Migration and Settlement Pattern in a Middle Income Urban Milieu

N. Ganeshan

Department of Sociology, Pondicherry University, Pondicherry 605 014, India
Telephone: +91-9443956629, E-mail: nanjanganesh@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT The process of urbanization due to migration has several facets which is likely to have a considerable bearing on the migrants on their settlement pattern. The study aims to understand the process of migration and settlement pattern in a middle income urban area. The data for the present study is collected from 400 respondents forming about 4.8 per cent of the total households of middle income residential areas of Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India. The study is descriptive in nature and Chi-square test was used. In the study persons with rural backgrounds initially settle temporarily in the city and later live their entire lives in the settlements inhabited by persons of their own kind, without ever coming into contact with others of a different cultural background. To sum the migrants are shaping the culture of the city as much as they are adjusting to it.

INTRODUCTION

There is an undeniable fact which shows that rural-urban migration was on the rise which led to unique urbanization trends. Urbanization is inevitable and is generally associated with rural underdevelopment and migration. Sustained economic growth and higher urban wages are providing a new impetus to urbanization in India. According to Chakravorty (2009), "People move for work and/or for higher income…… Urban work is more productive than rural work, and as a result, urban wages are higher. Whether one has a college degree or a primary school education, an equally skilled individual will almost certainly earn more in urban settings by working in a factory, office, shop – or even the informal or shadow economy – than in a village." The urban population growth is due to rural to urban migration, natural increase of urban population, status change of settlements (reclassification and declassification) and jurisdictional changes in the boundary of urban centres. A large proportion of the urban population tends to concentrate in big cities which have become the fastest growing urban settlements. Even in the less urbanized states, large cities and metropolitan areas have recorded a much higher rate of increase. Dominance of industry, commerce and administrative services in the occupational structure are characteristics associated with these trends in large cities. Since the last census in 2001, the 28 percent urban Indian population (285 million) has continued to increase rapidly and is projected to reach 40 percent by year 2030. Chakrovarty (2009) specu-

lates, by that time, India's total population will be around 1.5 billion, and around six hundred million, more than twice as much as in 2001, will be living in cities, mostly in or around the larger metropolitan cities where there is employment growth and/or wage growth. The accelerated pace of urban and industrial development has brought a host of problems in towns and cities of the developing countries like inadequate urban infrastructure, changes in housing pattern, deteriorating environment etc. As a result, the problems of over-crowding and pressure on essential services have now reached crisis extent in these cities. Slums are proliferating and even the posh areas of these cities are experiencing pressures of population growth. This according to Mukherji (2001) has led to the acute urban involution, congestion, decay and proliferation of slums.

Migration is the process that expresses those basic changes that are transforming the world from a planet of villages into a planet of cities and metropolises. A more comprehensive definition by Mangalam (1968) adds temporal, social and process dimensions to the concept; "Migration is a permanent moving away of a collectivity, called migrants from one geographical location to another preceded by decision making on the part of the migrants on the basis of a hierarchical ordered set of values and valued ends and resulting in changes in the interactional system of the migrants". UNESCO (2009) provides a more structured definition of migration crossing boundaries and communities; "the crossing of the boundary of a political or administrative unit for a certain minimum

period of time. It includes the movement of refugees, displaced persons, uprooted people as well as economic migrants. Internal migration refers to a move from one area (a province, district or municipality) to another within one country". Migration is also viewed as an early form of Globalization, a latent shaper of characteristics of people and places, labour markets and economic development (King 2008). Increasing pressure on agricultural land, poverty and low level of social and economic development, has been pushing the poor and unskilled in rural areas to urban areas. Migrants to urban areas, particularly to large cities, account for more than half the urban population, and an annual growth rate of 4-5 percent in many cities (Breman 1985; Rao 1994; Breman 1996; Rogaly et al. 2001).

