



# An Inflated Probability Model for the Rural Out-Migration

## Himanshu Pandey\*, Rajendra Tiwari

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, D.D.U.Gorakhpur University, Gorakhpur, 273009 (India)

Article Info	Abstract					
Article History	The main objective of the paper is to develop an inflated Probability model for the total					
Received : 28-05-2011 Revisea : 22-07-2011 Accepted : 27-07-2011	<ul> <li>number of migrants from a household. The suitability of the model is tested through observed data.</li> </ul>					
*Corresponding Author	-					
Tel : +919415282207						
Email: himanshu_pandey62@yahoo.com						
©ScholarJournals, SSR	Key Words: Inflated Probability Model, Displaced Geometric Distribution, Log- Series Distribution, Method of Moments, Method of Maximum Likelihood					

## Introduction

Migration is an important source of major socio-economic change of a nation or region. It is expected that migration incoming decades may play a crucial role in achievement of comprehensive policies and programs regarding spatial distribution of population and hence relating to socio economic cultural and demographic situation of a region particularly in developing countries. It is worth mentioning that the problem of human movement bring policy makers and development–planners to a new level of awareness<sup>[1]</sup>, the relationship between migration and other socio-economic factors, resources environment and sustainable development<sup>[2-3]</sup> on several planning process at the regional as well as national levels.

The rural out–migration <sup>[4-7]</sup> in developing countries like India may be considered of two types: one is which an adult male aged is 15 years and above migrate alone leaving their wives and children at home; and second male members migrate with their wives, children and other dependent relatives. It is seen that these two types of migration affect the socio-economic and cultural activities of origin and destination places of the migrants differently.

In this paper, some probability models are proposed to study the distribution of households according to number of both types of cut migrants as mentioned above at the household level.

The main objective of the paper is to develop an inflated Probability model for the total number of migrants from a household. The suitability of the model is tested through observed data.

## Model

A probability model<sup>[8]</sup> to describe the distribution of households according to the total number of migrants has been derived on the basis of the following assumption.

(i) Let  $\alpha$  be the probability of migration from a household and  $(1 - \alpha)$  be the probability of not migration from a household.

(ii) Two types of household are observed at the survey point. In first type of households, only males of fifteen years aged and above migrate alone and in second type of households, a male member migrates with his family. Let  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$  be the respective proportions of two types of exposure households to the risk of migration such that

$$\pi_1 + \pi_2 = \alpha$$

(iii) The number of migrants occurred in first type of house-hold follows a displaced geometric distribution with parameter p,i.e.,

$$P[Y = K] = pq^{K-1}$$
, K= 1, 2,3,....,p=1-q

where Y be the no. of migrants from the first type of household.

(iv) In second type of households migrants moves with their family member and follows a log - series distribution with parameter  $\lambda$ , i.e.,

P [Z = K] = 
$$\left[\frac{-\lambda^{\kappa}}{K \log(1-\lambda)}\right]$$
, K= 1,2,3, ...  
(2.2)

where Z be the no. of migrants from second type of household.

Let X is the total number of migrants from a household. Therefore from the above assumption (i) to (iv), with the help of Johnson and Kotz <sup>[9]</sup>, inflated form of the distribution for the total number of migrants from a household is

P [X = 0] = 1 - 
$$\alpha$$
 ,K = 0 and

P [X = k] = 
$$\pi_1$$
 pq <sup>K-1</sup> +  $\pi_2 \left[ \frac{-\lambda^K}{k \log(1 - \lambda)} \right]$ , K= 1, 2, 3...  
(2.3)

Estimation:

Probability model consists of four parameter  $\alpha$ , p,  $\lambda$  and  $\pi$ . It is difficult to estimate all these four parameters simultaneously. Therefore supposing  $\pi_1 = \pi_2$ , the remaining parameters are estimated by the method of moment and method of maximum likelihood.

## Method of Moments:

The parameters  $\alpha$ , p and  $\lambda$  are estimated by equating Zeroth and first cell theoretical frequencies to the observed frequencies of the respective cells and theoretical mean equal to observe mean as follows.

$$(1 - \alpha) = \frac{f_0}{f_1} \tag{2.4}$$

$$\pi_{1} \mathbf{p} + \pi_{2} \left[ \frac{-\lambda}{\log (1 - \lambda)} \right] = \frac{\mathbf{f}_{1}}{\mathbf{f}}$$
(2.5)

$$\frac{\pi_{1}}{p} + \pi_{2} \left[ \frac{-\lambda}{(1-\lambda) \log (1-\lambda)} \right] = \bar{X}$$
 (2.6)

where  $f_0$  denotes the no. of observed zeroth cell,

 $f_1$  denotes the no. of observed first cell,  $\,f\,$  denotes the total

no. of observations and  $\overline{\boldsymbol{X}}$  denotes the observed mean of the distribution.

