Arts and Social Sciences Journal

Ali et al., Arts Social Sci J 2015, 6:5
http://dx.doi.org/10.4172/2151-6200.1000144

Research Article Open Access

Causes and Effects of Rural-Urban Migration in Rural Areas of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa-Pakistan

Ali H[1]*, Shafi MM[2], Rehman MU[1] and Jadoon MA[3]

[1]*Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, The University of Agriculture, Peshawar, Pakistan*

[2]*Faculty of Rural Social Science, The University of Agriculture, Peshawar, Pakistan*

[3]*Department of Rural Sociology, University of Agriculture, Peshawar, Pakistan*

Abstract

The main objective of the study was to see the effect of migration on household income in rural areas of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa-Pakistan especially in district Peshawar. A total of 93 sampled respondents were purposively interviewed. The study indicates that about 71% of the total respondents migrated with their families during the period (2001-2010). The study revealed that war against terror, quality education, and employment were observed as major causes of rural-urban migration. Paired t-test was used to see before and after effect of migration on household income and expenditure. Moreover, after migration the monthly income and expenditure of the respondents increased. The earning members of 69.9% of the respondents increased after migration. The joint families were scattered in to nuclear family. Before migration farming were the main occupation of about 42% of the respondents while after migration most of them were engaged with private jobs and some have their own business. The education ratio of 83.9% of the respondents increased with migration. Positive changes have been observed in pre and post facilities under consideration. It is recommended that basic facilities like education, health and creation of off-farm jobs, improved training opportunities and development programs should be provided to rural peoples.

Keywords: Rural-urban migration; Push and pull factors; Paired t-test; Khyber Pakhtunkhwa

Introduction

The UN reported that half of the world populations live in cities and expected that this will rise to 60% by 2030. In Nigeria and other developing countries, population in cities is estimated to increase from 1.9 billion in 2000 to 3.9 billion in 2030. This is principally due to rural to urban migration which is consequent upon the dichotomous planning and development which many developing countries adopted especially after independence. These results in the rural underprivileged and the urban gifted that translates into better facilities and economic opportunities in these urban centers than the rural areas [1].

The process of migration especially internal migration in Pakistan is an old phenomenon. It not only improves the socio-economic condition of the migrant households but also provides opportunities for employment [2]. In Pakistan both the volume and nature of internal migration have varied overtime and so their impact on migrant households and on economy [3].

In Pakistan the urban population is 35% of the total population and its average annual growth rate is 3.4% (1990-2005) which is higher as compared to South Asia's figure of 2.8% in the same years. The status of life time migrants in the total population of 12 largest cities of Pakistan was about 15%, who moved into these cities from other districts of Pakistan [4].

According to 1998 census the total population of Peshawar is 2.02 million, in which male are 1.061 million and female are 0.958 million i.e., 11.38% of the population of KPK resides in Peshawar. Migrants from other parts of KPK and other provinces of Pakistan are about 46.62% out of total population. The total number of life-time in-migrants in KPK was 0.647 million (3.7% of the population of KPK).

The Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) is situated in the northwest of Pakistan, lying between the province of Baluchistan, Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa, and the neighboring country of Afghanistan. Majority of the people migrated to district Peshawar Khyber Pakhtunkhwa-Pakistan in search of livelihood and employment opportunities. The remittances sent by these migrants significantly develop the rural economy and prosperity of the rural people [5].

Business competition in Peshawar among the rural and urban population has been another positive effect of rural-urban migration, which accelerates the pace of economic and regional development. But further measures are required to increase the intermingling and assimilation of the rural and urban communities. Thus, while rural migrants from the FATA region are in the process of adjusting to urban life, they are exposed to and often adopt new ways of thinking, behaving and doing things that allow them to cope with problems and complexities of urban living. Other problems which adversely affect the progress of Peshawar to increase the rural-urban integration include administrative weaknesses, uneven development, rural-urban bias, and careless planning policies [6].