According to Deshingkar (2005), countries such as India are experiencing high levels of internal migration. Internal migration in India in terms of number has doubled from 1971 to 2001; from 159 million to 309 million persons (Lusome and Bhagat 2006). Census data is however, unable to capture different kinds of migration activities (Sheng 2002). Kundu's (2003) analysis of NSSO and Census data found a falling rate of migration in India, only because this data did not incorporate all kinds of migration, especially temporary migration. Nearly two-thirds (63 percent) migrated for employment reasons from rural to urban areas as compared to just 48 percent in case of rural to rural migration (Singh 2009). Deshingkar (2008) noted a high level of temporary migration, increase in rural-urban migration caused by new push and pull factors; and a higher propensity to migrate among certain castes; for example, Dayal and Karan (2003, cited in Deshingkar 2008) found that in Jharkhand while 15 percent of scheduled castes and scheduled tribes migrated, only 8 percent of upper castes and other backward classes did so. Further, Bhattacharya (2000, cited in Waddington and Wheeler 2003), found that states with higher proportion of scheduled tribes demonstrated higher rates of rural-rural migration attributed to their greater comfort levels and confidence in being within known areas/regions. Further, Deshingkar (2008) found evidence of the increasing circular labour migration in India; where poor people from low productivity regions moved seasonally both within the state and outside for work and wages. A new and emerging trend in migration according to Deshigkar (2005) is 'accumulative

migration'; that is, where migrants migrate less out of necessity and more due to aspirations and need for additional income and that people continue to migrate much after the distress reasons are no longer relevant. The future of migration trends in India is therefore as much framed by strong push factors as from stronger pull factors for India's poor emerging from economic growth and globalization.

In India, migrants do move from one city to another, but many of them move from rural areas into urban. A sizeable section of the population in an industrial metropolis is composed of migrants both from rural and urban. The migrants are a special case as they undergo the entire process of migration, in contrast to the natives of the city. This process has several facets such as their reasons for migration, contacts with their native places, pulls of the hinterland, their decision about settling permanently in the city and so on. All of these aspects are likely to have considerable bearing on their urban settlement and their ultimate assimilation with and adjustment to the city environment. Besides migration, many urban centres also have large floating populations, that do not fit into the conventional definition of migrants, but who contribute to a city's economy, utilize its resources and add to the infrastructure stress. It is also assumed that perceptions of relative deprivation towards urban settlers may increase migration propensities and settlement pattern (Czaika 2011). Therefore, the paper attempts to comprehend the process of migration so far as it affects the settlement pattern in the urban centres. The selective dimensions of migration taken up for the study include the nativity of migrants, their place of birth, place of emigration, earlier urban exposure and reasons for migration. The analysis also includes the 'resource-person' phenomenon, migrant's frequency and nature of contacts with the hinterland and their disposition or plan to settle in the city. Thus, an analysis and measurement of migration and settlement pattern in urban areas would be a useful indicator of a community's potentialities, its structural weakness and strength as also its general preparedness for development and growth of cities.

DATA AND METHODS

The present paper utilizes the data from a larger study on "Housing and Neighbourhood

Relationships in a Middle Income Urban Milieu" conducted in 2008. The study has been carried out in the city of Coimbatore, the Manchester of South India, an industrial city, and a commercial entrepot. It is the third largest city in Tamil Nadu after Chennai and Madurai. In all, 400 respondents have been interviewed forming about 4.8 per cent of the total households from middle income residential areas. While purposive sampling was resorted to in the selection of the neighbourhoods, the sample of households was drawn up through random sampling method. The schedule consisted of questions on personal data about respondents, socio-economic status, housing and other civic facilities available, migratory status, leisure-time activities, residential information, neighbourhood relationships, formal and informal participation, neighbourhood preference and neighbourhood perception in terms of responsibility, quality and safety. Most of the questions in the schedule were structured though a few questions were also open-ended. The overall methodological orientation of this study is descriptive in nature while it tests causal relationships (Chi-square test) to establish associational relationships between the variables. The entire data processing was done using SPSS.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Profile of the Respondents

