

Determinants of Male Internal Migration in Bangladesh: Is Due to Services Matter?

Muhammad Shafiu Alam

MSS, Department of Public Administration, Shahjalal University of Science and Technology (SUST), Sylhet
Bangladesh

E-mail: shafiu.mohon@gmail.com

Md. Shahidul Islam (Corresponding author)

MSS (Thesis), Department of Sociology, Shahjalal University of Science and Technology
Sylhet, Bangladesh

E-mail: shahidulsoc@gmail.com

Abstract

Migration is a common process where people move rural to urban area for better livelihood. The aim of this study is exploring the factors of rural to urban migration in Bangladesh. A cross-sectional study was conducted in Sylhet City Corporation and 120 migrants were selected through two stage cluster sampling technique. Social survey method was used to collect the data from the respondents. Binary logistic regression was applied to determine the factors related to male migration due to services. The results show that level of education is positively associated with male migration due to services. The results also show that income, occupation before migration, family types also effects cause of migration due to services.

Keywords: Rural-urban migration, Determinants, Migration status, Bangladesh

1.1 Introduction

Migration is a common phenomenon of human being. Rural urban migration is a common part of the internal migration in any country. People move one place to another for better economic and social environment (Ishtiaque & Ullah, 2013). Bangladesh have faced the large number of rural to urban migration because it has become liveli- hood strategy for the poor people who are migrated to large city in search of better employment opportunities (Giani, 2006). The causes of migration vary in a country according to the socioeconomic, demographic and cultural factors (Ishtiaque & Ullah, 2013). Several factors push rural people to urban area like economic crisis, food crisis, high unemployment rate, low income, high population growth, unequal distribution of land, demand for higher schooling, search in new job, previous migration history, and for better economics outcomes (Ishtiaque & Mahmud, 2011; Ishtiaque & Ullah, 2013). It is considered a major factor to change the socio-economic, demographic condition and a important strategy to economic development (Meerza, 2010). Most of the cities of Bangladesh are facing rapid urbanization because most of the people migrate rural to urban areas (Uddin & Firoj, 2013). Bangladesh is considerate one of the highest rates of growth of urban population and millions of people migrate to cities (Uddin & Firoj, 2013). In Bangladesh, about two-thirds of migration occurs from rural to urban areas (Islam and Siddiqi, 2010). Migrants are usually being aware of the benefit of the migration but they give little consideration about the problem of after migration (Fasoranti, 2009). Majority of the poor migrants can hold the benefit of the urban area (Johan, 2012). Most of the poor undergo very through helpless condition (Johan, 2012). Majority of the rural poor migrants take shelter in disadvantages places like slums, squatters, footpaths, rail stations and other scattered places (Farhana et al., 2012). Every year thousand of natural victims' people are migrated from rural areas to urban areas (Haider, 2010). Rural to urban migration causes for low income and surplus labour in agriculture (Johnson, 1948). Moreover, poor people are pressured to migration from rural to urban area to secure their livelihood (Haider, 2010). On the other hand, rural urban migration has positive benefit for rural areas in two ways, (a) remittance receiver in rural areas from migrants uses this money for fulfill their various needs as food, clothing, children education, health care, improvement in household food and security, and water and sanitation, (b)rural urban migrants perform various development of the rural area (Ajaero, & Onokala, 2013). While rural un-employed and under-employed are migrated into urban area, it reduces the pressure on agricultural economy in rural area (Farooq et al., 2005). But the semi skilled and unskilled population creates pressures on the civic institutions and faces housing problem (Farooq et al., 2005). There are many reasons why people are migrated from one place to another. There are the five reasons of migration in Bangladesh - economic, environmental, social, demographic and political (Martin et al., 2013). Urban sector provides the various income opportunity i.e. industry labour, garments, and others income opportunity. Moreover, urban centers have great opportunity of various innovation, technological programme and cultural activities (Islam & Siddiqi, 2010). This opportunity always pull people to migrate in urban areas. Urban areas have the better job, better working condition, higher wages, better sanitation, transportation and communication facilities (Farooq et al, 2005). People are also decide to migration for better opportunities for