Peshawar city is also suffering a problem of rural urban migration which has somehow disturbed the valves, normative, structure, and urban development planning. So this study will be mainly conducted through this connection. Peshawar city is on the way to the development and progress in each and every sphere of life. It not only provide the livelihood opportunities to local and migrants in the form of various

***Corresponding author:** Ali H, Scholar, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, The University of Agriculture, Peshawar, Pakistan, Tel: +923339350722; E-mail: haiderkpk59@gmail.com

Received November 13, 2015; **Accepted** December 07, 2015; **Published** December 11, 2015

Citation: Ali H, Shafi MM, Rehman MU, Jadoon MA (2015) Causes and Effects of Rural-Urban Migration in Rural Areas of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa-Pakistan. Arts Social Sci J 6: 144. doi:10.4172/2151-6200.1000144

trade center and small industries but also provide the basic facilities like health, education, transport, communication, water supply and drainage system.

Thus this study is directed to find out the causes influencing the migration from rural areas to Peshawar city and also to dig out the impact of migration including the adjustment problem of the migrants too. It is prospected that this study will help to minimize the problems of the migrants and also make a sure through check on the erotic progress of urbanization.

Main objective were to find out the pull and push factors of rural-urban migration as well as to see the effect of migration on house hold income in the selected villages of district Peshawar, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa-Pakistan.

Materials and Methods

Khyber Pakhtunkhwa-Pakistan constituted the universe of the study. As the study examines the migrants households in the rural areas of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa-Pakistan specifically district Peshawar. The study was conducted in rural areas (namely Wazir colony and Latifabad No.1) of district Peshawar because there were migrant households. In these two areas there were total 930 migrant households. Due to limited time and resources only 10% of the total migrant households were taken as a sample size. According to Roscoe sample size above 30 and below 500 are appropriate for research [7]. The data was analyzed in SPSS program using simple frequency distributions and percentages. A paired t-test was applied to see the significance of the difference between the income of the respondents before and after migration. Recommendations were made on the basis of personal observations.

$$t = \frac{\bar{d}}{s_d / \sqrt{n}} \quad (1)$$

Which under null hypothesis (H_0) follows a, distribution with $_{(n-1)}$ degree of freedom.

In equation (1),

n = number of pairs; $d = X_A - X_B; \bar{d} = \sum d / n$ and

$s_d = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1}\left[\sum d^2 - \frac{(\sum d)^2}{n}\right]}$, is the standard deviation.

Results

Table 1 illustrates that 27.9% of the sampled respondents belonged to the age group 20-30 years, 30.1% and 28% of sampled respondents were in the age group 31-40 and 41-50 years respectively. 14% of the sampled respondents had age above 50 years. Comparison of age of sampled respondents of both villages shows that in Wazir colony, 18.3% of the sampled respondents have age group 41-50 years, whereas in Latifabad No.1 about 17.2% of the sampled respondents fall in the age group 31-40 years. Table as a whole conclude that majority of the respondents were young. Usually individuals of this age group are considered more energetic and more responsible to meet the needs of themselves as well as of their youngsters. So, they decide easily to migrate in search of better future.

Age group (years)	Locations				Total	
	Wazir colony		Latifabad No. 1			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
20-30 years	15	16.1	11	11.8	26	27.9
31-40 years	12	12.9	16	17.2	28	30.1
41-50 years	17	18.3	9	9.7	26	28
Above 50 years	8	8.6	5	5.4	13	14
Total	52	55.9	41	44.1	93	100

Source: Field survey, 2012

Table 1: Distribution of sampled respondents on the basis of age group.

Age group (years)	Locations				Total	
	Wazir colony		Latifabad No. 1			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Married	44	47.3	35	37.6	79	84.9
Unmarried	8	8.6	6	6.5	14	15.1
Total	52	55.9	41	44.1	93	100

Source: Field survey, 2012

Table 2: Distribution of sampled respondents on the basis of marital status.

Educational status	Wazir colony		Latifabad No.1		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Illiterate	36	38.7	29	31.2	65	69.9
Literate	16	17.2	12	12.9	28	30.1
Literacy level						
Primary	6	6.5	4	4.3	10	10.8
Middle	1	1.1	2	2.1	3	3.2
Matric	1	1.1	2	2.1	3	3.2
Intermediate	1	1.1	-	-	1	1.1
graduation	3	3.2	2	2.2	5	5.4
Master	2	2.1	2	2.2	4	4.3
Other	2	2.1	-	-	2	2.1
Total	52	55.9	41	44.1	93	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 3: Distribution of sampled respondents on the basis of educational level.