*Method of Maximum Likelihood*:After taking the value of  $\lambda$  from the method of moments and the remaining parameters are estimated by this method. Let X be a random variable from a sample of f observation with the probability function (2.3) then the likelihood function for the given sample can be express as:

$$L = (1 - \alpha)^{f_0} \left( \pi_1 p + \pi_2 \left[ \frac{-\lambda}{\log(1 - \lambda)} \right] \right)^{f_1} \left( \alpha - \pi_1 p - \pi_2 \left[ \frac{-\lambda}{\log(1 - \lambda)} \right] \right)^{f - f_0 - f_1}$$
(2.7)

Let  $\left[\frac{-\lambda}{\log(1-\lambda)}\right] = A$ 

, then the likelihood function become the following form.

$$L = (1 - \alpha)^{f_0} (\pi_1 p + \pi_2 A)^{f_1} (\alpha - \pi_1 p - \pi_2 A)^{f_{-f_0 - f_1}}$$

(2.8)

(2.11)

Taking log on both the side, we get  $LcgL=f_0 lcg(1-\alpha)+f_1 lcg(\pi p+\pi_2 A)+(f-f_0-f_1) lcg(\alpha-\pi p-\pi_2 A)$ (2.9)

Now partially differentiating (2.7) with respect to  $\alpha$  and p respectively and equating to zero we get the following equation.

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} \log L = -\frac{f_0}{(1-\alpha)} + \frac{f-f_0}{\alpha} = 0 \quad (2.10)$$

and 
$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p} log L = \frac{f_1}{(p+A)} - \frac{(f-f_0 - f_1)}{(2-p-A)} = 0$$

By solving the equation (2.10) and (2.11), we get the estimated value of  $\alpha$  and p in the following form.

$$\alpha = f - \frac{f_0}{f}$$
 (2.12) and  
 $p = \frac{2 f_1}{f - f_0} + A$  (2.13)

Now the asymptotic variance of ( $\alpha$ , p) is obtained by inverting the information matrix whose elements are negative of second order of the likelihood function.

The second order derivations of the equations (2.10) and (2.11) are:

$$\frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial \alpha^{2}} \log L = -\left[\frac{f_{0}}{(1-\alpha)^{2}} + \frac{f-f_{0}}{\alpha^{2}}\right]$$

$$\frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial p^{2}} \log L = -\left[\frac{f_{1}}{(p+A)^{2}} + \frac{(f-f_{0}-f_{1})}{(2-(p+A))^{2}}\right]$$
(2.15)

and

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha \partial p} \log L = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial p \partial \alpha} \log L = 0 \qquad (2.16)$$

Since E 
$$[f_0] = f(1 - \alpha)$$
,  
E  $[f_1] = f(\pi_1 p + \pi_2 A)$ .

and

$$E [f - f_0 - f_1] = f (\alpha - \pi_1 p - \pi_2 A)$$

where E denotes for the Expectation.

The elements of the information matrix follow from (2.14), (2.15) and (2.16) as:

$$\Phi_{11} = E \frac{\left[ -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha^2} \log L \right]}{f} = \frac{1}{(1 - \alpha)} + \frac{1}{\alpha}$$

$$\Phi_{22} = E \underbrace{\left[ \frac{-\partial^2}{\partial p^2} \log L \right]}_{f} = \left[ \frac{(\pi_1 p + \pi_2 A)}{(p + A)^2} + \frac{(\alpha - \pi_1 p - \pi_2 A)}{\left[2 - (p + A)\right]^2} \right]$$
  
and

$$\Phi_{12} = E \left| \frac{-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha \partial p} \log L}{f} \right| = \Phi_{21} = E \left| \frac{-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial p \partial \alpha} \log L}{f} \right| = 0$$

