Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology

40(6): 88-101, 2022; Article no.AJAEES.85628
ISSN: 2320-7027

Pattern and Implication of Youth Migration in the Garhwal Division of Uttarakhand, India

Kiran Rana [a*#] and Ajay Mamgain [a*≡]

[a] Department of Agricultural Communication, GBPUA&T, Pantnagar, Uttarakhand, India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/AJAEES/2022/v40i630907

Open Peer Review History:
This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/85628

Original Research Article

Received 26 January 2022
Accepted 02 April 2022
Published 06 April 2022

ABSTRACT

This study examines the youth migration patterns, driving forces, reasons, factors of migration and consequences of out-migration in the Garbwal division of Uttarakhand. Data were collected from both primary and secondary sources .The district Tehri Garbwal comprises of nine blocks out of them two blocks Chamba and Thauldhar were chosen. Four villages Kainchu, Jaspur, Kot and Bhainskoti were selected for the study. Sample of 120 respondents was selected through PPS method. We used both qualitative and quantitative approaches to conduct this study. Data was gathered from both primary and secondary sources. The findings of the study revealed that majority of the respondents (40.83%) belonged to 24-32 age groups, (73.33%) were men, 40.84 per cent had intermediate education, (67.50%) belonged to general category, 55.00% had medium family size, majority 40.00 per cent of the respondents were in service, 54.16% had moderate level of achievement motivation, 59.16 per cent had moderate mass media exposure, had less than 1 acre land holding (64.16%), 63.33 per cent had medium level of change proneness. Majority of the respondents (92.50%) had migrated for non – agricultural purpose, (53.33%) had migrated from village to nearby town, (81.66%) had up to 2 migrants in their family, and (69.16%) had medium term of migration (6 to 10 years). Majority of the respondents (64.16%) had high level of push factors of migration, majority of the respondents (59.16%) had medium level of pull factors of migration. The study concludes that the high rate of rural-urban migration is driven by the various forces such as poor socioeconomic conditions, climate, education, unemployment and overall

[#] Asst. Prof;
[≡] M.Sc. Student;
**Corresponding author: E-mail: kiranagricommunication@gmail.com, ajaymamgai7@gmail.com;*

lacking in infrastructural facilities. It was observed that rural-urban migration has several implications both in sending and receiving areas. Development of rural areas through implementing various innovative programmes may control rural-urban migration and develop Suitable strategy for reducing out-migration was suggested.

Keywords: Rural-youth migration; drivers; education; employment; garhwal division of Uttarakhand.

1. INTRODUCTION

Migration is a growing global phenomenon and most nations are simultaneously the countries of origin, transit and destination for migrants. Conflicts, violence and natural disasters are among the root causes of migration and forced displacement. Many migrants are compelled to move because of socio-economic factors, including poverty, food insecurity, lack of employment opportunities, limited access to social protection, natural resource depletion and the adverse impacts of environmental degradation and climate change. The word “migration” is derived from the Latin word “migrate”, which means to change one's residence. Migration has been broadly defined as a spatial shift or "movement by humans from one locality to another, sometimes over long distances and in large groups" [1-3]. UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) provides a more structured definition of migration as crossing boundaries and communities; the crossing of the boundary of a political or administrative unit for a certain minimum period of time. Migration is a process of movement of people from one region or country to another [4]. Migration from rural to urban areas has many adverse effects. Towns and cities in which the migrants settle face innumerable problems. There is the prolific growth of huge slums and shantytowns. These settlements and huge neighborhoods have no access to municipal services such as clean and running water, public services, electricity, and sewage system. There is an acute housing shortage. The city transport system is unable the meet the demand of the growing population. There are air and noise pollutions and increased crime and congestion. The costs of providing facilities are too high to be met, despite the best intentions of the local bodies. Besides, there is massive underemployment and unemployment in towns and cities [3,5]. Men and women are found selling bananas, groundnuts, balloons, and other cheap products on pavements and in streets. Many work as shoeshine's, parking helpers, porters, etc. Thus, urban migration increases the growth rate of job seekers relative to its population growth, thereby raising the urban supply of labour. On the demand side,there are not enough jobs available for the realities in the formal urban sector for the uneducated and unskilled rural migrants. Consequently, this rapid increase in labour supply and the lack of demand for such labour lead to chronic and increasing urban unemployment and underemployment. There are numerous causes of migration from rural to urban centers and vice versa or from one region to another. Migration is being attributed to push and pulls factors [5-8]. Whil6push factors are mostly repelling and compelling ones, the pull factors are largely the attracting ones. Notable among these are income maximization, social conflicts and social tension, gap in civilization culture law and order situation, inequalities in the available social and economic opportunities and other amenities of life between groups of people or sectors, inequitable distribution of benefits of economic development, social mobility and social status aspirations, residential satisfaction, friend and family influences, desire for attaining lifestyle, performance and enjoyment and development of some sort of complex (Yadav, 2018).

