



Migration, Social Equity, and Educational Sustainability: Ethical and Developmental Reflections from Global and Indian Literature

Jugal Kumar Deka¹ & Dr. Gunajit Sarma²

1. Research Scholar, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Central Institute of Technology, Kokrajhar, Assam, India.
2. Associate Professor, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Central Institute of Technology, Kokrajhar, Assam, India.

Abstract:

Migration remains a defining feature of contemporary societies, shaping economic opportunities, social structures, and educational outcomes in both sending and receiving regions. With over 280 million international migrants and exponentially larger internal movements globally, the intersection of mobility and human development demands rigorous scholarly attention. This paper revisits major theoretical and empirical contributions to migration studies—from Neoclassical equilibrium models to the New Economics of Labor Migration (NELM)—through the specific lens of sustainability, ethics, and social responsibility in education. It argues that migration is not merely a demographic or economic phenomenon but a deeply ethical issue involving access to rights, equity, and capability expansion. Drawing on classical and contemporary scholarship, the paper synthesizes evidence on how migration affects educational access, intergenerational mobility, and the distribution of opportunities. Particular attention is given to the experiences of internal migrants in India, where seasonal and circular migration intersects with structural inequalities to disrupt schooling and deepen the digital divide. The analysis highlights how policy interventions can adopt socially responsible frameworks, shifting from a “sedentary bias” to systems that ensure the portability of rights. The paper concludes by outlining ethical imperatives for educational planning to ensure that migration functions as a pathway to empowerment rather than a barrier to human capital formation.

Keywords: Migration-Education Nexus; Social Equity; Educational Sustainability; Internal Migration; NELM; India.

1. Introduction:

The relationship between human migration and socioeconomic development constitutes one of the most enduring yet contested areas of inquiry in the social sciences. For over half a century, scholars have debated whether migration serves as an engine of development or a symptom of underdevelopment. Today, the relevance of this debate is magnified by scale: the United Nations estimates over 280 million international migrants, while remittance flows to low- and middle-income countries reached \$647 billion in 2022 (World Bank, 2022). Yet, the implications of these movements extend far beyond labour mobility and financial

transfers.

In recent years, scholars and policymakers have increasingly acknowledged that migration intersects deeply with questions of educational access, equity, ethics, and social responsibility. While traditional migration studies emphasize economic determinants and household survival strategies, the literature reveals an underexplored dimension: the educational sustainability of mobile populations. In countries like India, where internal migration involves over 450 million individuals, the movement of populations often disrupts schooling, affects learning continuity, and exposes children to vulnerabilities that hinder long-term development.

This paper examines migration literature through the thematic lens of Sustainability, Ethics, and Social Responsibility in Education. It aims to synthesize theoretical perspectives—from Harris-Todaro’s economic models to Sen’s capability approach—to show how migration research provides a powerful lens for understanding sustainable educational systems. By integrating global theoretical paradigms with the lived realities of the Indian context, this paper argues that educational sustainability cannot be meaningfully discussed without acknowledging the fluid, multi-local realities of migrant households.

2. Theoretical Foundations: Migration, Inequality, and Human Development

To understand the educational implications of migration, one must examine the evolution of migration theory through a lens that views human capital not merely as an economic asset but as a developmental outcome. The intellectual journey from “optimistic” modernization approaches to “critical” structuralist perspectives offers distinct views on how mobility shapes the learning trajectories of migrant populations.

2.1 Classical and Neoclassical Contributions:

Early migration theories, such as Ravenstein’s *Laws of Migration* and the influential Harris-Todaro (1970) model, conceptualized mobility primarily as a rational response to spatial labour market inequalities. These neoclassical frameworks view migrants as utility-maximizing actors who move from labour-surplus to labour-scarce regions to achieve wage equalization. Within this paradigm, migration is fundamentally an investment in human capital; parents are theorized to migrate to maximize household income, ostensibly to purchase better opportunities and superior schooling for their children. However, the application of this economic rationality to educational outcomes is often critiqued for its inherent “sedentary bias.” By assuming perfect markets and frictionless movement, these models frequently overlook the immediate educational costs of displacement, such as the loss of curricular continuity and the psychological toll of family separation, which can negate the theoretical benefits of increased income.

