



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

MIGRATION IN HIMACHAL PRADESH

Dr. Surinder Singh

Associate Professor in Economics
Government Degree College Swarghat
District Bilaspur, Himachal Pradesh

Abstract: The present study has been undertaken to assess the nature, extent, pattern and determinants of migration in Himachal Pradesh. For this purpose, two districts i.e. Lahul & Spiti (tribal region) and Una (non-tribal region) out of twelve districts in Himachal Pradesh have been selected. A total sample comprises 200 households from both tribal and non-tribal regions. Overall, 21.5 percent of persons are migrants, with significant tribal & non-tribal, rural-urban and male-female differentials. Out of total migration in tribal region and rural areas of non-tribal region, proportion of out-migrants is higher as compared to those of in-migrants and return-migrants. Whereas in urban areas of non-tribal region, the percentage of out-migrants is lower than in-migrants. Migration is dominated by person age 15-29 years group as compared to other age groups. Migration among unmarried population has been higher as compared to married one. In both regions and rural-urban areas of non-tribal region, the proportion of migrants with educational level 'secondary and higher secondary' is the highest compared to other educational level groups. Rural to urban migration has been the most dominant migration stream, of the total internal migration, followed by rural to rural. The reason for migration for the migrants in tribal region has been dominated by education attainment, whereas employment has been the main reason for migration in non-tribal region.

Keywords: Logistic regression analysis, Migration, Tribal and non-tribal region.

1. Introduction

Migration brings both opportunities and challenges. Migration has major impacts on both the people and places involved. Migration affects both the area of origin (out-migration) and the place of destination (in-migration). The direction and volume of migration has considerably changed over the years. Migration flows are pronounced from economically backward or stagnation regions to prosperous or dynamic regions.

Internal migration is the migration of people within country. The mobility of people within national boundaries is diverse in nature and the distances covered vary from a few kilometers to several kilometers. The duration of stay vary from a few hours to several years in the new location. Many movements are casual (such as commuters and travelers etc.) which do not involve sustained or permanent change of residence and must, therefore be distinguished from migration, which involves a change of place of usual residence. Internal migration is also classified based on direction of movement i.e. rural to rural, rural to urban, urban to urban and urban to rural. It is also classified on the basis of spatial dimensions i.e. intra-district, inter-district and inter-state migration. Internal migration takes place due to various motivations and reasons such as marriage, employment, natural calamities etc. Migration is also classified on the basis of duration of migration i.e. permanent and temporary migration.

2. Theoretical backgrounds

The process of theorization of migration began in the nineteenth century. It has been explained by economists, sociologists and geographers. Theoretical formulations in the general principles of migration are found in the pioneering work of Ravenstein (1885: 167-235). In his paper on the laws of migration he came to conclusion that migrants only proceed to a short distance and as distance increases migration also decreases. Females dominate males among short distances migration. Current of migration took place in the direction of great centres of commerce and industries. First of all, most of migration took place from immediately surrounding towards these centres than from more remote district and step by step from the most remote corner of the country. Each main current of migration produces a compensating counter-current. Propensity to migrate is more in native of rural area as compared to towns. In another paper on the laws of migration Ravenstein (1889: 241-305) finds that advancement in the means of transportation, development of manufacturers and commerce will lead to an increase in migration. Among men, economic motive to make them better in material respect plays most important role in migration. Many of his observations are still found to be quite relevant. However, his work faced criticism also.

Stouffer (1940: 845-867) developed the theory of intervening obstacles. According to him, the number of persons going a given distance is directly proportional to the number of opportunities at that distance and inversely proportional to the number of intervening opportunities. For him, the factors which influence the decision to migrate are the plus and minus both at the place of origin and at the place of destination. This means factors like good education facilities and strong kinship ties hold people within the area, whereas difficult terrain and poor medical facilities could be repelling. Other two factors which influence the decision to migrate are the intervening obstacles and personal factors.

The push-pull framework evolved from the work done by Everett Lee. Lee (1966: 47-57) has conceptualised the factors which enter into the decision to migrate and the process of migration into four categories- factors associated with area of origin, factors associated with area of destination, intervening obstacles and personal factors. Within his conceptual framework he has formulated many hypotheses about

the volume of migration under varying conditions, the development of streams and counter-streams of migration and characteristics of the migrants. According to Lee's hypothesis, the volume of migration varies with the diversity of people, area, fluctuations in the economy, difficulty of surmounting the intervening obstacles and state of progress in a country or area. Unless severe checks are imposed, both volume and rate of migration tends to increase with time. Migration tends to take place largely within well-defined streams and for every major migration stream, a counter stream develops. Migration is selective and also depends upon the stages of the life cycle. The characteristics of migrants tend to be intermediate between the characteristics of the population at origin and the population of the destination. In every area there are many plus factors which act to hold people within the area or attract people to it, and there are many negative factors which tend to repel them. Migration may take place after weighing plus and negative factors at both origin and destination. Persons have always a better knowledge, and unhurried judgements regarding the area of origin as compared to area of destination. For some migrants intervening obstacles such as distance and transportation are relatively unimportant but for others it is insurmountable for making the same move.

The first comprehensive theory of development related to the process of rural-urban labour migration was the one developed by Lewis (1954: 139-191) and later extended by Fei & Ranis (1961: 533-652). It is based on a concept of dual economy, comprising a subsistence agricultural sector (rural) characterised by unemployment, under-employment, marginal productivity of labour being zero or very low, and a modern industrial sector (urban) characterised by full employment and high productivity. In the agriculture sector, wages paid to the workers are very low as compared to modern urban sector. Migration of workers from the rural areas to the urban areas is caused by differences in those wage rates.