Global Employment Trends for Youth; International Labour Office [9] stated that across the globe, 1.2 billion people belong to the age group of 15-24 year. Out of these, 85 per cent (754 million) live in developing countries and approximately 60 per cent live in Asia alone. The number of youth living in developing countries is expected to reach 89.50 per cent by the year 2025 [10]. United Nations declared 2011 as the ‘International Year of Youth’. Currently, 148 million youth are illiterate and 75 million young people are unemployed. CIA World Factbook [11] stated that about 70 per cent of India's population is below the age of 35 years. Youth population in India is 460 million, out of which 333 million are literate and 127 million are illiterate. The unemployment rate is 10.60 per cent among youth. Youth in the rural India are often forced to work in their family farms, but they prefer joining the army or becoming engineers, teachers or nurses, doctors, found a survey released last week [12]. The importance of

agriculture to the socio- economic development of country can't be overemphasized. Despite this, unemployment is high among rural youth, who prefer to migrate to urban areas to take up low paying jobs [13]. The challenges of quality of life for young people in rural areas are the main cause of illicit behavior and difficulties, making it difficult for young people to work in rural areas of the country. On illicit behavior leading causes of namely alcohol and drugs, lack of money and lack of education, jobs, lack of knowledge about career possibilities, lack of skills, lack of parental guidance, and absence of role models and other mentors. The four main factors that were likely to result in hardships included inadequate access to the information, absence of community youth programs, inadequate health services, and lack of employment. Response by development stakeholders to young people's needs was also explored [14]. The key informants identified the development plans from a list that included sports, entrepreneurship, entertainment, HIV-AIDS awareness, and recreation. They also gave their prospects on whether there were sufficient programs for young people in rural communities. Additionally, the knowledge of youth development programs by the local, county, and national agents of development was also explored Jivetti et al. [15]. Uttarakhand the newly formed state is among the one of the few states where a large number of youth have always been the part of an active workforce. Statistically, it is found that almost 2094 thousand youths of 15-24 years of age are found in Uttarakhand [16]. More than three-fourths of Uttarakhand total population depends on agriculture for their livelihood and economy is predominantly dependent on mountain agriculture. However, the land holdings are small and fragmented, and irrigation facilities limited. More than 68 per cent of the farmers have land holdings less than a hectare (http:/agropedia.iitk.ac.in). The majority of the rural population in the hills either survives on subsistence agriculture or migrates to other parts of the country for employment. The state faces the challenge of promoting livelihood to retain people through local employment and income generation and to enhance their quality of life. Agri-based employment opportunities need to be encouraged and vocational training of youth for various agriculture related areas should be incorporated [17]. New opportunities are available through the multicropping systems combined with animal husbandry through cattle rearing, poultry, fishing, bee-keeping, organic farming, floriculture etc. The state comprises of a large number of youths who are gradually shifting towards the idea of self-employment in many agriculture enterprises and they need expertise. The role of training comes into action in order to provide expertise in the field of agriculture.

The Uttarakhand human development report [18] made an attempt to study and understand the origin of in-migrants into the state of Uttarakhand by enquiring about their place of birth. Inter-district migration as well as migration from Uttar Pradesh's Bijnaur, Bareilly, Mau, Pilibhit and Ballia districts has been reported. District wise data for place of origin of in-migrants reveals that basically inter-district migration is taking place. Also, what is interesting is that across the districts, a majority of in-migrants are from rural areas of the same district. Such migration has been the trend in recent years in Uttarakhand where people flock into areas like the district headquarters or nearby urban centers to access better quality education for their children as well as better health care facilities. As a result of such migration, many villages have turned into ghost villages or have been left with the old and the disabled, who are forced to engage in farming for their livelihoods [19]. The Survey questionnaire also probed interstate migration to find out about the states from which migrants have moved into Uttarakhand.

The states of Uttar Pradesh (42 percent), of which Uttarakhand was once a part prior to year 2000, Bihar (3 percent), Delhi and West Bengal (1 percent) are where the migrants from Uttarakhand are predominantly hailing from. There are settlers from Nepal (0.4 percent) and Bangladesh (1.3 percent) as well. Inter-district migration is predominant along with migration from Uttar Pradesh. Haridwar (65 percent), Udham Singh Nagar (56 percent), Nainital and Rudraprayag (42 percent), Champawat and Dehradun (38 percent) have a high proportion of migrants from Uttar Pradesh. Migrants from Bihar are settled mostly in Rudraprayag (10.5 percent), Dehradun (4.2 percent) and Udham Singh Nagar (3.5 percent). Migrants from Delhi are reported in Uttarkashi, Bageshwar and Champawat. The main motivation for inter-state migration into Uttarakhand could be business and trade. Cross-country migration into Uttarakhand is also reported in the UKHDR (2018) Survey. Nepalese migrants are reported predominantly in Bageshwar (7.5 percent), Champawat (4.8 percent), Chamoli (3.9 percent) and TehriGarhwal (3.3 percent). Porous borders and