2.2 Structuralist Perspectives:

In contrast, the structuralist and dependency theories of the 1970s, exemplified by the work of Frank (1969) and Wallerstein (1974), reframed migration not as an equilibrium mechanism, but as a manifestation of unequal exchange. Structuralists argued that migration reinforces underdevelopment through the “brain drain”—the selective outmigration of educated individuals—and the distortion of local economies. Viewed through this lens, educational disadvantage among migrants is less a result of individual choice and more a predictable outcome of systemic inequality. The children of unskilled migrants often inherit the socio-economic precarity of their parents; rather than acting as a ladder for upward mobility, migration into urban slums often exposes children to structural barriers that exclude them from quality schooling. Consequently, the migration process can reproduce class positions across generations, trapping migrant youth in cycles of low-skill labour and limited educational attainment.

2.3 The New Economics of Labour Migration (NELM) and Social Capital:

The NELM framework, developed by Stark (1991), shifted the unit of analysis from the individual to the household, positing that migration is a strategy to diversify risk and overcome market failures, such as the lack of access to credit or insurance. In this context, the relationship between migration and education becomes a complex trade-off. Remittances often act as a critical safety net, effectively overcoming liquidity constraints to finance school fees and reduce the necessity for child labour. However, this financial gain frequently comes at a social cost. The empirical evidence reveals a “care drain” paradox: while cash flows for education may increase, the absence of parents can lead to a lack of supervision and increased psychological stress, paradoxically resulting in lower school attendance and higher dropout rates despite improved economic resources.

2.4 Transnationalism and Capability Approaches:

Recent scholarship incorporates the transnational framework (Glick Schiller et al., 1992) and Amartya Sen’s Capability Approach to interpret migration as a “multi-local” existence where individuals participate simultaneously in origin and destination societies. When applied to education, this perspective shifts the focus from income to the expansion of “substantive freedoms.” The ethical imperative becomes whether migration enhances a child’s capability to function and learn, or whether administrative rigidity restricts it. If a migrant child loses access to their right to education due to language barriers, lack of documentation, or non-portable benefits, their capabilities are effectively constrained. Therefore, true educational sustainability requires systems that acknowledge these transnational realities, ensuring that the freedom of movement does not compromise the freedom to learn.

3. Migration and Educational Sustainability: Insights from Global Literature:

The empirical record on migration and development reveals that the relationship between mobility and educational sustainability is fraught with complex and often contradictory outcomes. While migration can generate resources, it simultaneously creates structural frictions that challenge established learning systems.

3.1 School Disruptions and Learning Gaps:

Zelinsky’s (1971) “mobility transition” hypothesis suggests that societies experience increased human mobility during early stages of development. However, contemporary educational systems are rarely designed to accommodate this flux, resulting in a fundamental mismatch between mobile populations and static institutions. Studies from the Global South—specifically in Brazil, Indonesia, and Nigeria—indicate that migrant children face disproportionately high rates of academic discontinuity. This issue is particularly acute in contexts of circular or seasonal migration, which generates a phenomenon of “learning fragmentation.” In the absence of portable curricula or unified record-keeping systems, children moving between rural origins and urban destinations are frequently unable to validate their prior learning, leading to forced grade repetition or eventual dropout.

3.2 Barriers to Access and Equity:

Beyond physical disruptions, migrant students encounter systemic ethical barriers rooted in the educational sector’s assumption of residential stability. This “sedentary bias” manifests primarily through administrative exclusion, where the lack of transfer certificates or proof of permanent residence effectively bars children from enrollment. These administrative hurdles are often compounded by linguistic and cultural barriers, particularly in linguistically diverse regions; migrant children frequently enter classrooms where they do not possess fluency in the medium of instruction, leading to a form of “silent exclusion” within the classroom itself. Furthermore, the vulnerability of these students is exacerbated by the non-portability of entitlements. Critical social protection schemes, such as mid-day meals and scholarships, often fail to cross state or provincial borders, thereby stripping migrant children of essential support precisely when their economic vulnerability is highest.

3.3 Remittances and Human Capital Investment:

The economic dimension of migration presents a paradox for educational sustainability. While global remittance flows reached approximately \$647 billion in 2022, their conversion into human capital is neither automatic nor linear. Adams (2011) observes that while remittances significantly reduce the depth of poverty, household expenditure patterns frequently favor tangible assets like housing and consumption over long-term productive investments in education. Moreover, in specific contexts such as rural Mexico, the prevalence of high-wage labor migration can foster a “culture of migration” (Ali, 2007) that actively devalues formal schooling. In these scenarios, young men may disengage from the education system early, viewing migration—rather than academic credentialing—as the primary pathway to adulthood and economic success. This dynamic highlights the critical challenge of ensuring that the economic gains of migration are effectively translated into sustainable educational outcomes.