Todaro (1969: 138-148) formulated a rural-urban migration model which represents a realistic modification and extension of simple wage differential approach commonly found in the literature. Todaro, instead of advocating the simple wage differential as the cause of migration, showed that it is the 'expected' wage differential, which matters. Labour mobility occurs in direct response to expected wage differential between rural and urban areas. Further, given higher wages in urban areas, people would be attracted from low-income underdeveloped regions in numbers much larger than the available employment opportunities, and that too on the chance of their getting into a job. The probability of obtaining an urban job is inversely related to the urban unemployment rate and high rates of urban unemployment are the results of the serious imbalances of economic opportunities between urban and rural areas. Stark & Bloom (1985: 173-178) have given new theory of migration that migration decision is not by individual but by households and other family members in which they try to maximise their expected income and to minimize the risk involved in migration.

3. Methodology

3.1 Objectives

The present study has been undertaken to assess the nature, extent, pattern and determinants of migration in Himachal Pradesh.

3.2 Sampling design

In order to achieve the objectives of the present study, the primary data has been collected from Himachal Pradesh. A systematic, multi-stage stratified random sampling design has been adopted to collect data. In sampling procedure block, panchayat, village, town, ward and household are the different stages of random sampling. For this purpose, two districts i.e. Lahul & Spiti (tribal region) and Una (non-tribal region) out of twelve districts in Himachal Pradesh have been selected following simple random sampling, while arranging them in ascending order on the basis of their respective population. The entire sample for the study has been designed in such a manner that comparison can be made according to region (tribal and non-tribal regions), residence (rural and urban areas in non-tribal region) and migration status (migrant and non-migrant).

Sample selection in tribal region: Lahul & Spiti is tribal region and there is no urban area in this district. In Lahul & Spiti district, there are two development blocks i.e. Lahul and Spiti, and one sub-development block i.e. Udaipur, according to 2011 census. In order to collect data from tribal region, Lahul development block and Udaipur sub-development block (from two development blocks and one sub-development block), two panchayats from each block and sub-block and two villages from each panchayat have been selected following simple random sampling, while arranging blocks & sub-block, panchayats and villages in ascending order on the basis of their respective population. A sample of ten households has been selected from each village, and 80 households have been actually surveyed from eight villages in tribal region.

Sampling selection in non-tribal region: Una is a non-tribal region and data have been collected from both rural and urban areas. For urban areas, two urban areas (i.e. Una and Mehatpur), and from each urban area two wards have been selected following simple random sampling, while arranging urban areas and wards in an ascending order on the basis of their respective population. From four wards, data from total 40 households have been collected, while selecting ten households from each ward.

In order to collect data from rural areas, two blocks (i.e. Una and Bangana) have been selected out of total five blocks, two panchayats from each block, and two villages have been selected from each panchayat following simple random sampling, while arranging blocks, panchayats, and villages in ascending order on the basis of their respective population. From eight villages, data for total 80 households have been collected, while selecting ten households from each village. A total sample comprises 200 households from both tribal and non-tribal regions.

3. Migration in Himachal Pradesh

In this study, movements that resulted in the change of usual place of residence (UPR)¹ of the individuals have been treated as migration, and a household member whose last usual place of residence (UPR) was different from present place at the time of enumeration has been considered as migrant. The other types of movements that do not involve change of usual place of residence, but are short-term (less than six months) or seasonal in nature have not been considered. The changes of usual place of residence of women due to marriage have been excluded from being treated as migration in this study. Characteristics of sampled migrants belong to the time when they migrated whereas current characteristics of non-migrants have been considered.

This section has been divided into three sections. In section 3A, comparison of general characteristics of all migrants and non-migrants has been done; section 3B throws a light on different features of migrants such as migration rate, reason for migration, duration of migration, migration streams and others; whereas, in order to lend statistical support to the results, an econometric analysis of migration has been attempted in section 3C.

3A. General characteristics of sampled migrants and non-migrants

In this section, comparison of general characteristics of all migrants and non-migrants has been done. For this purpose characteristics of migrants at the time of migration and current characteristics (at the time of survey) of non-migrants have been taken into account. The demographic and socio-economic characteristics include age, sex, marital status, religion, caste, household type, literacy and levels of education, occupation level and land holdings of migrant and non-migrant population.

3A.1 Background characteristics of migrants and non-migrants

Table 3A.1 Percent distribution of migrants and non-migrants by selected background characteristics, according to residence and region

Background characteristic	Tribal			Non-tribal								
				Rural			Urban			Total		
	Migrants	Non-migrants	Total percent	Migrants	Non-migrants	Total percent	Migrants	Non-migrants	Total percent	Migrants	Non-migrants	Total percent
Age												
<15	30.9	69.1	100.0	0.0	100	100.0	17.6	82.4	100.0	5.2	94.8	100.0
15-24	61.9	38.1	100.0	35.5	64.5	100.0	33.3	66.7	100.0	34.9	65.1	100.0
25-34	17.5	82.5	100.0	17.3	82.7	100.0	18.8	81.2	100.0	17.7	82.3	100.0
35+	7.8	92.2	100.0	4.6	95.4	100.0	6.0	94.0	100.0	5.0	95.0	100.0
Marital Status												
Ever married	12.8	87.2	100.0	9.4	90.6	100.0	13.6	86.4	100.0	10.6	89.4	100.0
Never married	47.3	52.7	100.0	16.7	83.3	100.0	20.2	79.8	100.0	17.7	82.3	100.0

¹Usual place of residence (UPR) of a person was defined as a place (village/town) where the person had stayed continuously for a period of six months or more.