The observations from Table 1 shows that the respondents in the study sample are wide spread in all age groups ranging between 25 years and 72 years and the mean age of the respondents is 42.51. More than half of them are males and almost all respondents are married. Majority of them are Hindus and over half of them belong to Backward community. A greater proportion of respondents have Tamil as their mother tongue and nearly two thirds are graduates with at least fifteen years of education. Considerable proportions are Administrative Officials, clerks and businessmen. About one half have monthly family income ranging between Rs. 5001 to Rs. 10,000 and the mean family income is Rs. 9807.50 per month. Nearly three fifths live in nuclear families and the average family size is 3.84. Above half of the respondents have children below 18 years while two fifths have children above 18 years. Six out of

ten respondents live in own houses and a similar proportion are migrants to the city while more than two third of the respondents dwell in the same place for less than 20 years. A little over one half have some form of savings whereas one fourth are debted.

Migration and Settlement Pattern

Table 2 depicts that in the sample drawn up for this study, one third (33.75 percent) of the respondents are migrants leaving two thirds (66.25 percent) as native to the city proper. Among migrants 48.89 per cent are from villages while the remaining 51.11percent are from small or big towns or metropolises and from other country (Sri Lanka). This depicts that the migrants of the sample do not hail from similar background habitats. Though it is true that the majority come from rural areas, sizeable sections also originate from small towns as also from metropolises. With regard to place of birth, 57.78 percent migrants were born in village while others 42.22 percent born in small or big town or metropolis and other countries. The years of migration shows that 31.12 percent respondents have been migrated for up to 10 years while the remaining 68.82 percent have been migrated for more than 10 years and the mean years of migration is 18.10. The findings reveal that the bulk of the migrant population of the sample has a village or small town origin. It was noticed that in quite a few cases the native place and the place of birth of the respondent were not identical. One might belong to a place without necessarily being born there and vice-versa.

Among the migrants, 55.56 percent respondents have stayed in other places before migrating to Coimbatore while 44.44 percent respondents have directly migrated into Coimbatore. Among the respondents those who have stayed in other places before migrating to Coimbatore, 48.00 percent of the respondents have come from small towns while 46.67 percent from big cities or metropolises (Table 2). This depicts that some of them have drifted to other smaller or bigger towns before they migrated to Coimbatore. Various reasons for migration towards Coimbatore shows that more a majority (52.59 percent) have come to the city of Coimbatore on transfer , 31.11 percent migrants have come to city accompanied their parents or other family mem-

Table 1: Profile of the respondents (N-400)

Particulars	Number of respondents	Percentage
Age (in years)		
Up to 30	85	21.25
31-40	99	24.75
41-50	101	25.25
above 50	115	28.75
Mean	42.51	
S.D.	12.25	
Sex		
Male	222	55.50
Female	178	44.50
Marital Status		
Married	362	90.50
Widow/Widower	34	8.50
Separated	4	1.00
Religion		
Hindu	334	83.50
Non-Hindu	66	16.50
Caste		
OC	134	33.50
BC	224	56.00
SC/ST	29	7.25
No Response	13	3.25
Mother Tongue		
Tamil	282	70.50
Telugu	77	19.25
Malayalam	19	4.75
Kannada	7	1.75
Others	15	3.75
Educational Status (in years)		
Up to Middle School	23	5.75
High School	65	16.25
Higher Sec & Diploma	53	13.25
Graduates	146	36.50
Above graduation	113	28.25
Mean years of education	14.07	
S.D.	3.13	
Occupation		
Professionals	32	8.00
Administrative officials	146	36.50
Business	62	15.50
Clerk	115	28.75
Skilled or unskilled workers	26	6.50
Housewife	19	4.75
Family Income (in Rupees)		
Up to 5000	60	15.00
5001-10000	223	55.75
10001-15000	72	18.00
15001-20000	31	7.75
above 20000	14	3.50
Mean	9807.50	
S.D.	4600.64	
Type of Family		
Nuclear	292	73.00
Joint	108	27.00
Family Size		
Up to 3	150	37.50
4 to 5	229	57.25
above 5	21	5.25
Mean	3.84	
S.D.	0.96	

Table 1: Contd.....

