Volume: 13, Issue: 3 March 2025| Impact Factor (SJIF 2025):8.737 | Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2712 ISSN: 2277 – 5692
International Journal of Southern Economic Light (JSEL)
- Peer Review Journal

AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF IMPACT OF RURAL -URBAN MIGRATION AND RETURN MIGRATION ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN BANGALORE RURAL AND URBAN DISTRICTS AND TUMKUR DISTRICT OF KARNATAKA.

Dr.Padmini S.V.
Associate Professor, Department of Economics, University College of Arts, Tumkur University, Tumkur

ABSTRACT----------
The word "migrate" is derived from the Latin word "migratus" meaning to "change or transport". rural-urban migration is the movement of people from rural dwellings to urban cities. Return migration refers to the individual or family decision of a migrant to leave a host country and to return permanently to the country of origin(Tuncay Bilecen,2022). Research Methodology: Objectives of the study:To examine the reasons for rural-urban migration, To examine the HDI,GPI,FSI,INFORM,Passport Index, Percentage of migrants, Refugees, Conflict IDPs in different countries of the globe, To examine the countries ranking related to net migration rate, To examine the Net Migration Rate data in India, To examine the Effects of Rural-urban migration, To examine the Volume and trend of migration in Karnataka, To examine the Population share and Rate of migration according to social groups in Karnataka, To examine the rural and urban population from 1960 to 2024.Hypotheses:H0.Rural-Urban migration do not have influence on economic development., H1: Rural-Urban migration definitely have influence on economic development, Need of the study: Rural-Urban migration and Return migration has its favourable impact on economic development the study conducted. Recommendations:Central and State Governments, Self help groups and Non Government organizations Governments and non-government agencies should take appropriate initiation to invest on long term projects to enhance the economic, social and financial infrastructure. Town planning should be made in towns and cities.

KEYWORDS: *Rural-Urban migration, Return migration,Push factors, Pull factors,International migration.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The word "migrate" is derived from the Latin word "migratus" meaning to "change or transport". rural-urban migration is the movement of people from rural dwellings to urban cities.

Return migration refers to the individual or family decision of a migrant to leave a host country and to return permanently to the country of origin(Tuncay Bilecen,2022). The exact numbers are debated, but Mark Wyman concludes: "The totals are so enormous: at least one-third of the 52 million Europeans who left Europe between 1824 and 1924 returned permanently to their homelands."(Mark Wyman, 2005). Return migration can have major impacts on both the migrants themselves and the countries involved. Migrants may face challenges in reintegrating into their home societies, including finding suitable employment, adapting to changes in the local environment, or dealing with the stigma associated with migration. The decision to return is often influenced by a complex interplay of individual circumstances and broader economic, social, and political factors (Mark Wyman,1993).

II.RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Objectives of the study:

1)To examine the reasons for rural-urban migration.

Volume: 13, Issue: 3 March 2025| Impact Factor (SJIF 2025):8.737 | Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2712 ISSN: 2277 – 5692
International Journal of Southern Economic Light (JSEL)
- Peer Review Journal

2)To examine the HDI,GPI,FSI,INFORM,Passport Index, Percentage of migrants, Refugees, Conflict IDPs in different countries of the globe.
3) To examine the countries ranking related to net migration rate.
4) To examine the Net Migration Rate data in India.
5)To examine the Effects of Rural-urban migration.
6) To examine the Volume and trend of migration in Karnataka**.**
7) To examine the Population share and Rate of migration according to social groups in Karnataka
8) To examine the rural and urban population from 1960 to 2024.

Hypotheses
H0.Rural-Urban migration do not have influence on economic development.
H1: Rural-Urban migration definitely have influence on economic development.

Need of the study
Rural-Urban migration and Return migration has its favourable impact on economic development of the study area.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The reasons for rural-urban migration can be seen as a result of the interplay of two set of factors: the push factors and the pull factors**.** The push factors refer to those conditions present in the rural sectors that encourage residents of such areas to leave.