education, better standard of life, marriage freedom, safety and security, political awareness Better health and recreational (Farooq et al., 2005). So, every year a large number of people move into urban areas for these facilities. There are some push factors are reasonable for migration like floods, fire, drought, earthquake or epidemic, loss of employment, political, religious reason (Islam & Siddiqi, 2010). It is expected that the number of the poor people will be doubled within 2025 (Farhana et al., 2012). Urban population is increasing very faster and it is probable that more than 50 percent people will live in urban areas within 2025 (Farhana et al., 2012).

The census data of Bangladesh is not clearly explained the causes, patterns and consequence of migration (Islam and Siddiqi (2010). Most of the studies don't focus particularly the causes, consequence and patterns of male migration. These studies try to identify the socio-economic determinants of the migration due to services.

1.1 Literature review

Ishtiaque & Ullah (2013) explored the determinants that influenced rural urban migration in Bangladesh. They found that both push and pull factors were related to internal migration. They found in slum that about 52% of the respondents were temporary migrants, whereas 48% are permanent migrants. They identified the eight determinants of migration- natural disasters, lack of employment opportunity, financial crisis, influence of family members, and availability of jobs, getting easy access to city's informal economy, bright city lights, and occupation at rural origin. Islam & Siddiqi (2010) the examined the association among the socio-demographic characteristics and male migration status in Bangladesh. They found that various factors like age, educational qualification, occupation, income type of family are associated with migration. Qin (2010) explored the mediating factors related to internal migration in highlighting the rural environment in China. He found the difference between labour migrants household and non labour migrants household in the living behavior like agricultural production, agricultural technology use, income and consumption, resource use and management. So, out migration from rural areas change the rural household livelihoods. Sultana (2010) investigated the impacts of Monga on rural urban migration in northern Bangladesh. She found that Monga affected households are migrated to suitable areas as their livelihood strategy. McDowell & Haan (2010) examined the relation between migration and sustainable livelihoods in the context of institutional factors. He argued that migration was a livelihood a strategy for the poor but it was also related the condition of their place of origin. He argued that rural area also developed as a result of migration. Siddiqui (2003) identified that migration was an important strategy for the poor people in Bangladesh for their livelihood. She considerate migration as one of the determination of the development process of Bangladesh. Migration is helpful to reduce the poverty of Bangladesh. Jahan (2012) examined the determinants of migration process at Dhaka city in Bangladesh. He found that migrations have economic, demographic, environmental and socio-cultural impacts both of urban destination and country of origin. He explored that rural migrants could not hold facilities of the urban area. They have to live slums and squatter settlements because of acute housing problem. They are far from electricity and gas supply. Some of the migrants being adopted various unfair activities for their livelihood like smuggling, begging, drug trafficking, trafficking of women, prostitution etc. Meerza (2010) examined the effects of rural-urban migration on rural children in Bangladesh. This study revealed that migrant's households were more probability to have child worker in that household because most of the remittance was used for buying land. He found that migrant's households were less conscious about their children. Chowdhury et al., (2012) examined the factor related to internal migration and the effects of internal migration on their socioeconomic status at Sylhet City, Bangladesh. They found that poverty is the main push factor of the migration in this area. Their study revealed that along with other socio-economic status, poverty condition is improved after migration. Farhana et al. (2012) explored the factors of rural-urban migration in Bangladesh. They found that unemployment, poverty, political and ethnic conflicts, religious etc were the main factors of migration. Their study revealed that push factor (poverty and unemployment) were active than pull factors. Hunter (2005) examined the relation between migration and environmental hazards. He found that environmental factors play the vital role in the migration decision of the vulnerable people. Haque & Islam (2012) examined the association between rural to urban migration status and household living conditions in Bangladesh. They found that rural-urban migrant had lower level of association with better living condition compared with urban natives. But educated and professional/housewife migrants' lead better household living conditions.