Particulars	Number of respondents	Percentage
Presence of Children Below 18 Years (N=226)		
One	143	63.27
Two	74	32.75
Three	9	3.98
Mean	1.41	
S.D.	0.57	
Presence of Children Above 18 Years (N=169)		
One	68	40.24
Two	69	40.83
Three	14	8.28
Four	11	6.51
Five	7	4.14
Mean	1.94	
S.D.	1.06	
Nature of House		
Own	243	60.75
Rented	157	39.25
Migratory Status		
Natives	265	66.25
Migrants	135	33.75
Length of Residence (in years)		
Up to 10	184	46.00
11 - 20	99	24.75
21 - 30	72	18.00
above 30	45	11.25
Mean	16.26	
S.D.	13.17	
Savings(in rupees) (N = 224)		
Up to 50000	167	74.55
50001 to 10000	48	21.43
Above 100000	9	4.02
Mean	59129.46	
S.D.	69995.31	
Debts(in rupees) (N = 102)		
Up to 50000	63	61.76
50001 to 100000	13	12.75
Above 100000	26	25.49
Mean	149843.14	
S.D.	249277.99	

bers to have a better life, 11.85 percent for reasons of livelihood (job and business), a pure and simple economic reason and 4.44 percent migrants have come to the city for the purpose of settling down in city - a factor showing their positive attitude towards city life. To summarize it can be said that while 47.41 percent have somewhat voluntarily opted for their metropolitan residence, the rest 52.59 percent could not exercise such a voluntary option and were rather forced to the metropolis. The migrant's years of staying in Coimbatore shows that nearly half of the migrants (49.63 percent) have been staying for up to 10 years while remaining 50.73 have been staying in Coimbatore for more than 10 years and the mean years of staying in Coim-

Table 2: Migratory status and settlement (N – 400)

Migratory status and settlement	Number of respondents	Percentage
Migration		
Natives	265	66.25
Migrants	135	33.75
Native Place		
Village	66	48.89
Town	59	43.70
Metropolis	6	4.45
Other country	4	2.96
Place of Birth		
Village	78	57.78
Town	49	36.30
Metropolis	4	2.96
Other country	4	2.96
Years of Migration		
Up to 10	42	31.11
11-20	43	31.85
21-30	30	22.22
Above 30	20	14.82
Mean	18.10	
S.D.	14.23	
Place of Previous Out-migration		
Village	4	5.33
Town	36	48.00
Metropolis	35	46.67
Reason for Migration		
Family matters	42	31.11
Transfer	71	52.59
Livelihood	16	11.85
Settle down	6	4.5
Length of Stay in Coimbatore (in years)		
Up to 10	67	49.63
11-20	32	23.70
21-30	26	19.26
Above 30	10	7.41
Mean	15.24	
S.D.	11.87	
Kin Living in Native Place		
None	10	7.41
Parents	32	23.70
Relatives	37	27.41
Parents-in-law	19	14.07
Siblings	18	13.34
Parents and in-laws	6	4.45
Parents and siblings	4	2.96
Parents and relatives	3	2.22
Relatives and siblings	3	2.22
Parents, siblings and in-laws	3	2.22
Frequency of Visit to Native Place		
Never	10	7.41
Once in a year	31	22.96
2 to 3 times in a year	41	30.37
More than thrice in a year	53	39.26
Reasons for Visiting Native (N=125)		
Family functions and ceremonies	110	88.00
Looking after property	9	7.20
Holidaying only	6	4.80
Willingness to Settle		
No	71	17.75
Not definite	94	23.50
Yes	235	58.75

Table 2: Contd.....

Migratory status and settlement	Number of respondents	Percentage
Reasons for Settling		
Own or family members job	97	41.28
Property	18	7.66
Facilities and opportunities	19	8.08
Emotional and social life	76	32.34
Nearer to native place	8	3.40
No other alternatives	17	7.24

batore is 15.24. This depicts that the major forces behind migration towards the urban centres in the developing societies lie in the rural areas which push a large part of the rural population to cities. Unable to earn proper livelihood on the farms and in the villages, the migrants are not so much attracted by urban opportunities as they are expelled by rural poverty and economic insecurity that have resulted from fragmentation of land-holdings, inefficient land-use and the vagaries of nature. This is in sharp contrast to the history where migrants are drawn to cities by the pull of an expanding commercial and manufacturing economy.