a. **Economic push factors**: these include poor standard of living, reduced or unavailable social amenities, decrease in availability of job opportunities amongst others. A decreased availability of basic amenities (like water, accommodation and good roads) and standard health care amenities (like hospitals and clinics) will surely lead to low quality of life. Generally, job opportunities in rural areas are scarce and job security is not certain.
b. **Low standard of living**: this is a result of the above factors. Put together, lack of good jobs, lack of basic amenities and lack of good educational facilities and personnel will surely result in a low standard of living.
c. **Insecurities/ Wars**: civil wars, civil unrests and high crime waves make people leave the rural areas for safer grounds. While one may argue that urban settlements are also plagued by this dangers, it is also true that security measures available in urban areas are by far better suited than those in the average rural areas.
d. **Natural Disasters**: these are occurrences beyond man's control that endanger lives an properties. Floods, earthquakes, hurricanes and other such disasters, when they happen in rural settlements, will force residents to flee.
e. **Political factors:** oppression by rulers or unstable government at the rural community level will reduce occupants' willingness to remain in such places.
f. Conversely, the pull factors are those features of the urban settlements that attract potential immigrants from the rural settlement. These men, women and children are assured of a better quality of life based on these factors which include:
g. **Economic factors**: better standard of living, better job opportunities and quality amenities encourage movement into urban areas. Higher standard of education is a major factor for rural dwellers looking to further their education in better institutes of learning.
h. **Political factors**: cities have a defined system of government and selection of rulers. Such political stability is welcomed by those seeking to make such cities their new home.
i. **Better security**: people will always to prepare to live in a setting with law enforcement agencies and better record of security. This ensures safety of life and property.

Volume: 13, Issue: 3 March 2025| Impact Factor (SJIF 2025):8.737 | Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2712 ISSN: 2277 – 5692
International Journal of Southern Economic Light (JSEL)
- Peer Review Journal

Table: 1
HDI,GPI,FSI,INFORM,Passport Index, Percentage of migrants, Refugees, Conflict IDPs:

Country	HDI	GPI	FSI	INFORM	Passport index	% of migrants	Refugees (origin	Conflict IDPs
Luxembourg	0.93	-	19.5	1.1	192	48	<100	0
Denmark	0.948	1.31	17.9	1.4	192	12	0	0
Singapore	0.939	1.332	25.5	0.7	194	43	<100	0
Finland	0.94	1.399	16	1.5	193	7	0	0
Switzerland	0.962	1.339	17.8	1.4	190	29	<100	0
Liechtenstein	0.935	-	-	1	182	68	<100	0
Ireland	0.945	1.312	19.5	1.7	192	18	<100	0
New Zealand	0.937	1.313	16.7	1.4	190	29	<100	0
Iceland	0.959	1.124	15.7	1.6	185	19	<100	0
Norway	0.961	1.55	14.5	1.7	191	16	0	0
India	0.633	2.314	74.1	5.3	62	04	21,000	6,31,000

Source: Human Development Index (HDI) 2022 by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); Global Peace Index (GPI) 2023 by the Institute for Economics and Peace (IEP); Fragile States Index (FSI) 2023 by The Fund for Peace (FFP); INFORM Risk Index (INFORM) 2024 by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) and the European Commission; Henley Passport Index (Passport Index) 2024 by Henley and Partners; Refugees in 2022 by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR); Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) (Conflict IDPs) in 2022 The Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC); immigrant figures and percent of immigrants (2020) by United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA).
The above table indicate percentage of migrants in various countries.

Table 2
Countries Ranked By Net Migration Rate

Country Name	2024 Net Migration Rate
Djibouti	0.871
Mauritania	0.751
Bhutan	0.376
Ukraine	0.094
Vanuatu	0.000
Angola	-0.005
Republic of Congo	-0.027
Cameroon	-0.166
Kenya	-0.172
Sudan	-0.210
Mongolia	-0.248
Uzbekistan	-0.254
Nigeria	-0.267
Ghana	-0.299
India	**-0.323**
Tunisia	-0.329
Zambia	-0.367
Egypt	-0.368
Indonesia	-0.369
Honduras	-0.469
Philippines	-0.597
Bolivia	-0.600
Myanmar	-0.646
Pakistan	-0.839
Vietnam	-0.920
Morocco	-1.043

Volume: 13, Issue: 3 March 2025| Impact Factor (SJIF 2025):8.737 | Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2712 ISSN: 2277 – 5692
International Journal of Southern Economic Light (JSEL)
- Peer Review Journal

Cambodia	-1.718
Bangladesh	-2.028
Cabo Verde	-2.058
Nicaragua	-2.104
Solomon Islands	-2.143
Georgia	-2.535
Kiribati	-3.167
Lesotho	-3.281
Timor-Leste	-3.556
Sri Lanka	-3.977
Micronesia	-4.071
Eswatini	-4.184
El Salvador	-4.995
Sao Tome and Principe	-5.646

The above table indicate change in net migration rate in various countries at the global level during 2024.