Table 2 concludes that about (84.9%) of the sample respondents were married while the rest (15.1%) were unmarried. Out of the total married respondents, 47% belonged to wazir colony while 38% were from Latifabad No.1. Whereas out of 15.1% unmarried respondents, 8.6% belonged to wazir colony while 6.5% were from Latifabad No.1. Data shows that majority of the respondents were married. In study area most of the people came from FATA. In these regions mostly people believe on early marriages.

Table 3 reveals that majority (69.9%) of the sampled respondents were illiterate, whereas 30.1% were literate. Out of total (30.1%) literate (10.8%) of the sampled respondents were having education up to primary level, (3.2%) were up to middle, (3.2%) were up to matric, (1.1%) were up to intermediate, (5.4%) were graduates, (4.3%) were master degree holders while the remaining (2.1%) were doctors. There are more literate migrants in wazir colony as compared to Latifabad No.1 because they migrated earlier as compared to Latifabad No.1. The table as a whole shows that majority of the respondents was illiterate because they were not availing better educational facilities and opportunities or were engaged in different income generating activities to support their family members. While small numbers of the respondents were literate in which most of them having education up to primary level.

Data regarding the family size of the sampled respondents is given in Table 4. It is clear from the table that about (40.9%) of the respondents were having 5-8 family members followed by (29%) who live with 1-4 family members. It is evident from the table that minimum i.e., 18.3% and 11.8% of respondents were having family size of 9-12

Locations	1-4		5-8		9-12		Above 12		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Wazir colony	10	10.7	22	23.7	12	12.9	8	8.6	52	55.9
Latifabad No.1	17	18.3	16	17.2	5	5.4	3	3.2	41	44.1
Total	27	29	38	40.9	17	18.3	11	11.8	93	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 4: Distribution of sample respondents on the basis of family size.

Year of Migration	Locations				Total	
	Wazir colony		Latifabad No. 1			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1990-2000	10	10.7	8	8.6	18	19.3
2001-2010	37	39.8	29	31.2	66	71
2011 On-ward	5	5.4	4	4.3	9	9.7
Total	52	55.9	41	44.1	93	100

Source: Field survey, 2012

Table 5: Distribution of sampled respondents on the basis of period of migration.

Place of migration	Locations				Total	
	Wazir colony		Latifabad No. 1			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Rural	39	41.9	31	33.3	70	75.3
Sub urban	10	10.8	8	8.6	18	19.3
Urban	3	3.2	2	2.2	5	5.4
Total	52	55.9	41	44.1	93	100

Source: Field survey, 2012

Table 6: Distribution of sampled respondents on the basis of area migrated.

and above 12 members respectively. In research area family size was large because majority of the respondents migrated from rural areas where each house hold has more members because they considered it as a source of income.

Table 5 shows that 19.3% of the sampled respondents were migrated in the period of 1990-2000, about 71% of sampled respondents were migrated in the period of 2001-2010 while 9.7% of sampled respondents were migrated in 2011 and onward. The number of respondents migrated to Wazir colony was 10.7% in the period of 1990-2000, 39.8% in the period of 2001-2010 and only 5.4% in 2011 and onward. Whereas respondents migrated to Latifabad No.1 in the period of 1990-2000 were 8.6%, while in 2001-2010 and 2011 and onward 31.2% and 4.3% of the sampled respondents were migrated respectively. The data indicates that majority of the respondents migrated from FATA and Malakand division because of conflict, insurgency, and military operation since 2008. Some of the people migrated because of better life in cities.

Table 6 illustrates that majority 75.3% of sampled respondents came from rural areas. About 19.3% came from suburban and only 5.4% came from urban. About 55.9% of the migrants were settled in Wazir colony and 44.1% in Latifabad No.1. Results reveal that most of the respondents migrated from the rural areas because of lack of security, unemployment, and lack of other social facilities in these areas.

Data regarding migration with family or alone is given in Table 7. The data shows that majority (93.5%) of sampled respondents were migrated along with their families while (6.5%) of the sampled respondents were migrated alone. About 55.9% of the sampled respondents told that they migrated with family to wazir colony whereas 44.1% settled in Latifabad No.1 with family. All of the alone 6.5% respondents were from Wazir colony. Table as a whole conclude that majority of the sampled respondents were migrated with families because most of the respondents leave their native land due to push factors that's why they migrated along with their families.