Caste/tribe												
General	12.9	87.1	100.0	16.1	83.9	100.0	23.2	76.8	100.0	18.4	81.6	100.0
Scheduled cast	50.9	49.1	100.0	7.6	92.4	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	5.3	94.7	100.0
Scheduled tribe	28.9	71.1	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
OBC	53.8	46.2	100.0	12.8	87.2	100.0	18.8	81.2	100.0	13.9	86.1	100.0
Religion												
Hindu	24.4	75.6	100.0	12.8	87.2	100.0	22.3	77.7	100.0	15.0	85.0	100.0
Muslim	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sikh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Buddhist	36.9	63.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Household type												
Non-nuclear	28.9	71.1	100.0	14.9	85.1	100.0	18.0	82.0	100.0	15.6	84.4	100.0
Nuclear	34.0	66.0	100.0	9.6	90.4	100.0	15.4	84.6	100.0	11.8	88.2	100.0
Number of persons												

Background characteristics of migrants and non-migrants have been considered for the sake of comparison in Table 3A.1. The age distribution of migrant is different in tribal and non-tribal regions as well as in rural-urban areas of non-tribal region. Migrants age 15-24 years constitute the highest population as compared to other age groups in tribal and non-tribal regions as well as in rural and urban areas of non-migrant region. In tribal region, out of the total aged 15-24 years 61.9 percent are migrants and 38.1 percent non-migrants. In non-tribal region, out of total aged persons 15-24 years comprises 34.9 percent migrants and 65.1 percent non-migrants. In tribal region, forty-seven percent of migrants and eighteen percent in non-tribal region have been single (not married) at the time of migration. In tribal and non-tribal regions, the proportion of migrated unmarried population is more than married one. Among scheduled tribes, twenty-nine percent are migrants in tribal region as compared to seventy-one percent non-migrants, whereas in non-tribal region, 18.4 percent migrants belong to general caste as compared to non-migrants (81.6 percent). In tribal region, migration among Buddhist population is higher as compared to Hindu, and in non-tribal region, extent of migration among general caste is higher as compared to other castes. In tribal region, migration from joint type of households has been lower as compared to nuclear households.

3A.2 Education of migrants and non-migrants

Table 3A.2 Percent distribution of migrants and non-migrants by level of education, according to residence and region

Level of education	Tribal			Non-tribal								
	Migrant	Non-migrant	Total percent	Rural			Urban			Total		
				Migrant	Non-migrant	Total percent	Migrant	Non-migrant	Total percent	Migrant	Non-migrant	Total percent
Illiterate	17.5	82.5	100.0	1.7	98.3	100.0	27.3	72.7	100.0	8.5	91.5	100.0
Literate up to middle	23.5	76.5	100.0	6.1	93.9	100.0	20.8	79.2	100.0	9.4	90.6	100.0
Secondary higher secondary	45.5	54.5	100.0	22.4	77.6	100.0	14.9	85.1	100.0	19.9	80.1	100.0
Graduation and above	31.0	69.0	100.0	25.0	75.0	100.0	9.1	90.9	100.0	19.0	81.0	100.0

Table 3A.2 shows that the proportion of population with higher educational level who migrated is higher as compared to lower level of education. In tribal region, migration among illiterate is lower (17.5 percent) as compared to graduation level or above (31 percent) and also in non-tribal region migration among illiterate is lower (8.5 percent) as compared to graduation level or above (19 percent). In rural areas of non-tribal region migration among illiterate is lower (1.7 percent) as compared to graduation standard or above (25 percent), whereas in urban areas of non-tribal region, migration among illiterate is higher (27.3 percent) as compared to graduation or above level of education (9.1 percent).

3A.3 Occupation of migrants and non-migrants

Table 3A.3 presents distribution of migrants and non-migrants by occupation. In tribal region, migration among those who are not working has been higher as compared to those who are working. In non-tribal region, migration among professional workers has been higher as compared to other workers.

Table 3A.3 Percent distribution of migrants and non-migrants by occupation, according to residence and region

Employment characteristic	Tribal			Non-tribal								
	Migrants	Non-migrants	Total percent	Rural			Urban			Total		
				Migrants	Non-migrants	Total percent	Migrants	Non-migrants	Total percent	Migrants	Non-migrants	Total percent
Not worked in past 12 months	45.7	54.3	100.0	7.6	92.4	100.0	13.5	86.5	100.0	9.6	90.4	100.0
Agriculture worker	19.0	81.0	100.0	8.8	91.2	100.0	72.7	27.3	100.0	15.0	85.0	100.0
Production	0.0	100.0	100.0	36.4	63.6	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	34.8	65.2	100.0

worker												
Professional	50.0	50.0	100.0	75.0	25.0	100.0	33.3	66.7	100.0	57.1	42.9	100.0
Service & sales worker	21.4	78.6	100.0	25.5	74.5	100.0	15.2	84.8	100.0	21.4	78.6	100.0
Other worker	26.3	73.7	100.0	25.5	74.5	100.0	8.7	91.3	100.0	17.7	82.3	100.0

3A.4 Household agricultural land of migrants and non-migrants

Table 3A.4 Percent distribution of migrants and non-migrants by household agricultural land, according to residence and region

Agricultural land (in hectare)	Tribal			Non-tribal								
	Migrants	Non-migrants	Total percent	Rural			Urban			Total		
				Migrants	Non-migrants	Total percent	Migrants	Non-migrants	Total percent	Migrants	Non-migrants	Total percent
No agricultural land	47.8	52.2	100.0	3.8	96.2	100.0	15.3	84.7	100.0	13.9	86.1	100.0
0.01-0.39	20.0	80.0	100.0	12.4	87.6	100.0	16.0	84.0	100.0	12.7	87.3	100.0
0.40-0.99	23.1	76.9	100.0	13.9	86.1	100.0	50.0	50.0	100.0	15.5	84.5	100.0
1.00-1.99	41.2	58.8	100.0	8.1	91.9	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	7.5	92.5	100.0
2.00+	34.5	65.5	100.0	21.6	78.4	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.6	78.4	100.0

Table 3A.4 presents distribution of migrants and non-migrants according to ownership of agricultural land. In tribal region, migration among landless and those owning more than 1 hectare land is higher as compared to those who have less than 1 hectare land. In rural areas of non-tribal region, migration among those with more than 2 hectare land is higher as compared to those who have less than 2 hectare land.