Table 3:

Net Migration Rate data in India

Year	Net migration rate	Growth rate
2024	-0.323	-1.820%
2023	-0.329	-3.800%
2022	-0.342	-3.930%
2021	-0.356	-3.520%
2020	-0.369	-3.660%
2019	-0.383	-3.280%
2018	-0.396	1.280%
2017	-0.391	1.560%
2016	-0.385	1.320%
2015	-0.380	1.600%
2014	-0.374	1.360%
2013	-0.369	-3.910%
2012	-0.384	-4.000%
2011	-0.400	-3.610%
2010	-0.415	-3.710%
2009	-0.431	-3.360%
2008	-0.446	4.940%
2007	-0.425	4.940%
2006	-0.405	5.470%
2005	-0.384	5.490%
2004	-0.364	6.120%
2003	-0.343	13.950%
2002	-0.301	15.770%
2001	-0.260	19.270%
2000	-0.218	23.160%
1999	-0.177	31.110%
1998	-0.135	2.270%
1997	-0.132	2.330%
1996	-0.129	2.380%
1995	-0.126	2.440%
1994	-0.123	2.500%
1993	-0.120	27.660%
1992	-0.094	38.240%

Volume: 13, Issue: 3 March 2025| Impact Factor (SJIF 2025):8.737 | Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2712 ISSN: 2277 – 5692
International Journal of Southern Economic Light (JSEL)
- Peer Review Journal

1991	-0.068	65.850%
1990	-0.041	173.330%

Source: Census Reports.
The above table indicate from 1990 to 2024 percentage change in net miration rate and growth rate in India.

Effects of Rural-Urban Migration
Rural urban migration has both positive and negative effects
Positive effects of migration are urbanization, improved standard of living, improved economic output.
Negative effects of migration are depletion of the rural economy, increased population density.

Migration in Karnataka
Volume and trend of migration in Karnataka
In Karnataka, 16.2 million persons out of total population of 52.8 million were enumerated at a place different from the place of birth and thus termed as migrants. This constitutes 30.62 % (31.26 percent in 1971) of the total population of the state in 2001. In terms of absolute figures, number has increased from 9.1 million in 1971 to 16.2million in 2001 (Census,2001).

In 2001, 20.65% male and 40.95% female population enumerated outside their place of birth in Karnataka. The prevailing marriage custom in India of brides moving to place of groom after marriage terms most of female as migrants in major reason of migration of female. But still, percentage of female migrants is lower in Karnataka compared to India as a whole(Census,2001) .

Distance and direction of migration flows
It is evident from census that migrants mainly move over short distances, they move within district. As distance increases proportion of migrants decreases.Out of total migrants in Karnataka, intra-district migration dominates contributes to about 58.90 percent in total in 2001; inter-district migration was 27.80 percent and international migration was 0.27 percent of population.Inter-district, interstate and international male migration is higher than that of female migration in all the census years, but intra-district male migration is lower than female migration in both Karnataka and India.The proportion of migrants moved due to employment related reasons, increases with the increasing distance. Where as proportion of migrants moving due to marriage decline remarkably with the distance(Census,2001)

Reasons for Migration
Reasons for migrations are many and varied over time. In 1981, the reasons for migration was categorized into five groups viz., **employment, education, family moved, marriage** and others. Wheares in 2001 and later new dimensions like **business, drought** (Lambani community) and **other natural calamities** were became significant. In 2001, 11.37 % have migrated for work/employment, 0.94 percent for business, 2.08 percent for education, 42.31 percent for marriage purpose, 9.58 percent for moved after birth, 12.30 percent moved with household and 21.43 percent migrants moved due to other reasons (Census 2001) .

The National Sample Survey Organisation (**NSSO**) data (2007–08) shows that while the rate of migration in Karnataka is pegged at 38, there are vast differences between caste groups. It is 25.7 per cent for the Scheduled Tribes (STs), 34 per cent for the Scheduled Castes (SCs), 41 per cent for the other backward classes (OBCs) and 38 per cent for others. Rural-to-rural migration that is highest among SCs (73 per cent) and STs (78 per cent), as opposed to OBCs (58 per cent), others (42 per cent), and average (56 per cent). Rural-to-rural migration is in search of agricultural wage labour from dry to irrigated areas, from *subsistence crop areas to commercial crop areas*.Rural to urban migration is next to rural to rural migration in terms of volume. Rural to urban migration is mainly economic in nature and accompanies the process of modernization and industrialization. People move out to access education and employment (2011 Census).