4. Migration and Educational Sustainability in India:

India represents a paradigmatic case for analyzing the intersection of mobility and education, primarily due to the sheer magnitude of its internal migration flows. Data from the Census and the National Sample Survey Office (NSSO) indicate that the country hosts over 450 million internal migrants, a demographic shift that fundamentally alters the landscape of social service delivery. A substantial proportion of this movement is characterized by seasonal and circular migration, predominantly involving historically marginalized communities such as Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. These populations typically migrate for employment in the informal sector—specifically in construction, brick kilns, and agriculture—where work is defined by precarity, informality, and a distinct absence of social security. This pattern aligns closely with livelihood approaches that conceptualize migration not as a path to prosperity, but as a “survival strategy” necessitated by agrarian distress and economic volatility in source regions.

4.1 Children of Migrant Workers: An Overlooked Population:

Within this vast migratory landscape, the children of seasonal workers emerge as one of the most educationally marginalized demographics, often described in research by organizations such as UNICEF and Azim Premji University as “invisible” to the state machinery. This invisibility stems from the timing of migration; because families often move during the middle of the academic year, children become effectively untraceable. They frequently remain technically “enrolled” in their home village schools to maintain government records, yet are physically absent for months at a time, receiving no pedagogical instruction. Consequently, these children exhibit significantly higher dropout rates and poorer learning outcomes compared to their non-migrant peers. The challenge is further compounded in inter-state migration corridors, such as the migration flow from Odisha to Gujarat. In these contexts, linguistic dissonance acts as a formidable barrier, transforming schools in destination states into exclusionary spaces where migrant children cannot engage with the curriculum due to the language of instruction.

4.2 Digital Exclusion and the Post-COVID Landscape:

The fragility of the migrant educational experience was laid bare during the COVID-19 pandemic and the subsequent crisis of “reverse migration.” As the educational ecosystem pivoted abruptly to online learning, migrant households found themselves disproportionately excluded due to a lack of stable internet connectivity, digital devices, and reliable electricity. In this context, the digital divide functioned not merely as a technological gap but as a structural barrier that halted learning entirely for millions. This period of exclusion has had long-term implications, reinforcing the intergenerational transmission of poverty and significantly widening the learning gap between migrant children and their sedentary, more affluent counterparts.

5. Ethics and Social Responsibility in Migration-Affected Education:

The intersection of migration and education extends beyond mere administrative logistics; it represents a profound moral challenge for contemporary governance. Educational institutions are bound by a social responsibility to guarantee that human mobility does not nullify the fundamental right to education. Viewing migration through the lens of the New Economics of Labour Migration (NELM)—as a calculated household survival strategy—places an ethical obligation on the state to facilitate, rather than penalize, this resilience. Consequently, ethical educational planning necessitates the implementation of non-discriminatory admission policies that actively decouple access to schooling from proof of permanent residence. Furthermore, true inclusion requires a culturally sensitive pedagogy that honors the migrant child’s linguistic heritage while simultaneously scaffolding their transition into the host language environment.

5.1 Portability of Rights and Entitlements:

A critical ethical fissure in current governance frameworks is the absence of portability regarding rights and entitlements. In the context of a unified nation-state, citizenship rights should theoretically remain fluid and attached to the individual rather than the location. The denial of essential services, such as mid-day meals or textbooks, simply because a child has crossed a state boundary constitutes a severe failure of “distributive justice.” Therefore, establishing the portability of academic credits and welfare benefits across administrative lines is not merely a technical adjustment but a prerequisite for achieving genuine social equity.

5.2 Protecting Migrant Workers’ Children from Exploitation:

The literature consistently highlights the precarious position of children in high-mobility sectors like brick kilns and construction, where the risk of child labour is acute. For these families, the “opportunity cost” of schooling often enters a stark competition with the immediate imperatives of survival. Addressing this requires a shared framework of social responsibility involving the state, private employers, and civil society. Together, these stakeholders must create safe, learning-friendly environments at worksites to effectively break the cycle of intergenerational exploitation and ensure that economic necessity does not preclude educational attainment.

6. Towards Sustainable and Responsible Educational Frameworks for Migrant Populations:

Achieving true educational sustainability for mobile populations demands a decisive shift away from ad-hoc, reactive measures toward the development of systemic resilience.