The phenomenon of resource person is significant as it epitomizes a manifestation of rural-urban link. Contrary to general belief, the migrants to cities do not land in a vacuum but have an institutionalized mechanism, however undefined and informal it may be. Kinship and friendship channels do provide an underpinning for this mechanism. While 50.37 percent migrant respondents did not mention any one who acted as a resource person, the rest 49.63 percent mentioned someone who had been responsible for as well as helpful in their coming to the metropolis (not shown in table). Of these the largest number is of those who were helped by friends, forming 22.96 percent of the total while for 24.44 percent relatives have helped to settle down in the city (not shown in table). The pioneers move first and settle down in the city and friends, relatives and neighbours follow, finding support for work and location, as well as a powerful mechanism for adjustment to the new situation.

It is generally asserted that the roots of rural migrants lie in villages and they maintain close and continuous links with their native village by visiting it quite frequently. The table 2 shows that 23.70 percent migrant's parent and 27.41 percent migrant's relatives live in their native place while for 7.41 percent migrants none of

them were living in their native place and hence have no links. The break-up of migrants by their frequency of visiting their native places suggest that while 7.41 percent migrants have virtually no contacts with their native place, 39.26 percent migrants have more frequent contacts with their kin in native place, visiting at least once a month or even more. The figures suggest a strong homeward orientation resulting in frequent visits to native villages in 69.63 percent of cases. This shows that close and continuous extra-town links are significant as they may construct motivational or emotive barriers in the migrant's urban s pattern.

The reason for the migrant's visit to his native place reveals that visiting family members and attending their family functions and ceremonies are the most important reasons accounting for 88.00 per cent (Table 2). With regard to their plans for settling down in the city, it clear that a majority of respondents (58.75 percent) has either already settled permanently in Coimbatore or has been thinking in terms of settling down permanently while 41.25 percent is not reconciled fully to the idea of making the city of Coimbatore their permanent home. This depicts that there are persons who want to have the best of both the worlds i.e., links with the hinterland as well as city-living.

Co-associates of Migration and Settlement Pattern

The cross-tabulation and the application of the chi-square test of significance throw some light on the mechanism of settlement in the city and its co-associates. Table 3 reveals that settling in Coimbatore city is positively and significantly associated with age, religion, education, length of stay, migratory status, family size and nature of house. The general trend that could be assessed from the analysis is that the respondents who have opted for settling permanently in the city are generally older respondents. However, the fact that a large proportion of the respondents who are interested to migrate are in the working age group of 15-25 years, is in conformity with other studies (Majumdar and Nagaraj 1983). Hindus, those with higher education, middle class, ownership of house, smaller in family size, natives and those who have stayed in the city for quite some time are significantly associated with attitude to settle down. The magnitude of extra-town emotive ties among

migrants has a significant bearing on their urban settlement pattern by explaining the weaker attachment to, and the lesser involvement with neighbours and the city life. Further owning immovable property in the city and planning or deciding to settle permanently in the city are the two important indicators of an urban resident's favourable disposition towards the city and its environment. This explains that though the life of the city is difficult, problematic and couched in uncertainties, economic and emotional factors contribute effectively in motivating the migrants to acquiesce in their destiny in the metropolis.

Much of the earlier literature on migration has been preoccupied with 'development induced' economic migration resulting from unequal development trajectories leading to one-way movement from poorer to richer areas through the 'push' created by poverty and a lack of work and the 'pull' created by better wages in the destination (McDowell and De Haan 1997; Kothari 2002) which is also substantiated by the present study. The question whether migration can reduce poverty has not been clearly established in the literature which provides scope for further research. For instance, Chakrapani and Vijaya Kumar's study of Palamur labour (1994) notes an increase in migrants' incomes. Haberfeld et al. (1999) found households sending migrants from Dungarpur to have higher income levels than those not sending migrants. On the other hand, Kothari's (2002) review of migration studies finds that migration can both reduce and perpetuate poverty. Qualitative information from the study indicates better living condition on migration and settlement though they express inclination to move further.