Reason for in migration in Karnataka
In the past decade itself around 37 lakh students have left their home states to study in Karnataka, the most popular choice for migrating students in India. This is mainly because of improvement of quality education, emergence of

Volume: 13, Issue: 3 March 2025| Impact Factor (SJIF 2025):8.737 | Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2712 ISSN: 2277 – 5692
International Journal of Southern Economic Light (JSEL)
- Peer Review Journal

new private universities, new IITs, new IIMs and greater awareness levels, students prefer to change states and not countries.

More than 85 percent of in-migrants are from the neighbouring state of Andhra Pradesh, Tamilnadu, Maharastra and Kerala while, 94 percent of out-migrants from Karnataka going to the neighbouring state of Maharastra, Andhra Pradesh, Tamilnadu, Kerala and Goa in 2001 (Census,2001)..

Table 4
Population share in rural-urban areas in Karnataka

Social Group	Rural – Urban
SCs	71.6 – 28.4
STs	80.7 – 19.3
Others	57.2 – 42.8
All	61.9 – 38.1

(Source: Census of India, 2011)

Table 5
Rate of migration according to social groups in Karnataka

Total	38
Scheduled Castes	34
Scheduled Tribes	25.7
OBCs	41
Others	38

(Source: National Sample Survey (2007-08).

Details of districtwise Rural -Urban migration, Number of migrant persons and Percentage to total n Karnataka.

Table 6

Sl.No	Districts/State		Persons	Percentage to total	Male	Female
1.	Belagavi	Rural-Urban	259,566	6.50	5.63	7.30
		Urban-Rural	197,474	10.60	10.74	10.50
2.	Bagalkot	Rural-Urban	105,377	2.64	2.11	3.12
		Urban-Rural	61,881	3.32	3.32	3.32
3.	Bijapur	Rural-Urban	86,244	2.16	1.96	2.34
		Urban-Rural	53,798	2.90	2.70	3.01
4.	Bidar	Rural-Urban	68,715	1.72	1.39	2.02
		Urban-Rural	32,278	1.73	1.12	2.14
5.	Raichur	Rural-Urban	63,385	1.60	1.41	1.74
		Urban-Rural	39,561	2.12	1.74	2.38
6.	Koppal	Rural-Urban	42,708	1.07	0.94	1.18
		Urban-Rural	41,722	2.22	2.05	2.36
7.	Gadag	Rural-Urban	70,565	1.77	1.43	2.07
		Urban-Rural	40,025	2.15	2.27	2.06
8.	Dharwad	Rural-Urban	140,570	3.52	3.27	3.74
		Urban-Rural	60,506	3.25	3.61	3.00
9.	Uttara Kannada	Rural-Urban	65,380	1.64	1.39	1.86
		Urban-Rural	146,928	7.90	9.20	7.00
10.	Haveri	Rural-Urban	75,369	1.90	1.64	2.11
		Urban-Rural	54,763	2.94	2.81	3.02
11.	Bellary	Rural-Urban	133,378	3.34	3.10	3.57
		Urban-Rural	53,429	2.87	2.45	3.15

Continued on next page

Volume: 13, Issue: 3 March 2025| Impact Factor (SJIF 2025):8.737 | Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2712 ISSN: 2277 – 5692
International Journal of Southern Economic Light (JSEL)
- Peer Review Journal