Table 1. District wise migrants in last 10 years from gram panchayat in Uttarakhand

Districtt	Gram panchayat	Migrants	%
Uttarkashi	487	22620	5.295
Chamoli	929	46309	9.21
Rudraprayag	540	30570	6.08
Tehri Garhwal	1519	90339	17.97
Dehradun	284	28583	5.68
Pithoragarh	973	41669	8.28
Bageswar	541	29300	5.82
Almora	1668	69818	13.88
Champawat	512	28218	5.61
Nanital	552	25774	5.12
Udham singh nagar	201	7018	1.39
Haridwar	226	9419	1.87
Pauri Garhwal	1846	73072	14.53
Uttarakhand	10284	502707	100

Source: Rural Development and Migration Commission Uttarakhand (April 2018)

extreme poverty has led to migration into these districts. Cross-border migrants from Bangladesh are found to be settled in Udham Singh Nagar (6.9 percent), which could be because of the better agriculture base in this district and the availability of non-farm job opportunities.

Due to the harsh topography, difficult living conditions and lack of access to water, health, education and other essential services, Uttarakhand is a migration prone state. The villages in the State, where 70 per cent (1.01 crore) of the population resides, are devoid of necessities like healthcare and education [20]. The poor status of agriculture, absence of industries and other sources of income and employment generating activities have been pushing the rural inhabitant especially the rural youth for migration from the rural areas. Rapid population growth, widespread unemployment, and underemployment, illiteracy, poor education, lower family income, lack of opportunities at the farm level have led rural youth in the continued loss of self-esteem and self- confidence. The villages of the state of Uttarakhand were quoted as “Ghost Villages” by the reputed newspaper Hindustan Times [21], as the state is facing the increasing problem of migration from the villages to the cities and leaving behind only elders to guard these villages. A study conducted by the Directorate of Economics and Statistics (2011-12) revealed that there is not a single person left in about 1100 villages. There is still a lack of employment opportunities in the mountainous areas, making life difficult for the hill people. Researches reveal that one of the major reasons behind migration is the information gap persisting among rural youth of hills about the livelihood options already available there. Migration in the Himalayan mountainous area of the world is a common phenomenon and in recent years, global changes have led to a considerable increase in migration in the region. Migration has long been an important livelihood strategy for the people of the Himalayan region. Mountain agriculture is predominantly subsistence in nature and people from mountain regions have been migrating from centuries for cash to supplement household income. A large section of the population of the mountainous region depends upon agricultural activities for their livelihood consisting of agriculture, animal husbandry and forest interlinked production system. With increasing climatic stresses, particularly erratic rainfall and global food price volatility affecting even remote mountain communities, mountain agriculture is increasingly becoming a less reliable livelihood strategy, increasing the need to migrate. Migration in India is mostly determined by social structures and patterns of development. Since independence, development policies by all governments have accelerated the migration process [22]. Uneven growth is the main cause of migration. Indian agriculture became non-profitable and farmers are doing suicide in some states of India.In simpler terms, even though the hill districts of Uttarakhand were already well known for male out-migration in search of employment, the rate of out-migration has accelerated to such an extent that while all-hill districts exhibit substantial decline in population growth, two erstwhile 'capital ' districts of Pauri Garhwal and Almora have shown a negative growth rate. The only mitigating factor seems to be that the migration has taken place to the plains regions of

the state itself. The other indicators suggest that not only there is considerable migration from the hill districts, in contrast to the earlier pattern of only men going out, now whole families are migrating [23]. The other disturbing area of concern, which emerges from these early results, relates to a rather sharp decline in the child sex ratio, in the mountain districts. Thus, there is need to study the migration pattern of rural areas in Uttarakhand. So the present study was conducted to find out the answer to the researchable question are: (1) What are the profile characteristics of the migrated youth in the selected area? (2) What is the pattern of migration? (3) What are the push and pull factors responsible for migration? (4) What could be the strategy to counter this migration problem? The review of the literature shows that only a few studies have been conducted on migration related issues in the Garhwal division of Uttarakhand Further, no systematic or concrete study has been done on the major causes and consequences of out-migration in the entire Garhwal division of Uttarakhand. The present study is unique because it is the first of its kind that is carried out on the latest data, Further, it focuses on the main issues of migration, i.e. its reasons and consequences in a different way. The main objectives of the study are: (1)To study the profile characteristics of the migrated youth. (2) To assess the pattern of migration in the study area. (3) To identify the factors contributing to the migration of rural youth. (4) To suggest a suitable strategy for reducing migration. The present investigation attempted to study various aspects of rural out- migration and the important problems faced by India. The present study focused on the pattern of migration, factors of migration in terms of push and pull factors. The findings of the study shall help the State Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Universities, NGOs and other research organizations in knowing: (1) The pattern of migration in the study area. (2) The factors contributing to the migration of rural youth (3) Strategies for reducing migration.