3A.5 Migration status

Table 3A.5 Percent distribution of migrants and non-migrants by migration status, according to residence and region

Category of persons		Migration status				All	Number of persons
		Non-migrants	Out-migrants	In-migrants	Return-migrants		
Tribal	Male	62.5	30.2	4.4	2.9	100.0	315
	Female	76.7	22.0	1.0	0.3	100.0	287
	Persons	69.3	26.2	2.8	1.7	100.0	602
	Male	79.9	18.6	0.0	1.5	100.0	274

Non-tribal	Rural	Female	95.2	4.8	0.0	0.0	100.0	249
		Persons	87.2	12.0	0.0	0.8	100.0	523
	Urban	Male	80.7	5.5	13.8	0.0	100.0	109
		Female	86.4	1.0	12.6	0.0	100.0	103
		Persons	83.5	3.3	13.2	0.0	100.0	212
	Total	Male	80.2	14.9	3.9	1.0	100.0	383
		Female	92.6	3.7	3.7	0.0	100.0	352
		Persons	86.1	9.5	3.8	0.6	100.0	735

Table 3A.5 indicates distribution of migrants (out-migrants, in-migrants and return-migrants) and non-migrants according to residence and region. Out-migration rate has been very high in tribal region (26.2 percent) as compared to that in rural (12 percent) and urban areas (3.3 percent) of non-tribal region. In non-tribal region, 13.2 percent are in-migrants in urban areas as compared to no in-migrant in rural areas, whereas in tribal region, only 2.8 percent are in-migrants. Return migration rate is very low in both regions (tribal and non-tribal) and rural-urban areas of non-tribal region.

3B. Migrants

In this section, the different features of the migrants such as migration rate, caste, religion, migration stream, reason for migration, nature of migration and year since first migration have been presented. Besides, information on age, marital status, type of household, educational qualifications, occupation, and land holdings at the time of first migration has been also presented.

3B.1 Migration rate²

Table 3B.1 Migration rate (per 100 persons)

Category of persons	Tribal	Non-tribal			Overall
		Rural	Urban	Total	
Male	37.5	20.1	19.3	19.8	27.8
Female	23.3	4.8	13.6	7.4	14.6
Persons	30.7	12.8	16.5	13.9	21.5

Migration rate, for any category of person (male, female, rural, urban, tribal or non-tribal), has been estimated as the number of migrants belonging to that category per 100 of persons in that category. The

² The migration rate is computed as: $m = \frac{M}{P} \times K$

Where: m is the rate of migration, M is the number of migrations, P is the population exposed to the likelihood of migration, K is 100

estimated migration rate in sampled households is presented in table 3B.1. Overall, 21.5 percent of persons are migrants, with significant tribal & non-tribal, rural-urban and male-female differentials. The migration rate is lower in non-tribal region (13.9 percent) as compared to tribal region (30.7 percent). The migration rate is lower in rural areas (12.8 percent) of non-tribal region as compared to urban areas (16.5 percent). Magnitude of female migration rate has been far lower than male migration rate, in all regions (tribal and non-tribal regions) and residence (rural and urban areas). Overall migration rate is lower among female population (14.6 percent) as compared to that of male (27.8 percent). The changes of usual place of residence of women due to marriage have been excluded from being treated as migration in this study and can be the reason for lower magnitude of female migration as compared to that of male.

3B.2 Types of migrants

Table 3B.2 shows, out of total migration in tribal region and rural areas of non-tribal region, proportion of out-migrants is higher as compared to those of in-migrants and return-migrants. Out of total migration in tribal region, 85.4 percent are out-migrants, 9.2 percent in-migrants and 5.4 percent return-migrants. Out of total migration in rural areas of non-tribal region, 94 percent are out-migrants, 6 percent return-migrants and none, in-migrant. Whereas in urban areas of non-tribal region, the percentage of out-migrants (20 percent) is lower than in-migrants (80 percent).

Table 3B.2 Distribution (per 100 persons) of all migrants by out-migrant, in-migrant and return-migrant according to residence and region

Type of migrants	Category of persons											
	Tribal			Non-tribal								
				Rural			Urban			Total		
	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons
Out-migrant	80.5	94.0	85.4	92.7	100	94.0	28.6	7.1	20.0	75.0	50.0	68.6
In-migrant	11.9	4.5	9.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	71.4	92.9	80.0	19.7	50.0	27.5
Return-migrant	7.6	1.5	5.4	7.3	0.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	3.9
All	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number of persons	118	67	185	55	12	67	21	14	35	76	26	102

3B.3 Caste of the migrants

Table 3B.3 Distribution (per 100 persons) of migrants by caste according to residence and region

Caste	Category of persons											
	Tribal			Non-tribal								
				Rural			Urban			Total		
	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons
General	3.4	0.0	2.2	56.4	75.0	59.7	85.7	78.6	82.9	64.5	76.9	67.6
SC	16.9	13.4	15.7	14.5	16.7	14.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.5	7.7	9.9
ST	75.5	83.6	78.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
OBC	4.2	3.0	3.8	29.1	8.3	25.4	14.3	21.4	17.1	25.0	15.4	22.5
All	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number of persons	118	67	185	55	12	67	21	14	35	76	26	102

Table 3B.3 presents distribution of migrants by caste. Out of total migrants in tribal region, the share of scheduled tribe population (78.3 percent) is the highest, followed by schedule caste (15.7 percent), other backward class (3.8 percent) and general category (2.2 percent). Out of total migrants in non-tribal region, the share of general category (67.6 percent) is the highest, followed by other backward class (22.5 percent) and scheduled caste (9.9 percent). Out of total migrants the share of general caste has been higher as compared to that of other castes in rural and urban areas of non-tribal region.