Therefore by inverting the information matrix, the expression for the asymptotic variances of (  $\alpha$  , p) can be obtained as:

$$V(\alpha) = \frac{\left[\frac{\Phi_{22}}{(\Phi_{11}\Phi_{22} - \Phi_{12}^{2})}\right]}{f}$$

and

$$V(p) = \frac{\left[\frac{\Phi_{11}}{(\Phi_{11}\Phi_{22} - \Phi_{21}^{2})}\right]}{f}$$

Table – 1: Observed and Expected Distribution of Households According to the Total Number of Migrants from a Household in Three Types of Villages

Total No. of				Types	of Villages					
Migrants from a Household	<u>Semi-Urban</u>		Remote			Growth-Centre				
	Observed	Expe	ected	Observed	Expected		Observed	d Exp	pected	
		Method Of Moment	Method Of Likelihood		Method Of Moment	Method Of Likelihood		Method Of Moment	Method Of Likelihood	
0	1032	1032.00	1032.00	871	871.00	871.00	972	972.00	972.00	
1	58	57.93	57.89	139	139.00	138.92	124	124.05	120.56	
2	23	24.18	24.16	52	48.52	48.49	32	39.97	38.32	
3	6	13.81	13.80	15	25.30	25.29	25	20.82	20.26	
4	10	8.97	8.97	14	15.59	15.59	12	13.16	13.26	
5	8	6.22	6.23	11	10.35	10.36	10	9.05	9.48	
6	7	4.48	4.49	10	7.11	7.13	5	6.41	6.99	
7	1	13.41	13.46	6	17.13	17.22	5	18.54	21.13	
8+	16			16			17			
Total	1161	1161	1161	1134	1134	1134	1202	1202	1202	
α		0.1111	0.1111		0.2319	0.2319		0.1913	0.1913	
р		0.2347	0.2341		0.2899	0.2893		0.2765	0.2461	
λ		0.5885	-		0.4255	-		0.3681	-	
$\pi_1$		0.0556	0.0556		0.1159	0.1159		0.0957	0.0957	
$V(\alpha)$		-	0.0000 85	5	-	0.00015	7	-	0.000129	
V( <b>p</b> )		-	0.007669		-	0.00379	4	-	0.004333	
χ2		7.4815	7.4199		7.2052	7.1248		3.5342	3.0096	
d.f.		4	5		4	5		4	5	

Table-2: Observed and Expected distribution of Households according to the total number of Migrants in Household Cohort (Including International Migrants/Excluding International Migrants) of the Rural Areas of Comilla district of Bangladesh.

Household Cohort Number of Migrants Including International Migrants Excluding International Migrants								
Including International Migrants								
Observe			Observed	Expected				
	Method Of Moment	Method Of Likelihood		Method Of Moment	Method Of Likelihood			
1941	1941.12	1941.12	1941	1941.09	194109			
544	544.07	543.91	292	291.91	292.11			
117	111.87	111.87	67	70.74	70.76			
50	49.14	49.18	37	32.16	32.12			
18	2450	24.54	17	17.27	17.22			
8			6					
6	25.30	25.38	7	21.83	21.70			
6			3					
6			5					
2696	2696	2696	2375	2375	2375			
	0.2800	0.2800		0.1827	0.1827			
	0.4912			0.4356	0.4365			
		_			_ ``			
		0.1/			0.0914			
	0.14			0.0314	0.000063			
	-			-	0.002032			
	1 00/2				0.9666			
					3			
	0bserve 1941 544 117 50 18 8 6 6 6 6 6	Observed         Expe           Method Of Moment           1941         1941.12           544         544.07           117         111.87           50         49.14           18         2450           8         6           6         25.30           6         2696           2696         2696	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Including International Migrants_ \\ \hline Observed Expected \\ \hline Method Method Of Of \\ \hline Moment Likelihood \\ \hline 1941 1941.12 1941.12 \\ 544 544.07 543.91 \\ 117 111.87 111.87 \\ 50 49.14 49.18 \\ 18 2450 24.54 \\ 8 \\ 6 25.30 25.38 \\ 6 \\ 6 \\ \hline \hline 2696 2696 \\ \hline 2696 2696 \\ \hline 0.2800 0.2800 \\ 0.4912 0.4912 \\ 0.0978 - \\ 0.14 0.14 \\ - 0.000075 \\ - 0.001293 \\ 1.9942 1.7738 \\ \hline \end{tabular}$	Including         International Migrants_ Expected         Excluding International Observed           Method Of         Method Of         Method Of         Method           1941         1941.12         1941.12         1941           544         544.07         543.91         292           117         111.87         111.87         67           50         49.14         49.18         37           18         2450         24.54         17           8         6         6         5           2696         2696         2696         2375           0.2800         0.2800         0.2800         0.4912           0.0978         -         0.000075         -           0.14         0.14         -         0.0001293           1.9942         1.7738         1.7738         0	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } \hline lnternational Migrants \\ \hline Cbserved & Expected & Cbserved & Expected \\ \hline Method & Method & Of & Of & Of & Of & Of & Of & Moment \\ \hline Moment & Likelihood & Moment & 1941 & 1941.12 & 1941 & 1941.09 & 544 & 544.07 & 543.91 & 292 & 291.91 & 117 & 111.87 & 111.87 & 67 & 70.74 & 50 & 49.14 & 49.18 & 37 & 32.16 & 18 & 24.50 & 24.54 & 17 & 17.27 & 8 & 6 & 6 & 6 & 25.30 & 25.38 & 7 & 21.83 & 6 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & $			

