December 2015

program to create an impetus for urban youth to move to rural areas.[7,8] In general, jobs, housing and local community relations in the destinations are the three major hurdles that prospective migrants need to overcome to realize their migration plans. It is thus pertinent to understand the current urban-to-rural migration trend from a lifestyle migration perspective. However, little research has examined urban-to-rural migration in and after the 1990s in Japan in the context of lifestyle migration or lifestyle change. Given common lifestyle changes alongside major life events such as recruitment, marriage and retirement, as well as other motivations such as the preference for a rural life surrounded by rich natural amenities, it has become pertinent to more comprehensively understand the motivations driving migration and individual lifestyle values underlying such motivations.[9,10]

Migration from metropolitan to non-metropolitan areas has become an area of emerging interest for geographers. In recent times research has been directed towards ex-urban migration to coastal communities and increasingly rural localities. Housing affordability and stress literatures have focused extensively on metropolitan spaces, excluding the range of consequences that small changes in housing markets can have on existing residents in rural or non-metropolitan places.[11,12]

II. DISCUSSION

Migration is part of the process of development. As economies undergo structural transformation, the movement of people in search of better employment opportunities within and across countries is inevitable. Agriculture and rural development can address the root causes of migration, including rural poverty, food insecurity, inequality, unemployment, lack of social protection as well as natural resource depletion due to environmental degradation and climate change. Investing in sustainable rural development, climate change adaptation and resilient rural livelihoods is an important part of the global response to the current migration challenge.[13]

This microanalysis examines three main areas of concern : experiences of previous urban activity and the migration process; the main characteristics of the new businesses and their relationship with the local community; and socio-economic characteristics. The results demonstrate a stronger presence of urban-rural migrants in rural tourism activities, compared to other activities included in rural development programmes. The main reason for the urban-rural migration is the desire to be self-employed, although there are also a number of other secondary motives.

People's motivations to migrate from cities have been widely studied. However, little or no empirical study captures a clear picture concerning urban-rural migration following the enactment of Kenya's devolution policy.[14,15] Data concerning the differences in decision-making across demographic profiles when urban-rural migration occurs is equally scarce. In this study, there is a detailed look into the reasons for urban-rural migration, particularly from Nairobi city to rural or less urbanised places, emphasising the backdrop of opportunities or expectations across various demographic profiles and implications they carry forward in regard to income and occupational change. The research assesses these attributes in the Kenyan setup under the devolved system of governance. The study objectives are twofold 1) to estimate the probability and significance of income change upon urban-rural migration, 2) to assess the probability of occupational change upon migration to the rural area. Conclusions are made on the hypotheses results as well as way forward. To successfully assess the phenomenon, the research formulates two hypotheses; 1. H01: Significant probability for income change does not varies across different socio-economic attributes and demographic status; 2. H02: Significant probability for occupational change among returned migrants are not determined by low education level, female gender, the old age, huge rural land size, and low migrant's job-related expertise level. These hypotheses were tested using a probit regression model on the obtained 69 adult participants in the Republic of Kenya. The study first familiarises the reader with concepts and theories of urban-rural migration in literature review. It proceeds to test the collected data about the changes in income and occupation from the selected study sample. The study scope is the period after the implementation of the devolution policy in Kenya.[16,17]

Urban-rural migration can conceivably be viewed from the perspective of Ravenstein laws of migration. Ravenstein postulates that distance and volume of migration have inverse relationships. The theorist asserts that every existing migration tendency tends to have a counter-current one. Therefore, as people flock in cities, some go back to the rural

International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology

(An ISO 3297: 2007 Certified Organization)

Vol. 4, Issue 12, December 2015

areas. The theory suggests that migration is economical, as people move from agricultural to industrial and commercial areas. This assertion is consistent with the dual-sector migration model, which characterises migration in emerging economies like Kenya. The theory equally perceives that local migration is dominated by females migrating while males tend to migrate internationally. Notably, the theory introduces a new variable in the concept of migration. In particular, the theory points out wages and gender in the concept of migration.[18,19]

The study revealed that the main reasons in Japan that why I-turners moved to the rural areas are; preference to quiet and relaxed rural life (51.1%), to be engaged in agriculture (31.9%), and strong desire to raise kids in the rural environment (29.8%). The economic situation of the I-turners was not favourable as most of them earned a lower income after moving away from the cities. They also have to cope with decreased savings. Majority of them indicated that their expenditure was higher in the city compared to that in the village. At the same time, I-turners were also helped by the villagers in a variety of ways. The negative effect of unfavourable economic condition was offset partly by material assistance and moral support from neighbors, along with lower cost of living in rural areas. Meanwhile, some I-turners also experienced negative aspects of village life, such as the closed nature of village leadership and obligation to take part in communal work. Despite a harsh economic condition and other inconveniences, however, many I-turners expressed their contentment with village life due to various benefits they received from the other villagers, fellow I-turners as well as from natural environment. Thus sustainability of I-turners' livelihood is not only dependent on their financial bases, but also on their social relationships with the original villagers as well as a pastoral landscape, which has been maintained by farming practice of rural residents.[20,21]