3B.4 Religion of the migrants

Table 3B.4 Distribution (per 100 persons) of migrants by religion according to residence and region

Religion	Category of persons											
	Tribal			Non-tribal								
				Rural			Urban			Total		
	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons
Hindu	43.2	34.3	40.0	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Sikh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Buddhist	56.8	65.7	60.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
All	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Number of persons	118	67	185	55	12	67	21	14	35	76	26	102
--------------------------	-----	----	-----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----

Table 3B.4 presents distribution of migrants by religion according to residence and region. Out of total migrants in tribal region, the share of Buddhist community (60 percent) is higher as compared to Hindu (40 percent). In rural and urban areas of non-tribal region, all migrants belong to Hindu community.

3B.5 Household type of the migrants

Table 3B.5 Distribution (per 100 persons) of migrants by type of household according to residence and region

Household type	Category of persons											
	Tribal			Non-tribal								
				Rural			Urban			Total		
	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons
Non-nuclear	62.7	56.7	60.5	70.9	66.7	70.1	47.6	42.9	45.7	64.5	53.8	61.8
Nuclear	37.3	43.3	39.5	29.1	33.3	29.9	52.4	57.1	54.3	35.5	46.2	38.2
All	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number of persons	118	67	185	55	12	67	21	14	35	76	26	102

Table 3B.5 indicates, out of the total migrants in tribal region, 60.5 percent belong to non-nuclear households before migration, and the remaining to nuclear type of households. Out of the total migrants in rural areas of non-tribal region, 70.1 percent belong to non-nuclear households before migration, and the rest to nuclear type. In urban areas, higher percentage of migrants belongs to nuclear households before migration (54.3 percent) as compared to non-nuclear family (45.7 percent).

3B.6 Age of the migrants

Table 3B.6 Distribution (per 100 persons) of migrants by age according to residence and region

Regions/Residence	Category of persons	Age (years)					All	Number of persons	
		0-14	15-19	20-29	30-59	60+			
Tribal	Male	18.6	50.8	15.3	14.5	0.8	100.0	118	
	Female	17.9	35.8	37.3	9.0	0.0	100.0	67	
	Persons	18.4	45.4	23.2	12.5	0.5	100.0	185	
Non-tribal	Rural	Male	0.0	9.1	67.3	21.8	1.8	100.0	55
		Female	0.0	8.3	91.7	0.0	0.0	100.0	12
		Persons	0.0	9.0	71.6	17.9	1.5	100.0	67
	Urban	Male	19.0	19.0	42.9	14.3	4.8	100.0	21
		Female	35.7	28.6	7.1	28.6	0.0	100.0	14
		Persons	25.7	22.9	28.6	20.0	2.8	100.0	35
	Total	Male	5.3	11.8	60.5	19.8	2.6	100.0	76
		Female	19.2	19.2	46.2	15.4	0.0	100.0	26
		Persons	8.8	13.7	56.9	18.6	2.0	100.0	102

Distribution of migrants by age at the time of migration (all type of migrations included) according to region and residence is presented in table 3B.6. In tribal region migration is dominated by population age 15-19 years (45.4 percent) as compared to other age groups, whereas in non-tribal region, dominated by person age 20-29 years (56.9 percent). In rural areas, migration is preferred by those who aged 20-29 years at time of migration. There is also much male-female differential in migration among different age groups according to region and residence.

3B.7 Marital status of the migrants at the time of migration**Table 3B.7 Distribution (per 100 persons) of migrants by marital status according to residence and region**

Marital status	Category of persons											
	Tribal			Non-tribal								
				Rural			Urban			Total		
	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons
Ever married	16.9	25.4	20.0	29.1	83.3	38.8	42.9	50.0	45.8	23.2	36.5	27.5
Never married	83.1	74.6	80.0	70.9	16.7	61.2	57.1	50.0	54.2	76.8	63.5	72.5
All	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 3B.7 indicates that migration among unmarried population has been higher as compared to married one. In tribal region, out of total migrants, the percentage of never married (80 percent) at the time of migration is higher as compared to ever married (20 percent). In rural areas of non-tribal region, the percentage of unmarried migrants is also higher than ever married (38.8 percent). Whereas, in urban areas, the percentage of migration among never married to ever married is almost the same. The percentage of female ever-married migrants is comparatively more than that of male in both regions and rural-urban areas of non-tribal region.

3B.8 Migrants and their level of general education

Table 3B.8 presents educational level of migrants at the time of migration, by population age 6 years and above, according to residence and region. Proportion of illiterate migrants is higher in urban areas as compared to rural areas. In both regions and rural-urban areas of non-tribal region, the proportion of migrants with educational level 'secondary and higher secondary' is the highest compared to other educational level groups. Nearly, fifteen percent of the rural male migrants and eight percent that of the rural females have educational level 'graduation, diploma and above'.