2. METHODS AND MATERIALS

Uttarakhand state was formed as 27th state of country on November 9, 2000. The state is separated into two divisions, Kumaun and Garhwal. The state had thirteen districts which are categorized Chamoli, Bageshwar, Uttarkashi, Pauri Garhwal, Pithoragarh, Tehri Garhwal, Rudraprayag, Almora district, and part of Nainital, Champawat, and Dehradun fall under the hilly region. According to the census 2011 the population of Uttarakhand is 10,116,752 covering 5,154,178 males and 4,962,574 females. Around 70 percent of the total is a population residing in rural areas. The state is the 20th most populous state of the country, having 0.84 percent of the population on 1.69 percent of the land. Garhwal division of Uttarakhand was selected purposively for the study. In Garhwal Division of Uttarakhand out of seven districts, five districts are completely rural. Migration rate in Garhwal division is comparatively higher than Kumaon division. Garhwal division has witnessed 60.635 per cent migration and the rest 39.365 per cent is from Kumaon division [23]. The Garlwal region of Uttarakhand coordinates at 30.5N 78.5E. It is bordered with Kumaon region on the east, on the northwest it is enclosed by Himachal Pradesh state, bounded by Tibet on the north and on the south by Uttar Pradesh state. It is the western region of the state. The capital of the state, Dehradun, is situated in this region. Garhwal division comprises seven districts viz. Tehri Garhwal, Pauri Garhwal, Dehradun, Chamoli, Haridwar, Rudraprayag and Uttarkashi. Pauri is the administrative center for Garhwal division. The name Garhwal signifies "a land of many ‘garh’ or forts" In earlier days the region was made up of many small forts which were ruled by chieftains. Kanak Pal was the first ruler of the state of Garhwal in 823 AD.

Fig. 1. District wise map of Uttarakhand State

Table 2. Distribution of respondents on the basis of PPS sampling method

District	Block	Villages	Population	Respondents
Tehri Garhwal	Chamba	Kainchu	569	33
		Jaspur	581	27
	Thauldhar	kot	678	26
		Bhainskoti	709	34
Total			2537	120

Selection of District: Out of thirteen district of the state, Tehri Carhwal district was selected purposively for the present study because percentage of migration is highest in this district i.e. 17.97 percent [23]. Tehri Garhwal falls under Garhwal region.

Selection of the Blocks: The district Tehri Garbwal comprises of nine community development blocks Bhilangana, Chamba, Deoprayas, Jakhanidhar, Jaunpur, Kirtinagar, Naredranagar Pratapnaear and Thauldhar. Out of these nine blocks Chamba and Thauldhar blocks were selected randomly.

Selection of Villages: Four villages were selected by simple random sampling method for the study. Chamba block has 221 villages out of which Kainchu and Jaspur were selected, Thauldhar block has 179 villages out of which two villages Kot and Bhainskoti were selected.

Selection of the Respondents: From the selected villages120 respondents who migrated from the villages were selected through PPS (Probability Proportionate to Size) sampling method.

Depending upon the nature of the study and to meet the study objectives set forth, descriptive research design was adopted for this study.

3. RESULTS

Age: It is clear from the table that majority (40.83%) of the respondents were 24-32 years of age group, followed by 30.83 percent were in 16-24 years age group and28.34 per cent were in 32-40 years age group.

Sex: It is clear that from the table that most of the respondents (73.33%) were males and 26.67 per cent of the respondents were females.

Education: It is clear that majority of the respondents have completed education up to intermediate (40.84 %), followed by high school (23.33%), graduate and above (9.16%), primary school (10%), can read and write (5.83%), diploma (5%), can read only (3.34%) and illiterate (2.5%).

Caste: It is evident clearly that vast majority of the respondents (67.5%) belonged to the general category followed by SC/ST (32.5%). None of the respondents belonged to OBC category.

Marital status: It is revealed that majority of the respondents (60%) were married followed by 38.33 per cent who were unmarried and rest of the respondents were widow 1.67 per cent.