12.	Chitrdurga	Rural-Urban	60,906	1.53	1.48	1.50
		Urban-Rural	35,306	1.90	1.73	2.00
13.	Davangere	Rural-Urban	100,669	2.52	2.38	2.64
		Urban-Rural	46,071	2.47	2.37	2.54
14.	Shimoga	Rural-Urban	102,465	2.57	2.44	2.68
		Urban-Rural	75,431	4.05	4.10	4.01
15.	Udupi	Rural-Urban	74,678	1.87	1.64	2.08
		Urban-Rural	119,643	6.42	7.55	5.66
16.	Chikmagalur	Rural-Urban	44,085	1.10	0.99	1.21
		Urban-Rural	51,424	2.76	2.74	2.77
17.	Tumkur	Rural-Urban	119,786	3.00	2.80	3.18
		Urban-Rural	74,176	3.98	3.80	4.10
18.	Bangaluru	Rural-Urban	1,459,747	36.58	42.86	30.9
		Urban-Rural	115,911	6.22	7.68	5.24
19.	Mandya	Rural-Urban	60,208	1.51	1.32	1.67
		Urban-Rural	54,855	2.94	2.73	3.08
20.	Hassan	Rural-Urban	91,258	2.29	2.14	2.42
		Urban-Rural	42,170	2.26	2.04	2.41
21.	Dakshina Kannada	Rural-Urban	225,369	5.65	5.09	6.15
		Urban-Rural	123,106	6.61	7.46	6.03
22.	Kodagu	Rural-Urban	16,032	0.40	0.39	0.41
		Urban-Rural	46,461	2.49	2.79	2.29
23.	Mysuru	Rural-Urban	160,305	4.02	3.97	4.05
		Urban-Rural	63,085	3.39	3.24	3.48
24.	Chamarajanagara	Rural-Urban	28,656	0.72	0.55	0.87
		Urban-Rural	23,048	1.24	1.08	1.34
25.	Kalaburagi	Rural-Urban	103,319	2.59	2.38	2.77
		Urban-Rural	46,731	2.51	1.69	3.06
26.	Yadgiri	Rural-Urban	36,140	0.90	0.70	1.09
		Urban-Rural	20,195	1.08	0.81	1.26
27.	Kolar	Rural-Urban	59,146	1.48	1.40	1.55
		Urban-Rural	31,424	1.69	0.99	2.15
28.	Chikkaballapura	Rural-Urban	52,871	1.32	1.21	1.42
		Urban-Rural	31,914	1.71	1.35	1.95
29.	BangaluruRural	Rural-Urban	45,199	1.13	1.12	1.14
		Urban-Rural	47,282	2.54	2.34	2.67
30.	Ramanagara	Rural-Urban	38,536	0.96	0.88	1.03
		Urban-Rural	32,226	1.73	1.48	1.90
	Karnataka	Rural-Urban	3,990,632		1,893,247	2,097,385
		Urban-Rural	1,862,824		749,754	1,113,070

Source: [13]

The above table indicate Rural-Urban, Urban-Rural migrants, percentage to total and corresponding rankings of various districts in Karnataka.(Source: https://ijed.in/).

Rural-Urban Population

As cited in the latest Economic Survey 2023-24, it is expected that by 2030, more than 40 percent of India's population will live in urban areas. This estimation has been made on the basis of studies and reports of NITI Aayog (PIB Delhi, August 2024).

Volume: 13, Issue: 3 March 2025| Impact Factor (SJIF 2025):8.737 | Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2712 ISSN: 2277 – 5692
International Journal of Southern Economic Light (JSEL)
- Peer Review Journal

In addition, so far as the information on migration is concerned, in the Periodic Labour Force Survey (PLFS) conducted by Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation (MoSPI) during July 2020 – June 2021, information has been collected on migration particulars of the household members. The percentage of internal migrants by four types of rural-urban migration streams (i.e rural areas to rural areas, rural areas to urban areas, urban areas to rural areas and urban areas to urban areas) is given in the table as follows:

Table 7

Rural to rural	Urban to rural	Rural to urban	Urban to urban	Total
55.0	10.2	18.9	15.9	100.00

Source: Minister of State (Independent Charge), Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation (MoSPI).
The above table indicate percentage of people migrated from rural to rural, Urban to rural, Rural to urban Urban to urban areas.

Table 8
Urban And Rural Populations (1960 To 2023)