Table 3B.8 Distribution (per 100 persons) of migrants by general education according to residence and region

Region/residence	Category of persons	General education				All	Number of persons	
		Not literate	Literate and up to middle	Secondary and higher secondary	Graduate, diploma and above			
Tribal	Male	14.3	24.1	55.4	6.2	100.0	112	
	Female	14.8	19.7	55.7	9.8	100.0	61	
	Persons	14.5	22.5	55.5	7.5	100.0	173	
Non-tribal	Rural	Male	0.0	16.7	68.5	14.8	100.0	54
		Female	8.3	16.7	66.7	8.3	100.0	12
		Persons	1.5	16.7	68.2	13.6	100.0	66
	Urban	Male	25.0	25.0	45.0	5.0	100.0	20
		Female	7.1	42.9	42.9	7.1	100.0	14
		Persons	17.6	32.4	44.1	5.9	100.0	34
	Total	Male	6.8	18.9	62.2	12.1	100.0	74
		Female	7.7	30.8	53.8	7.7	100.0	26
		Persons	7.0	22.0	60.0	11.0	100.0	100

3B.9 Occupation of migrants

Table 3B.9 indicates that higher percentage of male and female in both regions and rural-urban areas of non-tribal region has been not working before migration. Agriculture is the main source of employment before migration in tribal region (28.6 percent), whereas in non-tribal region, service and sales, the main source of employment (17.7 percent). In tribal region, almost double of the female migrants (41.8 percent) has been engaged in agriculture sector as compared to male migrants (21.2 percent). In rural areas of non-tribal region, only 1.8 percent of male migrants have been engaged in agricultural sector as compared to all female migrants. In tribal and rural areas of non-tribal region, a few migrants have been engaged as professional worker before migration.

Table 3B.9 Distribution (per 100 persons) of migrants by occupation according to residence and region

Region/residence		Category of persons	Occupation						All
			Not working	Agriculture worker	Production worker	Professional	Service & sales worker	Other worker	
Tribal		Male	66.8	21.2	0.0	1.0	7.6	3.4	100.0
		Female	56.7	41.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	100.0
		Persons	63.3	28.6	0.0	0.5	4.9	2.7	100.0
Non-tribal	Rural	Male	32.8	1.8	14.5	5.5	23.6	21.8	100.0
		Female	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
		Persons	32.9	13.4	11.9	4.5	19.4	17.9	100.0
	Urban	Male	42.9	23.8	0.0	4.8	19.0	9.5	100.0
		Female	71.5	21.4	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	100.0
		Persons	54.2	22.9	0.0	2.9	14.3	5.7	100.0
	Total	Male	35.5	7.9	10.5	5.3	22.4	18.4	100.0
		Female	53.9	42.3	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	100.0
		Persons	40.2	16.7	7.8	3.9	17.7	13.7	100.0

3B.10 Agricultural land holdings of migrants

Table 3B.10 shows that in rural areas of non-tribal region, eighty-two percent of migrants owned one hectare of agricultural land, whereas in urban areas seventy-seven percent of migrants had no agricultural land before migration. In tribal region, thirty-six percent of migrants had less than one hectare of land, whereas six percent with no ownership of agricultural land before migration. In study area, generally the

proportion of male migrants with no agriculture land or less agricultural land has been higher as compared to females.

Table 3B.10 Distribution (per 100 persons) of migrants by agricultural land holdings according to residence and region

Category of persons		Land holdings (in hectare)						
		0.01 - 0.39	0.40 - 0.99	1.00 – 1.99	2+	No agricultural land	All	
Tribal	Male	16.1	24.6	39.0	15.3	5.0	100.0	
	Female	4.5	23.9	46.3	17.8	7.5	100.0	
	Persons	11.9	24.3	41.6	16.3	5.9	100.0	
Non-tribal	Rural	Male	50.9	30.9	5.5	10.9	1.8	100.0
		Female	25.0	58.3	0.0	16.7	0.0	100.0
		Persons	46.3	35.8	4.5	11.9	1.5	100.0
	Urban	Male	14.3	9.5	0.0	0.0	76.2	100.0
		Female	7.1	14.3	0.0	0.0	78.6	100.0
		Persons	11.4	11.4	0.0	0.0	77.2	100.0
	Total	Male	40.7	25.0	3.9	7.9	22.5	100.0
		Female	15.4	34.6	0.0	7.7	42.3	100.0
		Persons	34.3	27.5	2.9	7.8	27.5	100.0

3B.11 Nature of movement of the migrants

Table 3B.11 shows the intention of the migrants either to migrate out of the present place of enumeration sometimes in the future or to stay permanently at the place of enumeration in the normal course. It does not reflect the period elapsed since they migrated. The migration has been treated as temporary, if the migrant intended to move again to the last usual place of residence or to any other place. If the migrant, is likely to stay at the place of enumeration in the normal course and does not plan to move out of the place of enumeration, it is treated as permanent migration. In tribal region, higher percentage of the migration has been permanent in nature (61.6 percent) as compared to temporary movements (38.4 percent). No substantial male-female differential has been observed in tribal region. In rural and urban areas of non-tribal region, a higher percent of the migration has been temporary in nature. A higher proportion of urban migrants (71.4 percent) moved temporarily compared to rural migrants (62.7 percent). The nature of movement has been permanent in most cases of female migrants compared to male migrants in rural areas of non-tribal region. But in urban areas of non-tribal region, the nature of movement, in most of the cases, has been temporary among both- males and females. No migrants moved with expected duration of stay in the present place between six months to twelve months.