Table 3. Distribution of respondents on the basis of age (n=120)

S.No.	Age (in years)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	16-24	37	30.83
2.	24-32	49	40.83
3.	32-40	34	28.34
	Total	**120**	**100**

Table 4. Distribution of the respondents on the basis of sex (n=120)

S.No.	Category	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Male	88	73.33
2.	Female	32	26.67
	Total	**120**	**100**

Table 5. Distribution of respondents on the basis of their education status (n=120)

S.No.	Category	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Illiterate	3	2.50
2.	Can read only	4	3.34
3.	Can read and write	7	5.83
4.	Primary school	12	10.00
5.	High school	28	23.33
6.	Intermediate	49	40.84
7.	Diploma	6	5.00
8.	Graduate or above	11	9.16
	Total	**120**	**100**

Table 6. Distribution of the respondents on the basis of caste (n=120)

Sl.No.	Category	Frequency	Percentage
1.	General	81	67.50
2.	OBC	0	0.00
3.	SC/ST	39	32.50
	Total	**120**	**100**

Table 7. Distribution of the respondents on the basis of marital status (n=120)

Sl.No.	Category	Frequency	Percentage
1	Married	72	60.00
2	Unmarried	46	38.33
3	Divorce	0	0
4	Widow	2	1.67
	Total	**120**	**100**

Table 8. Distribution of respondents according to their family size (N=120)

S.No.	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Small (less than 7)	43	35.84
2.	Medium (7 to 10)	66	55.00
3.	Large (more than 10)	11	9.16
	Total	**120**	**100**

Family Size: Table reveals that majority of the respondents (55%) had medium family size i.e. 7 to 10 members followed by the 35.84 per cent of respondents having small family size (less than 7 members) and rest 9.16 per cent had large family size (more than 10 members).

Occupation: It is clear from the table 9 that majority of the respondents the main occupation (40%) was service followed by, labour (19.16%), business (15.84%), independent profession (10.84%), caste occupation (9.16%) and 5 per cent respondents engaged in cultivation farming.

Table 9. Distribution of the respondents on the basis of occupation (n=120)

Sl.No.	Category	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Labour	23	19.16
2.	Caste occupation	11	9.16
3.	Business	19	15.84
4.	Independent profession	13	10.84
5.	Cultivation/ farming	6	5.00
6.	Service	48	40.00
	Total	**120**	**100**

Achievement motivation: It is clear from the table that majority (54.16%) of the respondents had moderate level of achievement motivation, followed by 30 per cent respondents had low level of achievement motivation and 15.84 per cent respondents had high level of achievement motivation.

Mass media exposure: It is clear from the table that majority of the respondents (59.16%) had medium mass media exposure followed by the 21.67 per cent who had low and the rest 19.17 per cent of the respondents had high mass media exposure. The respondents were utilizing media like radio, television, magazine, newspaper, mobile, computer and internet for seeking information.

Land holding: It is clear from the table that majority of respondents (64.16%)belonged to small size land holding category followed by 34.17 per cent with medium size land holding category and rest of 1.67 per cent in high land holding category.

Change proneness: It is clear from the table that majority of the respondents (63.33%) displayed medium level of change proneness followed by 30.83 per cent with high level of change proneness and only 5.84 per cent respondents displayed low level of change proneness.

Purpose of migration: It is clear from the table that a large majority (92.5%) of the respondents migrated due to non -agricultural purpose and very few (7.5%) of the respondents migrated for agricultural purpose.

The most probable reason for this kind of result was that most of the migrants were not wholly dependent on agriculture for their living before migration as it is not remunerative [24]. They were doing some other non -agricultural works in the villages for their livelihood but later when these employment opportunities also gradually declined, they migrated to other places. Very few of the migrants who migrated for agricultural work in the destination areas are mostly seasonal migrants. Majority of the migrants were engaged in non -agricultural occupations as the income from them was comparatively high and regular as compared to the agricultural work. These migrants migrated for medium to long term to the destination areas. This is in conformity with the results of Deshingkar [25] and Anamica [26].

Table 10. Distribution of the respondents on the basis of achievement motivation (n=120)

Sl. No.	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
1	Low(less than 22)	36	30.00
2	Moderate(22-37)	65	54.16
3	High(more than 37)	19	15.84
	Total	**120**	**100**

Table 11. Distribution of the respondents on the basis of mass media exposure (n=120)

Sl. No.	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
1	Low(up to 1.09)	26	21.67
2	Moderate(1.09-5.01)	71	59.16
3	High(more than 5.01)	23	19.17
	Total	**120**	**100**

Table 12. Distribution of respondents on the basis of size of land holding (n=120)

Sl. No.	categories	frequency	Percentage
1	Less than 1 acre (< 20 nali)	77	64.16
2	1 to 5 acres (20-100 nali)	41	34.17
3	5 to 10 acres (100-200 nali)	2	1.67
	Total	**120**	**100**