2. Data and methods

This is a cross-sectional study. This study was conducted at Sylhet City Corporation in Bangladesh. Sylhet City Corporation was purposively selected as my study area. This is an urban area and migrated people are available here. Two stage cluster sampling technique was applied to select the respondent from this city. There are 27 wards in Sylhet City Corporation. At first stage, ward no 4 and ward no 6 were randomly selected from those wards. In the second stage, 140 migrants were selected through simple random sampling procedure.

Both closed and open-ended questions were included in the questionnaire and data was collected through face to face interviews. Social survey method was applied to collect the data from the respondents. The data was collected during November to December in 2013. There were two sections in the questionnaire: the first section

consisted of the socio-demographics characteristics and the second sections included the migration related in formations.

2.2 Analytical technique: This study was benefited from previous literatures (Islam & Siddiqi ,2010). The SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science) 17 program was used to analyze the data. At first, Univariate analysis as frequency distribution was applied to presentation of the data. Next, multivariate binary logistic regression was applied to understand the determinants of migration rural-urban migration in this area.

3. Results

Table 1. Age of the respondents

| Age in years | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| <30 | 47 | 33.6 | 33.6 | 33.6 |
| 30-39 | 49 | 35.0 | 35.0 | 68.6 |
| 40-49 | 40 | 28.6 | 28.6 | 97.1 |
| 50+ | 4 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 100.0 |
| Total | 140 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The table shows that 33.6% migrants were below 30 years age. Majority 35% of the migrants were 30-39 years and only 2.9% migrants were above 50+ years. So, ages between 30 to 39 years old were more likely to migrant in Sylhet city.

Table 2. Marital status of the migrants

| Marital status | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Married | 86 | 61.4 | 61.4 | 61.4 |
| Unmarried | 54 | 38.6 | 38.6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 140 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Decision of migration is also influenced by marital status. Married people are more likely to migrate from shorter distance of their origins in order to visit their family easily (Hossain, 2001). Educated people are more likely to migrate with their family members compare with uneducated people (Hossain, 2001).The table show that 61.1% migrants were married and 38.6% migrants were unmarried.

Table 3. Type of family before migration

| Type of family | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Unit | 64 | 45.7 | 45.7 | 45.7 |
| Joint | 76 | 54.3 | 54.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 140 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The table shows the type of the family before migration. Majority of the migrants 54.3% come from joint family and 45.7% migrants come from unit family.

Table 4. Education of the respondents

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Illiterate | 23 | 16.4 | 16.4 | 16.4 |
| Primary | 25 | 17.9 | 17.9 | 34.3 |
| Secondary | 23 | 16.4 | 16.4 | 50.7 |
| Higher Secondary | 28 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 70.7 |
| Graduate/ others | 41 | 29.3 | 29.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 140 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Education plays an important role in rural to urban migration. The table shows that majority 29.3% of the migrants were graduates. Among the migrants, 16.4%, 17.9%, 16.4% and 20.0% were illiterate, primary, secondary and higher secondary level educated respectively.

Table 5. Pre-migration occupation

| Occupation | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Farmers | 9 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 |
| Services/job | 59 | 42.1 | 42.1 | 48.6 |
| Business | 37 | 26.4 | 26.4 | 75.0 |
| Unemployed | 22 | 15.7 | 15.7 | 90.7 |
| Labour | 13 | 9.3 | 9.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 140 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Occupation plays an important role in migration process. Accessibility of job opportunity and better quality of job condition play an important role in the decision of migration process (Hossain, 2001). Pre-migration occupation also enable to understand the causes of migration i.e. push factor of the migration (Hossain, 2001). The table shows that that most of the migrants 42.1 % were service holder, 6.4 % were farmers, 26.4% were businessman, 15.7% were unemployed and 9.3% were labour.

Table 6. Occupational status (after migration)

| Occupation | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Services/job | 80 | 57.1 | 57.1 | 57.1 |
| Business | 33 | 23.6 | 23.6 | 80.7 |
| others | 27 | 19.3 | 19.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 140 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The table shows that 57.1% migrants were services holder, 23.6% were engaged in business and 19.3% were engaged in others occupation.