According to Table 8a economic motives loom large in all human movements, but are particularly important with regards to migration. Better economic opportunities, more jobs, and the promise of a better life often pull people towards a new place. Sometimes this is encouraged by the destination country, such as the employment campaign in the Caribbean by London bus companies in the 1960s, which actively recruited young men to move to London to work as bus drivers, often followed by their families. Another example might be the 'brain drain' to America that occurred in the latter half of the 20th Century from several other Western nations. Pull factors exist at destination point and these are mostly positive factors. In my research area the pull factors include better educational facilities available in Peshawar city, more employment opportunities and an opportunity to acquire skill and gain new experience. Table 8a indicates that 41.9% of the respondents migrated due to pull factors. Out of these about 17.2% were migrated for educational facilities, 16.1% were for employment opportunities, and 8.6% were migrated to acquire skill and gain new experience.

Table 8b illustrates that economic push factors are often the exact reversal of pull factors, lack of economic opportunities and

Migration with	Locations				Total	
	Wazir colony		Latifabad No. 1			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Family	46	49.4	41	44.1	87	93.5
Alone	6	6.5	-	-	6	6.5
Total	52	55.9	41	44.1	93	100

Source: Field survey, 2012

Table 7: Distribution of sampled respondents on the basis of migration with family or alone.

Pull factors of migrations	Wazir colony		Latifabad No.1		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Educational facilities	6	6.4	10	10.7	16	17.2
Employment opportunity	10	10.7	5	5.4	15	16.1
Acquire skill and gain new experience	5	5.4	3	3.2	8	8.6
Total	21	22.5	18	19.3	39	41.9

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 8a: Distribution of respondents on the basis of pull factors.

Pull factors of migrations	Wazir colony		Latifabad No.1		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
enmity at village	2	2.2	-	-	2	2.2
familial conflict	2	2.2	1	1.1	3	3.3
Religious harassment	-	-	2	2.2	2	2.2
inadequate health facilities	5	5.4	3	3.2	8	8.6
War against terrorism	22	23.6	17	18.3	39	41.9
Total	31	33.4	23	24.8	54	58.2

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 8b: Distribution of respondents according to push factors.

employment opportunities are often push people to look out of their origin to their futures area. One such example is the migration of the people of Mexican and other Central American countries into the United States, where they often work low-wage, long-hour jobs in farming, construction and domestic labor. It is difficult to classify this case purely with push factors however, as often the factors associated with the country of origin are just as important as the factors associated with the country of destination. Forced migration has also been used for economic gain, such as the 20 million men, women and children who were forcibly carried as slaves to the Americas between the 16th and 18th Centuries. Push factors exist at the point of origin and mostly these are negative factors. In the research area push factors are enmity at village, familial conflict, religious harassment, inadequate health facilities and war against terrorism. Table 4 reveals that (2.2%) of sample respondents migrated due enmity at village, (3.2%) migrated because of familial conflict, (2.2%) left their native land due to religious harassment, (8.6%) migrated due to inadequate health facilities while (41.9%) migrated because of war against terrorism. It is clear from the study that more than half of the respondents migrated due push factors so; it is a dominant cause of migration. The reason for this is the recent war of Pakistan army against terror.

Table 9 shows that before migration (40.8%) of respondents have income up to 8000, (35.5%) were in the income group of 8001-16000, (18.3%) were in the income group of 16001-24000 and (5.4%) have income above 24000. After migration the monthly income of the migrants was high. (12.9%) of respondents were income up to 8000, (28%) were in the income group of 8001-16000, (39.8%) were in the income group of 16001-24000 and only (19.3%) have income above 24000. The results are in line with Zanker et al. [8] who studied the effects of internal migration on the wellbeing of migrants and their families and how it affects the relationship between family members. They concluded that migrant households earn higher incomes after migration.

In Table 10 the data was split on the basis of locations. In order to test the income difference before and after migration, we incorporated paired t-test carried out separately for each location to test the hypothesis about two means with paired sources. Since the t-calculated value of both locations falls in the critical region, because probability value is much smaller than level of significance i.e., 0.000 < 0.05, so we reject our null hypothesis and conclude that there is significant difference between the two means and the results were significant at 95% significance level.