Table 3B.11 Distribution (per 100 persons) of migrants by nature of movements according to residence and region

Region/residence	Category of persons	Temporary		Permanent	All	Number of persons	
		Duration of stay more than 6 months but less than 12 months	Duration of stay 12 months or more				
Tribal	Male	0.0	39.8	60.2	100.0	118	
	Female	0.0	35.8	64.2	100.0	67	
	Persons	0.0	38.4	61.6	100.0	185	
Non-tribal	Rural	Male	0.0	69.1	30.9	100.0	55
		Female	0.0	33.3	66.7	100.0	12
		Persons	0.0	62.7	37.3	100.0	67
	Urban	Male	0.0	71.4	28.6	100.0	21
		Female	0.0	71.4	28.6	100.0	14
		Persons	0.0	71.4	28.6	100.0	35
	Total	Male	0.0	69.7	30.3	100.0	76
		Female	0.0	53.8	46.2	100.0	26

		Persons	0.0	65.7	34.3	100.0	102
--	--	----------------	-----	------	------	-------	-----

3B.12 Migration streams

Table 3B.12 Distribution of internal migrants (per 100 persons) by migration streams

Category of persons	Migration streams				
	Rural to rural	Rural to urban	Urban to rural	Urban to urban	All
Male	26.4	66.2	4.0	3.4	100.0
Female	17.1	79.6	1.1	2.2	100.0
Persons	23.2	70.8	3.0	3.0	100.0

Table 3B.12 presents the distribution of internal migrants, by four types of migration streams, namely rural to rural, rural to urban, urban to rural and urban to urban. Rural to urban migration has been the most dominant migration stream, accounting for 70.8 percent of the total internal migration, followed by rural to rural (23.2 percent). Urban to rural and urban to urban migration is very low and each has equal share of three percent of the total internal migrants. The pattern of migration among male and female migrants is slightly different. Rural to urban migration has been the most dominant migration stream with higher percentage (79.6 percent) of the total internal female migrants as compared to male (66.2 percent), followed by rural to rural migration stream among both- females and males. The share of male migrants in rural to rural migration stream (26.4 percent) is higher as compared to females (17.1 percent).

3B.13 Reason for migration

Table 3B.13.1 Distribution (per 100 persons) of migrants by reason for migration according to residence and region

Region/residence	Category of persons	Reason for migration				All	Number of persons	
		Education	Employment	Sequential migration	Other reasons			
Tribal	Male	50.8	39.8	1.8	7.6	100.0	118	
	Female	40.3	7.5	46.2	6.0	100.0	67	
	Persons	47.0	28.1	17.8	7.1	100.0	185	
Non-tribal	Rural	Male	9.1	85.4	0.0	5.5	100.0	55
		Female	8.3	0.0	91.7	0.0	100.0	12
		Persons	9.0	70.1	16.4	4.5	100.0	67
	Urban	Male	4.8	61.8	28.6	4.8	100.0	21
		Female	7.1	14.3	78.6	0.0	100.0	14
		Persons	5.7	42.9	48.6	2.8	100.0	35
	Total	Male	7.9	78.9	7.9	5.3	100.0	76
		Female	7.7	7.7	84.6	0.0	100.0	26
		Persons	7.8	60.8	27.5	3.9	100.0	102
Overall	Male	34.0	55.2	4.1	6.7	100.0	194	
	Female	31.2	7.5	57.0	4.3	100.0	93	
	Persons	33.3	39.5	21.3	5.9	100.0	287	

Table 3B.13.1 shows distinct kinds of reasons for migration according to region, residence and male-female migration. The reason for migration for overall male migrants in study area has been dominated by employment and its associates (55.2 percent), whereas, the reason for overall female migration has been sequential migration (57 percent). The reason for migration for male tribal migrants has been dominated by education attainment (50.8 percent), followed by employment (39.8 percent), whereas the reason for migration for female tribal migrants has been sequential migration (46.2 percent), followed by educational attainment (40.3 percent). The reason for migration for the migrants in tribal region has been dominated by education attainment (47 percent), whereas employment (39.5 percent) has been the main reason for migration in non-tribal region. For males in both rural and urban areas of non-tribal region, main reason for

migration is employment. Sequential migration is the main reason among females for migration in rural and urban areas of non-tribal region.

Table 3B.13.2 provides information regarding internal migrants by reasons for migration for each of the migration stream for whole study. Overall the prime reason for rural to rural migration, is employment (51.6 percent), rural to urban migration is education (41.8 percent), urban to rural migration is other reasons (87.5 percent) and urban to urban migration, both employment and sequential migration (37.5 percent). In case of male migrants, two migration streams i.e. rural to rural and urban to urban have been mainly driven by employment and its related reasons. Both education-related reasons (47 percent) and employment-related reasons (47 percent) are equally dominating factors for male migration from rural to urban. In the four types of migration streams the reasons for male migration has been different from that in case of female migrants. Among females, sequential migration has been the prime reason for migration for the three migration streams i.e. rural to rural (56.2 percent), rural to urban (58 percent) and urban to urban (50 percent), though the share of the education-related migration has also been quite significant i.e. rural to rural (18.8 percent), rural to urban (33.8 percent) and urban to urban (50 percent).

Table 3B.13.2 Distribution(per 100 persons) of internal migrants by reason for migration according to rural-urban migration streams

Category of persons	Migration stream	Reason for migration				All	Number of persons
		Education	Employment	Sequential migration	Other reasons		
Male	Rural to rural	21.7	65.2	2.2	10.9	100.0	46
	Rural to urban	47.0	47.0	4.3	1.7	100.0	115
	Urban to rural	0.0	14.3	0.0	85.7	100.0	07
	Urban to urban	16.7	50.0	33.3	0.0	100.0	06
Female	Rural to rural	18.8	12.5	56.2	12.5	100.0	16
	Rural to urban	33.8	6.8	58.0	1.4	100.0	74
	Urban to rural	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	01
	Urban	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	100.0	02

	to urban					0	
Persons	Rural to rural	21.0	51.6	16.1	11.3	100.0	62
	Rural to urban	41.8	31.2	25.4	1.6	100.0	189
	Urban to rural	0.0	12.5	0.0	87.5	100.0	08
	Urban to urban	25.0	37.5	37.5	0.0	100.0	08

3B.14 Period of stay since migrated

Table 3B.14 indicates distribution of migrants by period since migrated, an important aspect of migration structure. Short-term migration has been higher from non-tribal region as compared to tribal region. The percentage of migrants who have completed less than ten years has been higher in non-tribal region (54.9 percent) as compared to tribal region (47.6 percent). The share of migrants who have completed more than 19 years has been higher in tribal region (27 percent) as compared to non-tribal region (14.7 percent). Short-term migration has been higher among migrants from urban areas as compared to rural areas. The pattern observed for male migrants in the period of a stay since migration in both tribal and non-tribal regions, rural-urban areas of non-tribal region has been different from that of female migrants.