Table 13. Distribution of respondents on the basis of their change proneness (n=120)

Sl. No.	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
1	Low (Less than 2)	7	5.84
2	Medium (2 to 4)	76	63.33
3	High (More than 4)	37	30.83
	Total	**120**	**100**

Table 14. Distribution of respondents on the basis of purpose of migration (n=120)

Sl. No.	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
1	Agricultural purpose	9	7.50
2	Non Agriculture purpose	111	92.50
	Total	**120**	**100**

Pattern of Migration

Place of migration: It is clear from the table that majority (53.33%) of the respondents migrated from village to nearby town followed by village to district head quarter 32.5 per cent, village to out of district 8.33 per cent and 5.84 per cent of the respondents was migrated out of state.

Number of migrants in the family: It is clear from the table that majority (81.66%) of the families were having up to 2 migrants in their family followed by medium category with 3-4 migrants in their family (14.17%) and rest of high category with more than 4 migrants in their family (4.17%).

The families having up to two migrants had the main motive of getting remittances by doing job in the destination area. The families having three and four migrants had sent their family members for both education and income purposes, one or two members were doing job in destination area and other migrants were studying.

Duration of migration: It is clear from the table that majority (69.16%) of the respondents migrated for midterm of 6-10 years followed by short term (20.00%) of 1-5 years and long term (10.84%) of more than 10 years.

Factors of Migration

Push factors: It is clear from the table that majority (64.17%) of the migrants had high level on push factors for migration followed by medium (25%) and low (10.83%) level push factors of migration.

Table 15. Distribution of respondents on the basis of place of migration (n=120)

Sl. No.	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
1	Nearby town	64	53.33
2	District head quarter	39	32.50
3	Out of District	10	8.33
4	Out of State	7	5.84
	Total	**120**	**100**

Table 16. Distribution of respondents on the basis of number of migrants in the family (n=120)

Sl. No.	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
1	Low (up to 2)	98	81.66
2	Medium (3-4)	17	14.17
3	High (more than 4)	5	4.17
	Total	**120**	**100**

Table 17. Distribution of respondents according to their duration of migration (N=120)

S.No.	Duration	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Short term migration(1-5 years)	24	20.00
2.	Medium term migration(6-10 years)	83	69.16
3.	Long term migration (more than 10 years)	13	10.84
	Total	**120**	**100**

Table 18. Distribution of the respondents on the basis on push factors (n=120)

S.No.	Category	Frequency	Percentage
1	Low (12 to 20)	13	10.83
2	Medium(20 to 28)	30	25. 00
3	High(28 to 36)	77	64.17
	Total	120	100

Table 19. Distribution of respondents on the basis of various push factors

Sl. No.	Statements	Agree		Partially agree		Disagree	
		n	%	n	%	n	%
1.	Do you think that Crop failure due to heavy rainfall causes migration of farmers to the cities?	87	72.50	21	17.50	12	10.00
2.	Do you believe that crop loss due to severe drought causes migration of farmers to the cities?	89	74.16	16	13.34	15	12.50
3.	Lack of employment opportunities in the village forcing the rural people to migrate	120	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
4.	Do you think that inability to meet basic needs with existing income cause rural urban migration?	117	97.50	3	2.50	0	0.00
5.	Do you believe that Inability to meet educational expenses of children causes migration?	109	90.83	7	5.842	4	3.33
6.	Migration occurs due to inability of people's to meet medical expenses of their family	92	76.67	20	16.67	8	6.66
7.	Rural people migrate if they cannot clear off their family debts with the existing income	97	80.83	21	17.50	2	1.67
8.	Do you think that social caste and status related struggle in village causes migration to the cities?	39	32.50	34	28.34	47	39.16
9.	Do you feel peer group of rural people influence them to migrate to cities?	101	84.16	11	9.17	8	6.67
10.	Do you think that increased use of farm machinery reduced employment opportunities in villages, which is forcing people to migrate?	23	19.16	13	10.84	84	70.00
11.	If there is increase in household expenses, the rural people tend to take decision to migrate	110	91.67	6	5.00	4	3.33
12.	When a person faces family Conflict he would like to leave his family and to migrate to other place	65	54.16	17	14.17	38	31.67
13.	Do you think that lack of or Improper coverage of Government employment guarantee schemes like MNREGA play important role in taking the decision to whether to migrate or not?	98	81.67	15	12.50	7	5.83

The employment opportunities in the villages were very few, and they generated irregular and less income. The migrants got employment only for some portion of the year. Hence this kind of result appeared in the study. This indicated an increased dependence on wage-earning occupations and decrease in dependence on agricultural works in the second generation. Migrants agreed that the other push factors like inability to meet basic needs, increased household expenses, inability to meet educational expenses and medical expenses (which might be due to unproductive agriculture), peer group influence, lack of or improper coverage of Government employment guarantee schemes like MNREGA and inability to clear off their family debts were also the main reasons that forced respondents to migrate to other places. Other reasons like crop failure due to drought and heavy rainfall, family conflict, social caste and status related struggle in village and reduced employment due to increased the use of farm machinery were also some other reasons perceived by them. This is in conformity with the results of Singh et al. [27], Debasis and Pravat (2013), Kyaing (2013), Prashant (2013), Madhu and Uma (2014) and Santosh (2014).