Income group	Wazir colony		Latifabad No.1	
	No.	%	No.	%
Bellow 8000	38	40.8	12	12.9
8001-16000	33	35.5	26	28
16001-24000	17	18.3	37	39.8
Above 24000	5	5.4	18	19.3
Total	93	100	93	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 9: Distribution of sampled respondents on the basis of monthly income.

Villages	Mean before migration	Mean after migration	Difference	t-value	p-value
Wazir colony	12432.69	19653.84	7221.15	13.191	.000
Latifabad No.1	11170.73	17902.43	6731.7	11.443	.000

Source: Field Survey, 2012-Significant at 95% level

Table 10: Effect of migration on household income.

Income group	Wazir colony		Latifabad No.1	
	No.	%	No.	%
Bellow 8000	48	51.6	17	18.3
8001-16000	34	36.5	38	40.9
16001-24000	9	9.7	28	30.1
Above 24000	2	2.2	10	10.7
Total	93	100	93	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 11: Distribution of sampled respondents on the basis of monthly expenditure.

Description	Earning members in each Locations				Total	
	Wazir colony		Latifabad No. 1			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Increased	36	38.7	29	31.2	65	69.9
Decreased	2	2.2	2	2.2	4	4.4
Constant	14	15	10	10.7	24	25.7
Total	52	55.9	41	44.1	93	100

Source: Field survey, 2012

Table 12: Distribution of sampled respondents on the basis of earning members.

Income group	Wazir colony		Latifabad No.1	
	No.	%	No.	%
Farming	39	41.9	-	-
Labor	14	15	15	16.1
Government servant	8	8.6	10	10.8
private job	12	12.9	20	21.5
Business	9	9.7	18	19.4
Driver	6	6.5	16	17.2
Technician	5	5.4	14	15
Total	93	100	93	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 13: Distribution of sampled respondents on the basis of occupations.

The monthly expenditure of respondents increased after migration. Table 11 indicates that before migration monthly expenditure of (51.6%) of sampled respondents were up to 8000, (36.5%) were in the group of 8001-16000, (9.7%) were in the expenditure group of 16001-24000 and only (2.2%) of respondents have expenditure above 24000. While after migration the expenditure of (18.3%) of respondents were up to 8000, (40.9%) were in the expenditure group of 8001-16000, (30.1%) of respondents were in the expenditure group of 16001-24000 and about (10.7%) have expenditure above 24000.

Table 12 describes that earning members of majority (69.9%) of respondents increased with migration. The earning members of (4.3%) respondents decreased while the earning members of remaining (25.8%) respondents remain constant. Table as a whole shows that with migration there is in increase in the earning members of the majority of the respondents.

Table 13 shows that before migration farming was the main occupation of (41.9%) of sample respondents. (15%) were labor, government servants were (8.6%), respondents who were involved in private jobs were (12.9%), respondents having their own business were (9.7%), respondents having occupation of driver were (6.5%), and about (5.4%) were technician. After migration no one engaged with farming, (16.1%) were labor, (10.8%) were involved in government services, (21.5%) were having occupation of private job, (19.4%) of respondents having their own business, (17.2%) were driver, (15%) were technician.

Table as a whole shows that before migration occupation of most of the respondents was farming while after migration most of the respondents were engaged with private jobs and business.

Table 14 illustrates that before migrations majority (86%) of respondents was living in joint family system while (14%) of sample respondents were living in nuclear family system. After migration sample respondents that were living in joint family system were (30.1%) while (69.9%) of sample respondents were living in nuclear family system. Table as a whole conclude that before migration majority of the respondents belonged to joint family system while after migration most of the respondents belonged to nuclear family system. The results are in line with Yasin et al. [9]. They analyzed that unplanned urbanization give rise to environmental issues, including pollution, poor drainage system, poor quality of drinking water, and poor hygienic conditions. The research was carried out in Multan city in Pakistan, through field survey of 200 respondents. The results illustrate that urbanization is one of the major causes of changing joint family system to nuclear family system [10-16].

Table 15 illustrates that (19.3%) of sample respondents were living in pacca houses before migration while after migration this increased to (91.4%). Before migration (28%) of sample respondents had semi-pacca houses while after migration there were (8.6%) of respondents having semi-pacca houses. Majority (52.7%) of respondents had kacha/mud houses before migration while after migration this ratio was zero. Table as a whole conclude that before migration most of the respondents were living in kacha/mud houses while majority of the respondents were living in pacca houses after migration.