The main problems that the city has been experiencing are rapid population growth, area expansion, unplanned growth and lack of adequate infrastructure and services to meet the demands of the city's functional specialization in terms of trade, industry (Sastry 2008). Management of problems arising on account of heavy demand on the already congested roads is best summarized by Sastry (2008) that he states "The immediate ramifications of such unplanned process has been that the city has no well planned access roads to several peripheral residential layouts developed by the BDA which can carry huge traffic generated between the city center and it's so called planned residential layouts.

Table 3: Migration and settlement pattern by structural variables (N-400)

Structure variables	Settlement			χ^2
	Yes	Not Definite	No	
Age (in years)				
Up to 30	38	24	23	33.10***
31-40	47	29	23	
41-50	62	19	20	
above 50	88	22	5	
Education				
Up to higher secondary	40	29	19	11.86**
Graduates	120	40	39	
Above graduation	75	25	13	
Occupation				
Professionals	19	8	5	13.47
Administrative officials	94	33	19	
Business executives	31	16	15	
Clerks	60	27	28	
Skilled workers	20	5	1	
Housewife	11	5	3	
Total Income (in Rupees)				
Up to 5000	29	20	11	12.00
5001-10000	129	51	43	
10001-15000	45	14	13	
15001-20000	25	5	1	
above 20000	7	4	3	
Religion				
Hindus	210	69	55	14.69***
Non-Hindus	25	25	16	
Size of Family				
Up to 4	171	89	63	24.28***
Above 4	64	5	8	
Type of Family				
Nuclear	165	70	57	2.94
Joint	70	24	14	
Nature of House				
Own	231	12	-	339.61***
Rented	4	82	71	
Migratory Status				
Natives	181	49	35	29.71***
Migrants	54	45	36	
Length of Stay (in years)				
Natives	181	49	35	78.52***
Up to 20	22	42	35	
Above 20	32	3	1	

**Significant at 0.05 level   ***Significant at 0.01 level

This has ultimately resulted in frequent traffic jams, accidents etc., which in turn has led to instant transport management approach like conversion of several narrow roads as one-ways, widening of narrow roads etc. All these problems are mainly due to lack of a well-conceived vision plan for the city prepared well in advance to absorb all future rapid urbanization shocks".

CONCLUSION

The overall analysis of migration and settlement pattern in the study indicates that roughly one-third of respondents are born outside the city and overwhelming majority is from the rural hinterland around the city of Coimbatore and within the State. The lack of occupational and educational opportunities in the hinterland accounts for most of the movements. The migrants do experience a certain amount of deprivation and dissatisfaction, but they progressively adapt and enculturate themselves to their new surroundings. The fact that they were drawn to the city primarily due to economic advantages does not mean that their motivations in subsequent behaviour are necessarily or primarily economic in nature.

The study also emphasizes that the migrants also invest themselves emotionally into the urban surroundings which result in a certain kind and level of social interaction which may not be very different from those residents who belong to the city proper. The difference between the migrants and the city-born are not completely obliterated. Many persons with rural backgrounds initially settle temporarily in the city and later live their entire lives in the settlements inhabited by persons of their own kind, without ever coming into contact with others of a different cultural background. They do not identify themselves with the city as a community, lack civic consciousness and continue to orient psychologically and culturally toward their home village and their own kinship or caste group. The network of personal associations, informal ties and voluntary associations that they develop in the process of their urban living imperceptibly weakens the foundations of homeward orientation.

To sum the migrants are shaping the culture of the city as much as they are adjusting to it. In view of the findings it is observed that the migrants initially have some difficulty in settling down and face issues regarding security, support, recreation, information and services. It is important that some service agencies / local level associations can provide the needed support and also engage them in the social activities of the residential area.

REFERENCES

Breman J 1985. *Of Peasants, Migrants, and Paupers.* Delhi: Oxford University Press.
Breman J 1996. *Footloose Labour: Working in the Indian Informal Economy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Census of India 2001. From <http://www. censusindia.gov. in/Census_Data_2001/Census_Data_Online/Online_ Migration.html> (Retrieved on 20 February, 2011).