	Hou	sehold Cohort		
Total No. of Migrants from a Household	Observed	Exp	pected	
		Method Of	Method Of	
		Moment	Likelihood	
0	1470	1470.00	1470.00	
1	172	171.75	171.92	
2	54	56.59	56.67	
3	23	29.39	29.57	
4	18	18.66	18.67	
5	14	12.74	12.67	
6	11	8.81	9.01	
7	6			
		24.06	23.49	
8+	24			
Total	1792	1792	1792	
α		0.1797	0.1797	
P		0.2756	0.2761	
λ		0.3845		
			-	
$\Pi_1$		0.0898	0.0898	
$V(\alpha)$		-	0.000082	
V(P)		-	0.003092	
χ2 d.f.		3.667	3.9928	
a.t.		4	5	

Table - 3: Observed and Expected distribution of the Household according to the total out-migrants of the Rural Area of Rewa.

#### Conclusion

The proposed model has been applied to data for total out migration at household level taken three different survey wherein one "**RDPG** – a sample survey (1978)", second is Rural Areas of Camilla districts, Bangladesh and third is "**Rewa Survey** – 2002". After testing the suitability of the model, it is found that the observed value of  $\chi^2$  are insignificant at 5% level of significant and hence indicating the suitability of the model. From the table, it is found that the estimated value of the risk of migration under the proposed model are 0.1111, 0.2319 and 0.1913 respectively for "Semi-Urban", "Remote", "Growth Centre", type of villages . So we concluded that the risk of migration of Remote (0.2319) is greater than Growth Centre (0.1913) and Semi-Urban (0.1111).

## Acknowledgement

First author is thankful to U.G.C., New Delhi, India for providing a financial support by MRP-37-546/09(SR)

## References

- Bilsborrow, R., Oberai, A. and Standing G. (1984), Migration surveys in low-lincome countries, Guidelines for survey and questionnaire Design, London: Groom Heln.
- [2] Do Vanzo, J. (1976), Why Families Move: A Model of the Geographic Mobility of Fmarried Couples. Technical Report R-1972-DOL Santa Manica, Calif, Rand Corp.

- [3] Sukhatme, P.V. and Sukhatme, B.V. (1976), "Sampling Theory of survey with Application" Lowa State University Press, Ames Towa U.S.A.
- [4] Gautam, S.S., Singh,S.R.J. and Agrawal, A. (2008), Probability Models for the Number of Rural cut-migration: A micro-approach, International Journal of Agriculture Statistics Science, Vol. <u>4</u>.No(2): PP. 425-436.
- [5] Sharma, H.L. (1985), A Probability Distribution for Rural Out-Migration at Micro Level, Rural Demography 12 (1&2): PP.63-69.
- [6] Sharma, H.L. (1988), Two Inflated Probability Distribution for Migration from Rural Areas, Aligarh journal of Statistics, 8: PP. 35-41.
- [7] Singh, S.R.J. (1985), A Study on Rural Out-Migration and els. Effect on Fertility, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, India.
- [8] Yadava, K.N.S., Tripathi, S. and Singh, V.S. (1994), A Probability Model for the total number of Migrants from the Household: An alternative approach, Journal of Scientific Research, Banaras Hindu University, 44: pp.125-134.
- [9] Johnson, N.L. and Kotz, S. (1969), Discrete Distributions, The Distributions in Statistics.