Year	Population	Urban Population %	Annual % Growth	Rural Population %
1960	445,954,579	17.92%		82.08%
1961	456,351,876	18.03%	2.95%	81.97%
1962	467,024,193	18.22%	3.39%	81.78%
1963	477,933,619	18.41%	3.39%	81.59%
1964	489,059,309	18.60%	3.38%	81.40%
1965	500,114,346	18.79%	3.31%	81.21%
1966	510,992,617	18.98%	3.22%	81.02%
1967	521,987,069	19.17%	3.20%	80.83%
1968	533,431,909	19.37%	3.23%	80.63%
1969	545,314,670	19.56%	3.26%	80.44%
1970	557,501,301	19.76%	3.27%	80.24%
1971	569,999,178	19.99%	3.44%	80.01%
1972	582,837,973	20.32%	3.94%	79.68%
1973	596,107,483	20.65%	3.95%	79.35%
1974	609,721,951	20.99%	3.96%	79.01%
1975	623,524,219	21.33%	3.92%	78.67%
1976	637,451,448	21.68%	3.89%	78.32%
1977	651,685,628	22.03%	3.88%	77.97%
1978	666,267,760	22.38%	3.88%	77.62%
1979	681,248,383	22.74%	3.88%	77.26%
1980	696,828,385	23.10%	3.92%	76.90%
1981	712,869,298	23.42%	3.71%	76.58%
1982	729,169,466	23.65%	3.29%	76.35%
1983	745,826,546	23.88%	3.29%	76.12%
1984	762,895,156	24.11%	3.29%	75.89%
1985	780,242,084	24.35%	3.27%	75.65%
1986	797,878,993	24.58%	3.26%	75.42%
1987	815,716,125	24.82%	3.23%	75.18%
1988	833,729,681	25.06%	3.20%	74.94%
1989	852,012,673	25.31%	3.18%	74.69%

Source: Census Reports

Volume: 13, Issue: 3 March 2025| Impact Factor (SJIF 2025):8.737 | Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2712 ISSN: 2277 – 5692
International Journal of Southern Economic Light (JSEL)
- Peer Review Journal

The above table indicate the changing trends in rural and urban population.
Urban Population was 17.92 % in 1960 which is now 36.36% Urban population grew by 2.19%.
in 2023. In 2023 Rural Population grew by 0.03% only.Urban Population has become double of its size from 1960.

Recommendation

- Central and State Governments should take appropriate initiation to enhance quality infrastructure facilities in rural areas. So,that unnecessary rural-urban migration can be avoided.
- Central and State Governments, Self help groups and Non Government organizations Governments and non-government agencies should take appropriate initiation to invest on long term projects to enhance the economic, social and financial infrastructure. Town planning should be made in towns and cities.

CONCLUSION

In the modern era migration issue is playing dominant role. Few people go for return migration ie., going back to urban areas with appropriate reasons. In spite of tendency of return migration , rural urban migration ie in the state level people migrate from village to holies, hoblies to taluks, taluks to district, from various districts to Bangalore city in Karnataka. Rural urban migration surely enhances the income level of the migrated population. As a result of that enhancement in standard of living, human development index among migrated people can be expected. Further, with the enhanced rural-urban migration one can expect individual development, human development, Increased GDP growth rate, State domestic product, faster rate of development of the economy.

REFERENCES

1. *Andaleeb Rahman , and Arjun SrinivasView all authors and affiliations: Migration Along Bengaluru's Rural–Urban Continuum: Implications for Household Well-being and Climate Change Adaptation, Indian Journal of Human Development, May 2, 2024*
2. *R. B. Bhagat, Archana K. Roy, Harihar Sahoo Taylor & Francis: Migration and Urban Transition in India: A Development Perspective, 4 May 2020.*
3. *Bernard Attah-Out, Angan Sengupta and Tony McAleavy, There and back again: dynamics of temporary labor migration, insights from rural India, Migration and Society, Front. Sociol., Volume 9, 06 August 2024.*
4. *Brinda Viswanathan and K.S. Kavi Kumar: Weather, agriculture and rural migration: evidence from state and district level migration in India, 18 March 2015, Oxford University Press.*
5. *Chandni Singh PhD, Ritwika Basu: Moving in and out of vulnerability: Interrogating migration as an adaptation strategy along a rural–urban continuum in India, Geographical Journal, 13 September 2019.*
6. *Harris Selod, Forhad Shilpi: Rural-urban migration in developing countries: Lessons from the literature, Regional Science and Urban Economics,Elsevier, Volume 91, November 2021.*
7. *Mayumi Murayama: Academia:Rural to Urban Migration: A District-Level Analysis for India, International Journal of Migration, Health and Social Care, Research Gate, 2009.*
8. *Namma KPSC: Migration in Karnataka, April 3rd,2024.*
9. *Rakesh Kumar Bhati: A study of Rural To Urban Migration In India,., Conference: ASM's International E-Journal on Ongoing Research in Management and IT, January 2015.*
10. *Sibsankar Mal: Causes and Consequences of Rural-Urban Migration in India: A Qualitative Study, GRIN Verlag, 5 Jul 2021.*