Table 7. Income of the migrants (before migration)

| Income(Taka) | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| No income | 24 | 17.1 | 17.1 | 17.1 |
| less than 6000 | 67 | 47.9 | 47.9 | 65.0 |
| 6000+ | 49 | 35.0 | 35.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 140 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The table shows the income before migration. Majority 47.9% of the migrants had less than 6000 taka income before migration and 17.1% had no income before migration.

Table 8. Causes of migration

| Causes | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Economic /Better opportunity | 40 | 28.6 | 28.6 | 28.6 |
| Service | 73 | 52.1 | 52.1 | 80.7 |
| Labour | 5 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 84.3 |
| Environment | 10 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 91.4 |
| Liking of place | 5 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 95.0 |
| Others | 7 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 140 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Poverty and unemployment are the main economic factor for migration (Farhana et al, 2012). When people have no work and fail to feed their family, they are compelled to migrate in urban area for better economic opportunity. (Farhana et al., 2012). The table showed the causes of migration, Majority of the migrants are migrated for taking job which percentage was 52.1% and 28.6% were migrated for economic reason, 3.6 % were migrated for labor, 7.1% migrated for environmental reason, 3.6% were migrated for liking of places and 5.0% were migrated for others reasons.

Table 7. Migration status

| Migration status | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Temporary | 80 | 57.1 | 57.1 | 57.1 |
| Permanent | 60 | 42.9 | 42.9 | 100.0 |
| Total | 140 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The table shows the migration status of the respondents. 57.1% migrants were temporary migrants and 42.9% migrants were permanent migrants.

Table 9. The regression coefficient showed the effects causes of migration by factors.

| Variables | B | S.E. | Odds ratio |
|--------------------------------------|--------|-------|------------|
| Age of the migrants | | | |
| <30(ref) | | | |
| 30-39 | .455 | .672 | 1.576 |
| 40-49 | -.747 | .720 | .474 |
| 50+ | -1.282 | 1.645 | .277 |
| Education of the migrants | | | |
| Illiterate(ref) | | | |
| Primary | .573 | .784 | 1.773 |
| Secondary | 1.621 | .884 | 5.058 |
| Higher Secondary | 1.951 | .936 | 7.036** |
| Graduate/ others | 2.817 | .946 | 16.719*** |
| Income before migration | | | |
| No income(ref) | | | |
| less than 6000 | 1.321 | .694 | 3.749* |
| 6000+ | -1.683 | .670 | .186** |
| Occupation | | | |
| Services(ref) | | | |
| Business | -2.592 | .767 | .075*** |
| Others | -3.690 | .905 | .025*** |
| Type of the family before migrations | | | |
| Unit(ref) | | | |
| Joint | -1.173 | .547 | .309** |
| Constant | .394 | .703 | 1.483 |

Significant at * $p < 0.10$; ** $p < 0.05$; *** $p < 0.01$;

The table shows that migrants whose were completed primary education, were 1.78 times more likely to migrate in Sylhet city due to services than those were illiterate. Migrants whose were completed secondary education were 5.06 times more likely to migrate in Sylhet city due to services than those are illiterate. Migrants whose were completed higher secondary education were 7.04 times more likely to migrate in Sylhet city due to services than those were illiterate. Migrants whose were completed graduate were 16.72 times more likely to migrate in Sylhet city due to services than those are illiterate. Migrants whose had income less than 6000 taka before migration were 3.75 times more likely to migrate in Sylhet city due to services than those had no income before migration. Migrants whose had income 6000 taka or more before migration were 0.19 times less likely to migrate in Sylhet city due to services than those have no income before migration

Migrants whose occupations were business 0.08 were times less likely to migrate in Sylhet city due to services than those are services holder. However, migrants whose occupations were others were 0.03 times less likely to migrate in Sylhet city due to services than those were services holder. However, migrants who are from joint family 0.31 were times less likely to migrate in Sylhet city due to services than those are from unit family.