6.1 Policy Innovations:

India has witnessed the emergence of promising, albeit fragmented, policy innovations aimed at this demographic. While the Right to Education (RTE) Act theoretically mandates admission for all, its practical implementation often lags due to bureaucratic rigidities. Specific interventions, such as Migrant Resource Centres (MRCs) and the establishment of Seasonal Hostels in states like Odisha and Gujarat, represent attempts to decouple child education from parental migration, allowing children to remain in school while parents move for work. Additionally, the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 explicitly emphasizes equity, yet the success of these mandates rests heavily on the efficacy of inter-state coordination mechanisms.

6.2 Community and Civil Society Roles:

In spaces where state capacity falls short, civil society organizations frequently intervene to fill the institutional void. Models such as “Mobile Creches” at construction sites and “Bridge Schools” have demonstrated that flexible, context-specific interventions can effectively mitigate educational disruption. These initiatives validate the “livelihood approach” to development, acknowledging that educational structures must adapt to the complex survival strategies of the poor, rather than demanding that vulnerable populations conform to rigid, sedentary school schedules.

6.3 A Sustainable Education–Migration Interface:

Ultimately, a sustainable interface between education and migration requires the design of systems characterized by resilience, portability, and equity. Resilience involves creating administrative structures capable of processing mid-term admissions and exits without friction. Portability necessitates the utilization of digital infrastructure to ensure student records track across geographies, while equity demands the provision of targeted remedial support to bridge learning gaps incurred during movement. Realizing this vision requires a fundamental paradigm shift: moving from viewing migration as a “problem” to be solved, to understanding it as a dynamic “process” that must be managed with dignity and foresight.

7. Conclusion:

The synthesis of global and Indian literature presented in this paper underscores that the relationship between migration and education is neither linear nor predetermined; rather, it is deeply contingent upon the ethical frameworks and institutional responses of the state and society. While classical economic theories historically viewed migration as a rational path to prosperity, and structuralist perspectives warned of the reproduction of inequality, a more nuanced contemporary understanding reveals migration to be an endogenous, self-sustaining process of household survival. However, as the evidence demonstrates, this survival strategy often comes at a high educational cost for the next generation.

The persistence of a “sedentary bias” in educational planning—characterized by rigid administrative requirements, lack of portability, and linguistic exclusion—creates a fundamental ethical failure. In the Indian context, where internal migration is a massive demographic reality, the invisibility of migrant children within the school system threatens to turn the “demographic dividend” into a demographic liability. The digital exclusion witnessed during the post-COVID era further highlights the fragility of current systems.

Ultimately, achieving educational sustainability requires a paradigm shift from viewing migration as a disruption to be penalized, to recognizing it as a reality to be supported. This entails a move toward “distributive justice” where rights travel with the citizen. By implementing portable entitlements, investing in flexible infrastructure, and adopting the ethical imperative of inclusion, policymakers can ensure that the freedom to move does not compromise the freedom to learn. Only through such systemic resilience can migration fulfill its potential as a vehicle for human development and capability expansion.

References:

- Adams, R. H. (2011). Evaluating the economic impact of international remittances on developing countries using household surveys: A literature review. *Journal of Development Studies*, 47(6), 809–828. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2011.563299>
- Ali, S. (2007). Go west young man: The culture of migration among Muslims in Hyderabad, India. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 33(1), 37–58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691830601043497>
- Azim Premji University. (2020). *Myths of online education*. Azim Premji University.
- Frank, A. G. (1969). *Capitalism and underdevelopment in Latin America*. Monthly Review Press.
- Glick Schiller, N., Basch, L., & Blanc-Szanton, C. (1992). Transnationalism: A new analytic framework for understanding migration. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 645(1), 1–24.
- Harris, J. R., & Todaro, M. P. (1970). Migration, unemployment and development: A two-sector

analysis. *The American Economic Review*, 60(1), 126–142.

- Ministry of Education. (2020). *National Education Policy 2020*. Government of India.
- Stark, O. (1991). *The migration of labor*. Basil Blackwell.
- UNICEF. (2020). *COVID-19 and children on the move*. UNICEF.
- Wallerstein, I. (1974). *The modern world-system I: Capitalist agriculture and the origins of the European world-economy in the sixteenth century*. Academic Press.
- World Bank. (2022). *Migration and development brief 37: Remittances brave global headwinds*. World Bank.
- Zelinsky, W. (1971). The hypothesis of the mobility transition. *Geographical Review*, 61(2), 219–249. <https://doi.org/10.2307/213996>

Citation: Deka, J. K. & Sarma, Dr. G., (2026) “Migration, Social Equity, and Educational Sustainability: Ethical and Developmental Reflections from Global and Indian Literature”, *Bharati International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Development (BIJMRD)*, Vol-4, Issue-01(1), January-2026.