III. RESULTS

In developed countries, along with urbanization, the opposite process - ruralization or deurbanization - is becoming increasingly noticeable. Ruralization is not only the movement of townspeople to the countryside, but also the development of villages and the increasing importance of rural areas as a place to live and work. Townspeople make the decision to move by comparing the advantages and disadvantages of living in urban and rural areas, and non-economic motives[34,35] (the desire to get closer to nature, to find one's roots, to live in silence, without haste, to eat natural products, etc.) play an important role in this decision. Among economic motives, the difference in the cost of urban and rural real estate and of life in general is the most important motive, i.e., families, especially young and large, can improve their living conditions by moving to the countryside. The study, aimed at identifying those groups of townspeople that tend to resettlement, their motives, and factors pushing people to leave cities and facilitating/hindering resettlement to rural areas. The research is based on the study of special literature on the topic and on the data of the survey of resettled townspeople and experts in ruralization.[22,23] Unlike most publications on ruralization, the author focuses on the positive aspects of the resettlement of townspeople to the countryside and insists on the removal of administrative barriers that prevent ruralization, because the resettlement of townspeople to the countryside does not have a negative impact on the city and is compensated by the influx of people from the countryside, [33]who want to get education or a new profession.

There has always been variation within the rural, including variation in how people with different movements relates to the same place. In some areas, farmers form concentrated settlements and leave every morning to travel to their fields; in other areas, they live close to their respective fields and are thus more spread out. Farmers coexist with groups who move with their animals during the year, sometimes to exploit the change of the seasons, sometimes simply because they were not able to afford enough land close together For shepherds the term "village" has a different meaning than it has for farmers, and both are very different from that ascribed to it by the owner of a secondhome. The rural is not just a site of variation but has always also been a site of conscious political intervention: The colonisation of land by peasants has a long history as part of political projects. The creation of artificial villages has a history in colonial times; they were also adopted by various African Governments, in the 1970s and 1980s and they are part of land reforms in other contexts.[24,25]

Conflict between the people who live off the land and the wild can come in the form of droughts, avalanches, and diseases. They take on a special form if the wild is invested with outside valuation by conservationists, or tourists. This

International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology

(An ISO 3297: 2007 Certified Organization)

Vol. 4, Issue 12, December 2015

has a long history in Africa, for example, where the creation of national parks has excluded a range of uses by local populations. It is time to ruralize our thinking: [32]While it maybe true that the most remote places are connected to and through market forces, it is also true that we have never been urban in the way urbanists imagined us to be: informal social relations, the natural, the problem of food and livelihoods, the need, complex dependencies that nevertheless enable survival. Dimensions of the rural enter more and more spaces and they enter in unlikely places - as capital leaves Western cities, for example, new forms of informality take over. As public sector cuts hit in European economies, connecting infrastructure is lost.[26,27]

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Rather than dismiss either the urban or the rural as ideology, I suggested that the way forward is to distinguish dimensions formerly associated with the urban and the rural from the perspective of the rural and use these to explore variations among forms of settlement. Only based on a distinction between the dimensions of the urban and the rural can we see how they are recombined as properties of solidarities, places, governance and livelihoods.[28,29] The study of forms of settlement from the perspective of ruralization begins with better description but it need not be descriptive and atheoretical. But as we link the description of places to theory, the relationship of specific forms of settlement to capitalist development - or processes of differentiation or other hypothesis about social and institutional change for that matter - needs to be examined rather than assumed.[30,31]