Table 20. Distribution of the respondents on the basis on pull factors (n=120)

S. No.	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Low(9 to 15)	28	23.34
2	Medium(15 to 21)	71	59.16
3	High(21 to 27)	21	17.50
	Total	120	100

Table 21. Distribution of the respondents on the basis of various pull factors

Sl. No.	Statements	Agree		Partially agree		Disagree	
		n	%	n	%	N	%
1.	Do you believe that Improved railway / road and transport facility and communication networks in cities are attracting rural people?	77	64.16	28	23.34	15	12.50
2.	Do you think that modern city life style is attracting rural youth?	69	57.50	32	26.67	19	15.58
3.	High demands of labors in urban areas attract rural youths to migrate and work in urban areas?	112	93.33	5	4.17	3	2.50
4.	Do you think that in urban areas there are better earning opportunities than rural areas?	107	89.16	9	7.50	4	3.34
5.	In the place where you have migrated wages are higher comparatively	96	80.00	14	11.66	10	8.34
6.	Do you believe that ease of life people in urban areas is attracting people towards cities?	88	73.33	17	14.17	15	12.50
7.	Experience of already migrated persons motivate other people to migrate	101	84.16	13	10.84	6	5.00
8.	In the place where you have migrated works are available throughout year	91	75.83	19	15.83	10	8.34
9.	In the place where you have migrated works are not drudgery comparatively	58	48.33	16	13.33	46	38.34

Pull factors: It is clear from the table that majority (59.16%) of the migrants had medium level on pull factors for migration followed by low (23.34%) and high (17.5%) level pulls factors for migration. The effect of rural-urban migration on agricultural production [28].

Definitely an improvement in their lives as it was an escape from dire poverty situation in the villages. They were also attracted to the factors of urban areas like ease of life (73.33%), improved railway / road and transport facility and communication networks in cities (64.16%), modern city life style (57.5%) and less drudgeous work comparatively (48.33%) [29]. This is in conformity with the results of Tiwary *et al.* (2002), Gerard (2003), Deshingkar (2003), Priya and Edward (2004),Joshi (2013), Debasis and Pravat (2013), Kyaing (2013) Madhu and Uma (2014) and Santosh (2014).
They may construct polyhouses in the rural areas and may indulge in off season cultivation of crops. It was also observed during the study that few people in the villages, especially ex-servicemen were keen to stop migration and wanted youths to generate employment activities in the village itself. So using such people to motivate and influence the youth about different locally available enterprises and also training them with government help.

4. DISCUSSION

The study was conducted in Tehri Garhwal district of Uttarakhand state. The district was selected purposively for the present study because in overall state, percentage of migration is highest in this district i.e. 17.97 percent. Two blocks namely Chamba and Thouldhar was selected randomly. Four villages of Kainch, Jaspur, Kot and Bhainskoti were also selected randomly. Total 120 respondents were selected from these four villages through PPS sampling procedure. The descriptive research design was used to meet the objective of the study. For this study Age, Sex, Education, Caste, Marital status, Family size, Occupation, Achievement motivation, Mass media exposure, Size of land holding, Change proneness, Factors of migration and Pattern of migration were selected as variables. Data was collected through structure interview schedule and all the respondents were interviewed by the researcher personally. Appropriate statistical tools and technique i.e., frequency, percentage, range, arithmetic mean and standard deviation were used.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Out-migration has become a common phenomenon in the Uttarakhand. A large number of people, mainly youth, has out-migrated semi-permanently and permanently. The rate of out-migration has increased mainly after 2000-2021. Unemployment is one of the major impediments of out-migration. Since the rural areas are devoid of infrastructural and institutional facilities, augmentation of employment is not possible. Further, the output from traditionally practised subsistence cereal cultivation is not enough to carry livelihood sustainably. These factors have manifested a large out-migration of youth from the region, and if it continues, the out-migration will have severe adverse implications on the rural areas and their economy.Modern technological innovations related to agriculture can enhance the yield of crops and employment opportunities. Therefore, at the community level, the development of agriculture should be ensured. The government should come forward for the development of infrastructural facilities and through it, employment can be augmented.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

The findings provide an in depth understanding about pattern of migration in the hilly areas of uttarakhand and can be utilized to design strategies to encourage youth toward self-employment generation to stop migration [30]. It is clear from the study that all of the migrants felt strong need for more employment opportunities in the villages, so government should take initiatives to provide the required employment opportunities in the villages. Majority of the respondents of the study are educated up to intermediate [31]. The government should provide educational and employment opportunities to the rural youth in their locality itself to retain them in their villages.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Senger A. New perspective on youth migration: Motives and family investment patterns. Demographic Research. 2003; 33:765-800.