Chakrapani C, Vijaya Kumar S 1994. Migration pattern and occupational change (A study of Palamur labour in Andhra Pradesh. *The Indian Journal of Social Work,* 55(1): 83–94.

Chakrovarty S 2009. India's Urban Future: It's Time to Pay Attention. From <http://casi.ssc.upenn.edu/iit/ chakravorty> (Retrieved on 20 February, 2011).

Czaika M 2011. Migration and Social Fractionalization: Double Deprivation as a Behavioural Link, *IMI Working Paper 36 (DEMIG Project Paper 6).* University of Oxford: International Migration Institute.

Deshingkar P 2005. Maximizing the benefits of internal migration for development. In: F Laczko (Ed.): *Migration and Poverty Reduction in Asia, International Organisation for Development.* Department for International Development (UK) and Ministry of Foreign Affairs, People's Republic of China, pp. 21-63.

Deshingkar P 2008. Circular internal migration and development in India. In: Josh De Wind, Jennifer Holdaway (Eds.): *Migration and Development Within and Across Borders.* Research and Policy Perspectives on Internal and International Migration. Geneva: International Organization for Migration, pp. 163-190.

Haberfeld Y, Menaria RK, Sahoo BB, Vyas RN 1999. Seasonal migration of rural labour in India. *Population Research and Policy Review,* 18(4): 73–78.

King R 2008. *Theories and Typologies of Migration, MA in Migration Studies Course Introduction.* Brighton, United Kingdom: University of Sussex.

Kothari U 2002. Migration and Chronic Poverty*, Working Paper 16.* Manchester, Chronic Poverty Research Centre, Institute for Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester.

Kundu A 2003. Urbanisation and urban governance: Search for a perspective beyond neoliberalism. *Economic and Political Weekly*, July 19, XXXVIII (29): 3079–3087.

Lusome R, Bhagat RB 2006. Trends and Patterns of Internal Migration in India, 1971 -2001. *Paper presented at the Annual Conference of Indian Association for the study of Population,* 7-9th June 2006, Thiruvanathapuram.

Majumdar S, Nagaraj K 1983. Process of Migration-An analysis of simple migrants in Madras Urban Agglomeration. *Working Paper 33*. Madras Institute of Development studies, Madras.

Mangalam JJ 1968. *Human Migration: A Guide to Migration Literature in English 1955-1962.* Lexington: University of Kentucky Press.

Mc Dowell C, De Haan A 1997. Migration and Sustainable Livelihoods: A Critical Review of the Literature. *IDS Working Paper 65*. Institute of Development Studies, Brighton: University of Sussex.

Mukherji S 2001. Low quality migration in India: The Phenomena of Distressed Migration and Acute Urban Decay. *The 24th IUSSP Conference, Salvador, Brazil, Session 80: Internal Migration – Social Processes and National Patterns.* 18-24 August.

Rogaly B, Biswas J, Coppard D, Rafique A, Rana K, Sengupta A 2001. Seasonal migration, social change and migrants rights, lessons from West Bengal. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 8 December: 36: 4547–4559.

Sastry GS 2008. Emerging Development Issues of Greater Bengaluru. *ISEC Working Paper 194*, Bengaluru.

Sheng KY 2002. Urbanisation and Internal Migration. *Asian Population Studies Series 158,* Fifth Asian and Pacific Population Conference – Selected Papers, United Nations.

Singh DP 2009. Poverty and Migration: Does Moving Help? *India Urban Poverty Report 2009*, Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation Government of India, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

UNESCO 2009. Migration Social Transformation Themes From <http://portal.unesco.org/shs/en/ev.php-URL_ ID=3020&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION= 201.html> (Retrieved on 20 February, 2011).

Waddington H, Wheeler RS 2003. How Does Poverty Affect Migration Choice? A Review of Literature. *Working Paper T3 Development Research Centre on Migration, Globalisation and Poverty*. University of Sussex, Brighton, United Kingdom.