REFERENCES

- 1) Bauer Gerard and Roux Jean-Michel. 1976. La rurbanization ou la ville éparpillée. Paris: Edition du Seuil.
- 2) Bausinger, Herman. 1990 , Folk Culture in a World of Technology. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- 3) Berry, Brian. 1980. "Urbanization and Counterurbanization in the United States." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 451/1: 13-20.
- 4) Bloch, Ernst. 1962, Erbschaft unserer Zeit. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- 5) Braudel, Fernand. 1992, Civilization and Capitalism, 15th–18th Centuries. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 6) Brenner, Neil 2012. Theses on Urbanization. Public Culture 24/3
- 7) Brenner, Neil and Christian Schmid. 2012. "Planetary urbanization," in Matthew Gandy ed., Urban Constellations. Berlin: Jovis, pp. 10-14.
- 8) Bünz-Efferding, Anke and Wieland Efferding. 2002. Die Alpen-Sherpas. Geschichten vom Hüttentragen im Oberen Iseltal. Berlin: Haymond Verlag.
- 9) Cannon Lorgeb, Christy. 1999. The Experience of Villagisation: Lessons from Ethiopia, Mozambique, and Tanzania. London: Oxfam.
- 10) Carruthers, Jane. 1995. The Kruger National Park: a Social and Political History. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press.
- 11) Champion, Anthony G. (ed). 1989. Counterurbanization: the changing pace and nature of population deconcentration. London: Edward Arnold.
- 12) Champion, Anthony G., and Graeme Hugo. 2004. New forms of urbanization: beyond the urbanrural dichotomy. London: Ashgate.
- 13) Chekhovskik, Irina. 2005. "The Dacha Phenomenon", in Philip Oswalt (ed) Shrinking Cities, Volume 1, International Research. Ostfildern-Ruit: Hatje Cantz, pp. 494-497.
- 14) Creager, Angela .N.H, Elizabeth Lunbeck,. and M. Norton Wise. 2007. Science without laws: Model systems, cases,exemplary narratives. Chapel Hill: Duke University Press.
- 15) Dahly, Darren L., and Linda S. Adair. 2007. "Quantifying the urban environment: a scale measure of urbanicity outperforms the urban-rural dichotomy." Social science & medicine 64(7):1407–1419.
- 16) De Boeck, Filip, and Marie-Fraçoise Plissart. 2004. Kinshasa: tales of the invisible city. Ludion:
- 17) Royal Museum for Central Africa. Diener, Roger, Jacques Herzog, Marcel Meili, Pierre de Meuron, Christian Schmid (ed). 2006. Switzerland: an urban portrait. Basel: Birkhäuser.

International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology

(An ISO 3297: 2007 Certified Organization)

Vol. 4, Issue 12, December 2015

- 18) El Faïz, Mohamed. 2002. Marrakech: patrimoine en péril. Paris: Actes Sud. Ferrario, Viviana. 2009). "Agropolitana: Countryside and Urban Sprawl in the Veneto Region (Italy)" *Revija za geografijo - Journal for Geography*, 4-2, 129-142.
- 19) Fletcher, Roland. 1998. "African urbanism: scale, mobility and transformations." In Graham Connah (ed.) *Transformations in Africa: Essays on Africa's Later Past*, London: Leicester University Press: 104–38.
- 20) Frank, Charlotte. 2008. "Berlin Schwaben raus!" *Sueddeutsche Zeitung*, 23.12.2008, <http://www.sueddeutsche.de/panorama/berlin-schwaben-raus-1.374212>.
- 21) Frug, Gerald. 1996. "The Geography of Community." *Stanford Law Review*, 48(5): 1047-1108.
- 22) Gandy, Matthew. 2005. "Learning from Lagos." *New Left Review* 33:37–53.
- 23) Gans, Herbert J. 2009. "Some Problems of and Futures for Urban Sociology: Toward a Sociology of Settlements." *City & Community* 8(3):211–219.
- 24) Gieryn, Thomas F. 2006. "City as Truth-Spot: Laboratories and Field-Sites in Urban Studies." *Social Studies of Science* 36(1):5–38.
- 25) Guggenheim, Michael and Krause, Monika. 2012. "How Facts Travel. The Model Systems of Sociology." *Poetics* 40: 101-117.
- 26) Haldimann, Hans. 2008. *Bergauf Bergab*. Documentary. 101 min. Switzerland.
- 27) Halfacree, Keith. 2004. "Rethinking 'rurality'." In Anthony Champion, Graeme Hugo, and others. (ed) *New forms of urbanization: Beyond the urban-rural dichotomy*. London: Ashgate, pp. 285–304.
- 28) Halfacree, Keith. 2008. "To revitalise counterurbanization research? Recognising an international and fuller picture", *Population, Space and Place* 14(6):479–495.
- 29) Halfacree, Keith. 2012. "Diverse Ruralities in the 21st Century: From Effacement to (Re-) Invention." in László J. Kulcsár and Katherine J. Curtis (eds) *International Handbook of Rural Demography*. Springer: Dordrecht, pp. 387–400.
- 30) Hilgers, Mathieu. 2012. "Contribution à une anthropologie des villes secondaires" in *Cahiers d'Etudes africaines*, LII (1), 205, pp. 29-55.
- 31) Hocking, Sctott. 2005. *Scrappers*, in Philip Oswalt (ed) *Shrinking Cities*, Volume 1, International Research. Ostfildern-Ruit: Hatje Cantz, pp. 470-478.
- 32) Hogart, Keith, and Cristobal Mendoza. 1999. "African immigrant workers in Spanish agriculture." *Sociologia Ruralis* 39(4):538–562.
- 33) Howlett, Peter, and Mary S. Morgan. 2010. *How well do facts travel? The dissemination of reliable knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 34) Hugo, Graeme, Anothony Champion, and Alfredo Lattes. 2003. "Toward a new conceptualization of settlements for demography." *Population and Development Review* 29(2):277–297.
- 35) Jacobs, Jane. 1970. *The Economy of Cities*. New York: Random House.