Table 16 shows that before migration majority (74.2%) of respondents was the owner of their own houses while after migration this reduced to (38.7%). Before migration (8.6%) of respondents were living in rented houses while after migration (61.3%) of respondents were living in rented houses. There were (17.2%) of respondents who were living in not rented houses before migration while after migration this trend is zero. Table as a whole indicates that majority of the respondents were the owner of houses before migration while after migration most of the respondents were living in rented houses [16-25].

Locations	Family System											
	Before migration						After migration					
	Joint Family		Nuclear Family		Total		Joint family		Nuclear family		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Wazir colony	45	48.4	7	7.5	52	55.9	16	17.2	36	38.7	52	55.9
Latifabad No.1	35	37.6	6	6.5	41	44.1	12	12.9	29	31.2	41	44.1
Total	80	86	13	14	93	100	28	30.1	65	69.9	93	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012.

Table 14: Distribution of sampled respondents on the basis of family system.

Condition of House	Family System											
	Before migration						After migration					
	Wazir colony		Latifabad No.1		Total		Wazir colony		Latifabad No.1		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Pacca	10	10.8	8	8.6	18	19.3	48	51.6	37	39.8	85	91.4
Semi-Pacca	14	15	12	12.9	26	28	4	4.3	4	4.3	8	8.6
Kacha/ mud house	28	30.1	21	22.6	49	52.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	52	55.9	41	44.1	93	100	52	55.9	41	44.1	93	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012.

Table 15: Distribution of sampled respondents on the basis of house conditions.

House Status	Before migration						After migration					
	Wazir colony		Latifabad No.1		Total		Wazir colony		Latifabad No.1		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Own	39	41.9	30	32.3	69	74.2	20	21.5	16	17.2	36	38.7
Rented	4	4.3	4	4.3	8	8.6	32	34.4	25	26.9	57	61.3
Non-Rented	9	9.7	7	7.5	16	17.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	52	55.9	41	44.1	93	100	52	55.9	41	44.1	93	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012.

Table 16: Distribution of sampled respondents on the basis of house status.

Facilities	Before migration		After migration	
	No.	%	No.	%
Electricity	93	100	93	100
Gas	18	19.4	86	92.5
Telephone	36	38.7	93	100
Water supply	24	25.8	93	100
Health	20	21.5	93	100
Education	42	45.2	93	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 17: Distribution on the basis of facilities available to sampled respondents.

Education ratio increase in your family			If no reason			
			Child labor		costly education	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	78	83.9	-	-	-	-
No	15	16.1	9	60	6	40
Total	93	100	9	60	6	40

Source: Field Survey, 2012.

Table 18: Distribution of sample respondents on the basis of education ratio.

Table 17 shows that before migration electricity was available to (100%) of respondents, gas was available to (19.4%) of respondents, telephone facilities were available to (38.7%) of respondents, (25.8%) of respondents having facilities of water supply, (21.5%) having health facilities and (45.2%) having education facilities. After migration gas facilities was available to (92.5%) of respondents, while educational, health, telephone, water supply and electricity were available to all respondents. Table as a whole shows that there was increase in the existing facilities of the sampled respondents after migration.

Table 18 shows that (83.9%) of sample respondents reported that their education ratio has increased after migration. While (16.1%) of sample respondents reported that their educational ratio has not increased with migration. Among these (16.1%) of respondents; (60%) of respondents prefer for their children to do some work rather than to get education while (40%) of respondents reported that they can't afford the high cost of their children's education [26-28].

Conclusion

The effect of migration on household income in rural areas of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa-Pakistan especially in district Peshawar,

positive changes have been observed in pre and post facilities under consideration and it is recommended that basic facilities like education, health and creation of off-farm jobs, improved training opportunities and development programs should be provided to rural peoples.