4.1 Discussion and conclusion: This study examined the factors related to internal migration in Bangladesh. The study shows that most of the migrant are temporary migrants. Temporary migrants come to rural to earn money and to develop their family in rural areas (Ishtiaque & Ullah, 2013). They want to return their origin places but they do not know when they return their place of origins (Ishtiaque & Ullah, 2013). Some of migrants come here due to job place is here. Most of the permanents migrants wanted to buy land here (Ishtiaque & Ullah, 2013). They do not like to return their place of origin. Our study reveals that higher education is positively related to migration due to job. Evidence supported that higher educational qualification increasing the risk male migration due to service (Islam and Siddiqi, 2010). Educated people are more likely to migrate because there is little job capacity in rural areas and educated people are less likely to involve in agricultural activities (Hossain, 2001).

In logistic regression analysis, we found that joint family decreases the risk of the migration due to services. Islam and Siddiqi (2010) found the similar result that male migrants from joint family were 0.461 times less likely to migrate rural area than whose family types was unit before migration. We found that income before migration was negatively associated with rural migration. People who had income above 6000 taka were less likely migrates in sylhet city. This means that whose income is good in rural place are less likely to leave their place of origins.

We found that 7.1% people says that they environment (natural disaster) were the cause for their migration. Due to riverbank erosion some of the affluent farmer can be a landless (Ishtiaque & Ullah (2013). Flood is also

another common natural disaster Bangladesh and many rural people became homeless. This homeless and landless rural people move to urban area for taking shelter in urban slums. So, our study reveals that higher education, income before migration, occupation and type of family were the related to internal migration due to services.