2. Source- Economic and Statistical Directorate, Statistical diary, 2012, Dehradun.
3. Source: The Economic Survey; 2017.
4. Clarke JI. Population geography. Oxford, Pergamon Press; 1965.
5. Tiwari PC, Joshi B, Rothan V, Srivastav R. Climate change and rural out-migration in Himalaya. Change and Adaptation in Socio-Ecological Systems, 1(open-issue); 2002.
6. Jain A. Labour migration and remittances in Uttarakhand. Consultant for Uttarakhand working under International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMD). Case study report; 2010.
   Available:http://lib.icimod.org
7. Sati VP. Patterns and implications of rural-urban migration in the Uttarakhand Himalaya, India. Annals of Natural Sciences. 2016;2[1]:26-37.
8. Santhosh, K. H. 2014. A study on rural-urban migration among youths: Social work perspective. Indian Streams Research Journal, 4 (1): 1- 3.
9. Source: Global Employment Trends for Youth, International Labour Office; 2012.
10. Agriculture Organization. Prospects, risks and opportunities. Food & Agriculture Organization. 2008;3(2):166-169.
11. Source: CIA World Factbook; 2012.
12. Deshingkar P, Bhagat RB. Development impacts of migration and urbanisation. Economic and political weekly. Development Research Centre on Migration, Globalization and Poverty 2009. 2004;53(48):15-19.
13. Gangwar R, Kameswari VLV. Attitude of rural youth towards agriculture as a means of livelihood. Journal of Applied and Natural Science. 2016;8(2):879-882.
14. Dhargupta A, Goswami A, Sen M, Mazumder D. Study on the effect of socio-economic parameters on health status of the Toto, Santal, Sabar and Lodha tribes of West Bengal, India. Studies of Tribes and Tribals. 2009;7(1):31-38.
15. Human Development Report. Overcoming barriers: Human mobility and development. 2009;1-217.
    Available:http://hdr.undp.org
16. Working Paper No. 217; 2008.
    Available:www.YouthinIndia.com
17. Source: Uttarakhand Human Development Report; 2018.
18. Divisha A. Reasons and effects of the romanian labour force migration statistical and sociological review. The Annals of the University of Oradea. 2017;29.
19. Census of India. Population census provisional data; 2001.
    Available:www.censusindia.gov.in
20. Source: News Paper Hindustan Times; 2015.
21. Jayaraj D. Family migration in India: 'Push'or'Pull' or both or what?. Economic and Political Weekly. 2013;48(42):44-52.
22. Joshi D, Kashyap SK. Awareness on livelihood options among youth of Uttarakhand: A review. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2019;8(3):648-655.
23. Source: Rural Development and Migration Commission Uttarakhand; 2018.
24. Bora RS. Out-migration: Some policy implications for Uttarakhand. Uttarakhand Statehood: Dimensions of Development. New Delhi, Vedam eBook, Indus Publication Company Ltd. (P). 2014;91-114.
25. Deshingkar P. Internal migration, poverty and development in Asia. ODI Briefing Paper. 2006;11.
26. Anamica M. Migration behavior of dry land farmers: An ex-post facto study. Unpublished Thesis, M.Sc. (Ag), Department of Agricultural Extension & Rural Sociology, TNAU, Coimbatore; 2010.
27. Singh NP, Singh RP, Kumar R, Padaria RN, Singh A, Varghese N. Labour migration in indo-gangetic plains: Determinants and impacts on socio-economic welfare. Agricultural Economics Research Review. 2011;24(347-2016-16978):449-458.
28. Adaku AA. The effect of rural-urban migration on agricultural production in the northern region of Ghana. Journal of Agricultural Science and Applications. 2013;2(4):193-201.
29. Chakraborty D, Kuri PK. Rural-urban migration and urban informal sector in India: An inter-state analysis. International Journal of Current Research. 2013;5(4):950-956.
30. Uttarakhand at a glance. 2011-12. Directorate of Economics and Statistics.

Available:www.uk.gov.in.

31. Word migration in figures. A joint contribution by UN-DESA and the OECD to the United Nations High-Level Dialogue on Migration and Development; 2013. Available:www.oecd.org.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/85628