References

1. The United Nations (2014) Human Settlements Program (UN-HABITAT).
2. Arif GM (2014) Internal Migration and Household Well-being-Myth or Reality. In: Oda H (eds.) Internal Labour Migration in Pakistan. Institute of Developing Economies, Japan.
3. Naseem SM (2014) Underdevelopment, Poverty and Inequality in Pakistan. Vanguard Publication Ltd.
4. Helbock WR (2013) Differential Urban Growth and Distance Considerations in Domestic Migration Flows in Pakistan. The Pakistan Development Review 14: 1-15.
5. Shinwari NA (2010) Understanding FATA - Attitude towards governance, religion and society in Pakistan's federally administered Tribal areas. Community appraisal and motivation program 4: 122-136.
6. Khan A (2005) Urban centers as a catalyst for Socio-Economic and Regional Development in TWC's - A case study of Peshawar, KPK, Pakistan. Gomal University, Pakistan.
7. Roscoe JT (1975) Fundamental research statistics for behavioral sciences pp: 295.
8. Zanker H, Jessica H (2011) Causes and effect of migration on migrant households in source countries.
9. Yasin G, Sattar S, Faiz FA (2012) Rapid Urbanization as a Source of Social and Ecological Decay - A Case of Multan City. Asian Social Science, Pakistan 8: 180-189.
10. Becker C, Hammer A, Morrison A (1994) Beyond Urban Bias in Africa of Asia. Westview Press, Boulder pp: 143-164.
11. Davis B, Stecklov G (2002) Domestic and international migration from rural Mexico-Disaggregating the effects of network structure and composition Population Studies. Taylor and Francis 56: 291-309.
12. Chaudhry MJ (2004) Socio-economic and Demographic Profile of Balochistan-An Analysis of 1998 Population and Housing census. Institute of Development Economics, Pakistan.
13. Gimba Z, Kumshe MG (2007) Causes and effects of rural-urban migration in Borno state-A case study of Maiduguri metropolis. Asian Journal of Business and Management Sciences. 1: 168-172.
14. Grau HR, Aide TM (2007) Are Rural - Urban Migration and Sustainable Development Compatible in Mountain Systems. Mountain Research and Development 27: 119-123.
15. Hasan A, Raza M (2009) Migration and small towns in Pakistan. International Institute for Environment and Development.
16. Irfan ML, Demery, Arif GM (1983) Migration Pattern in Pakistan - Preliminary Results. Pakistan Institute of Development Economics.
17. Karim M, Nasar A (2003) Migration Patterns and Differentials in Pakistan-Based on the Analysis of 1998 Census Data in Population of Pakistan.
18. Khattak NR (2004) Socio-economic and Demographic Profile of KPK - An Analysis of 1998 Population and Housing Census. Pakistan Institute of Development Economics.
19. Mahmood S, Khan IA, Maann AA, Shahbaz B, Siara C (2010) Role of international migration in agricultural development and farmer's livelihoods - A case study of an agrarian community. University of Agriculture, Pakistan 47: 297-301.
20. Mayda AM (2007) International migration - A panel data analysis of the determinants of bilateral flows. Georgetown University.
21. Munir A (2002) Causes and effects of rural urban migration. NWFP Agricultural University, Pakistan.
22. Naeem J (2004) Socio-economic and Demographic Profile of Punjab Province - An analysis of 1998 Population and Housing Census, Census Monograph Series. Pakistan Institute of Development Economics.
23. Nil DG, Tansel A (2007) Brain Drain from Turkey - The Case of Professionals Abroad. International Journal of Manpower, Turkey.
24. Poveda AR (2007) Determinants and consequences of internal and international migration - The case of rural populations in the south of Veracruz, Mexico. Demographic Research, Mexico 16.
25. Rukanuddin AR, Chaudhry MA (2004) Socio-economic and Demographic Profile of Sindh - An Analysis of 1998 Population and Housing Census; Census' Monograph Series No.3. Institute of Development Economics, Pakistan.
26. Skeldon R (1986) Migration and the population census in Asia and the Pacific - issues, questions and debate. International Migration Review 21: 1074-1100.
27. Stephenson R, Matthews Z, Mcdonald JW (2003) The impact of rural-urban migration on under two mortality in India. Journal of biosocial science 35: 15-31.
28. World Bank (2007) World Development Indicators 2007. The World Bank, Washington.

Citation: Ali H, Shafi MM, Rehman MU, Jadoon MA (2015) Causes and Effects of Rural-Urban Migration in Rural Areas of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa-Pakistan. Arts Social Sci J 6: 144. doi:10.4172/2151-6200.1000144