References

1. Ajaero, C. K & Onokala, P. C. (2013) .The Effects of Rural-Urban Migration on RuralCommunities of Southeastern Nigeria. *International Journal of Population Research*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2013/610193>
2. Chowdhury,I. Q. et al. (2012). Internal Migration and Socio-Economic Status of Migrants: A Study in Sylhet City, Bangladesh. *American Journal of Human Ecology* , 1(4); 123-133.
3. Farooq, M., Mateen, A & Cheema, M. A. (2005). Determinants of Migration in Punjab, Pakistan: A Case Study of Faisalabad Metropolitan. *Journal of Agriculture & Social Sciences*. 1(3):280–282. [Online]Available: http://www.fspublishers.org/published_papers/17714_.pdf (March18,2014)
4. Fasoranti, O. O. (2009). Perception of rural-urban migration in selected rural communities in Ondo State, Nigeria. *Bangladesh e-Journal of Sociology*.6 (1).96-105. [Online]Available: <http://www.bangladeshsociology.org/BEJS%206.1.pdf> (March18,2014)
5. Farhana, K. M., Rahman, S. A., Rahman, M. (2012). Factors of Migration in Urban Bangladesh: An Empirical Studyof Poor Migrants in Rajshahi City. *Bangladesh e-Journal of Sociology*,9(1):105-117.[Online]Available: http://www.bzu.edu.pk/PJSS/Vol30No22010/Final_PJSS-30-2-10.pdf
6. Giani,L.(2006).Migration and education:Child migrants in Bangladesh.Sussex Migration WorkingPaperno.33.[Online]Available: <https://www.sussex.ac.uk/webteam/gateway/file.php?name=mwp33.pdf&site=252>(March18,2014)
7. Hunter, L .M.(2005). Migration and Environmental Hazards. *Popul Environ*. 26(4): 273–302. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11111-005-3343-x>.
8. Haider ,S.K.U(2010). Factors of Migration on Urban Bangladesh: An Empirical Study of Poor Migrants in Rajshahi City. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*.30(2):307-323. [Online]Available:http://www.bzu.edu.pk/PJSS/Vol30No22010/Final_PJSS-30-2-10.pdf(March18,2014)
9. Haque ,M.E & Islam,M. M.(2012). Rural to Urban Migration and Household Living Conditions in Bangladesh. *Dhaka Univ. J. Sci*. 60(2): 253-257.<http://dx.doi.org/10.3329/dujs.v60i2.11529>
10. Hossain, M. Z.(2001) Rural-Urban Migration in Bangladesh: A Micro-Level Study. [Online]Available :http://archive.iussp.org/Brazil2001/s20/S28_P02_Hossain.pdf(March18,2014)
11. Ishtiaque, A & Ullah, M. S. (2013). The Influence of Factors of Migration on the Migration status of Rural-Urban Migrants in Dhaka, Bangladesh. *Journal of Studies and Research in Human Geography*.7(2):45-52 [Online]Available: http://humangeographies.org.ro/articles/72/7_2_13_5_ishtiaque.pdf(March18,2014)
12. Ishtiaque, A . & Mahmud, M .S. (2011) .Migration objectives and their fulfillment: A micro study of the rural-urban migrants of the slums of Dhaka city. *Malaysian Journal of Society and Space* 7(4): (24 - 29) [Online]Available :<http://journalarticle.ukm.my/3152/1/4.geografia-2011-4-Asif-bangladesh-english--editedfinal1.pdf>(March18,2014).
13. Islam, R & Siddiqi, N.M .(2010). Determinants and Modeling of Male Migrants in Bangladesh. *Current Research Journal of Economic Theory* 2(3): 123-130, [Online]Available : <http://maxwellsci.com/print/crjet/v2-123-130.pdf>(March18,2014).
14. Jahan, M.(2012) .Impact of rural urban migration on physical and social environment: The case of Dhaka city . *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*. 1(2): 186-194. [Online]Available :<http://isdsnet.com/ijds-v1n2-10.pdf>(March18,2014).
15. Johnson, D.G., 1948. Mobility as a field of research. *Southern Economic J*.40: 152–61
16. McDowell, C & Haan, A.(2010). Migration and sustainable livelihoods: A critical review of the literature. IDS Working Paper65. [Online]Available:<http://www.mycantos.com/community/USR458732/newsNo/901>(March18,2014).
17. Martin,M., Kang, Y., Billah,M., Siddiqui.,T., Black,R & Kniveton,D . (2013). Policy analysis: Climate change and migration Bangladesh. Refugee and Migratory Movements Research Unit y& Sussex Centre for Migration Research .Working paper 4. [Online]Available: <http://migratingoutofpoverty.dfid.gov.uk/files/file.php?name=wp4-ccrm-b-policy.pdf&site=354> (March18,2014).
18. Meerza, S. I. A.(2010).Rural-Urban Migration and Its Consequences on Rural Children:An Empirical Study. *Asian Social Science*.6(12):176-181. [Online]Available: <http://ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/ass/article/viewFile/6414/6314>(March18,2014).
19. Qin, H (2010) .Rural-to-Urban Labor Migration, Household Livelihoods,and the Rural Environment in Chongqing Municipality,Southwest China. *Hum Ecol Interdiscip J*, 38:675–690. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10745-010-9353-z>
20. Siddiqui,T(2003).Migration as a livelihood strategy of the poor:the Bangladesh case. *Development and*

- Pro-Poor Policy Choices in Asia. [Online] Available
http://www.migrationdrc.org/publications/working_papers/WP-C1.pdf (March 18, 2014)
21. Sultana, Z (2010) Impact of Monga on Rural Urban Migration: Its Socio- Economic Consequences. ASA University Review, 4(2):151-167. [Online] Available : <http://www.asaub.edu.bd/data/asaubreview/v4n2s114.pdf> (March 18, 2014).
22. Uddin, M. N & Firoj, M. (2013). Causes and Consequences of Rural- Urban Migration in Bangladesh: An Empirical Study in Chittagong City. *International Journal of Ethics in Social Sciences*. 1(1):89-104. [Online] Available: <http://www.crimbbd.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/07.pdf> (March 18, 2014).

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:
<http://www.iiste.org>

CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page: <http://www.iiste.org/journals/> All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: <http://www.iiste.org/book/>

Recent conferences: <http://www.iiste.org/conference/>

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