Table 3B.14 Distribution of migrants (per 100 persons) by period since migrated according to residence and region according to residence and region

Category of persons		Period since migrated (years)						All	
		>5	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25+		
Tribal	Male	30.5	17.8	11.9	9.3	14.4	16.1	100.0	
	Female	32.8	13.5	16.4	16.4	11.9	9.0	100.0	
	Persons	31.4	16.2	13.5	11.9	13.5	13.5	100.0	
Non-tribal	Rural	Male	29.1	23.6	20.0	5.5	12.7	9.1	100.0
		Female	8.3	33.3	16.7	16.7	16.7	8.3	100.0
		Persons	25.4	25.4	19.4	7.4	13.4	9.0	100.0
	Urban	Male	47.7	14.3	19.0	19.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
		Female	64.3	0.0	21.4	14.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
		Persons	54.3	8.6	20.0	17.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
	Total	Male	34.2	21.1	19.7	9.2	9.2	6.6	100.0
		Female	38.5	15.4	19.2	15.4	7.7	3.8	100.0

		Persons	35.3	19.6	19.6	10.8	8.8	5.9	100.0
--	--	----------------	------	------	------	------	-----	-----	-------

3C Logistic regression analysis

Logistic regression, being well suited for analysing dichotomous outcomes, has been increasingly applied in social science research. It has been used to overcome limitation of ordinary least squares (OLS) regression in handling dichotomous outcomes. Logistic regression is applied for studying the relation between a categorical or qualitative outcome variable and one or more predictor variables. The logit is the natural logarithm, (Ln) of odds of outcome variable Y, i.e.

$$\text{Ln} \left(\frac{\pi}{1-\pi} \right) = \log (\text{odds}) = \text{logit} = \alpha + \beta x_i$$

Here π = probability ($y = 1 | X = x$)

$$= \frac{e^{\alpha + \beta x_i}}{1 + e^{\alpha + \beta x_i}}$$

Where, π is the probability of the outcome of the event.

Logit = Natural log of odds

$$= \text{Ln} \left(\frac{p}{1-p} \right) = \log_e (\text{odds})$$

= logit (p)

Log-likelihood is the value of the log likelihood of a logistic regression model.

Odds $\frac{p}{1-p} \neq$ probability (p) or likelihood

Odds ratio, a measure of association is given as

$$\frac{\frac{p_1}{1-p_1}}{\frac{p_0}{1-p_0}}$$

Where p_1 = probability of an event, given the membership in Group 1,

P_0 = probability of an event, given the membership in Group 0,

An odds ratio greater than 1 implies an increased likelihood.

3C.1 Logistic regression analysis for all migrants of tribal region

Independent (explanatory) variables are:

SEX: 1 for male, 0 for female

EDUCATION 2: 1 for matric, 0 otherwise

EDUCATION 3: 1 for above matric, 0 otherwise

RELIGION: 1 for Buddhist, 0 otherwise

SLI 2: 1 for SLI 26-40 score, 0 otherwise

SLI 3: 1 for SLI 41+ score, 0 otherwise

HLAND 2: 1 for land 1-2 hectare, 0 otherwise

HLAND 3: 1 for land 2+ hectare, 0 otherwise

HHTYPE: 1 for joint type of household, 0 otherwise

Dependent variable:

MGSTATUS: 1 for migration (migrants), 0 otherwise

Table 3C.1.1 Logistic regression analysis (Tribal region, Migration)

Dependent variable: Migration status (MGSTATUS)

Covariate	B	p-value	Exp (B)
SEX	0.573	0.019	1.773
EDUCATION2	1.040	0.000	2.828
EDUCATION3	1.074	0.000	2.927
MGSTATUS	-2.394	0.000	0.091
RELIGION	0.527	0.061	1.694
SLI 2	0.559	0.060	1.750
SLI 3	1.105	0.006	3.020
HLAND 2	0.740	0.009	2.096
HLAND 3	0.426	0.349	1.532
HHTYPE	-0.255	0.346	0.775
CONSTANT	-1.916	0.000	0.147

-2 log likelihood	Cox & Snell R ²
447.092	0.286

Estimation terminated at iteration number 5.

Table 3C.1.2 Probabilities

Covariates	Probability	Odds ratio
Unmarried Buddhist male with HHTYPE	0.24	1.79
Unmarried Hindu male with HHTYPE	0.15	
Unmarried Buddhist male with HHTYPE EDUCATION 3	0.82	1.68
Unmarried Buddhist male with HHTYPE SLI 3	0.73	

The results (Table 3C.1.1) obtained by applying logistic regression on migration status (MGSTATUS) reveal that estimates of sex (male with respect female), higher education with educational level less than matric, standard of living (as against lower one) and Buddhist beside Hindu are statistically significant, and have direct effect on migration. Migration increases with incremental increase in these independent variables. One unit change in male, educational level, religion and standard of living index, keeping other variables unchanged, changes migration by 0.573, 1.040 - 1.074, 0.527 and 0.559 - 1.105, respectively as compared to their respective base categories. Marital status (married as against unmarried) has adverse effect that unmarried population migrate more than married one and the differential is about 2.39. Migration among joint type of households is less than nuclear households.

Another table 3C.1.2 shows that unmarried Buddhist population (0.24 percent) is likely to migrate more than unmarried Hindu population (0.15 percent) with same type of household. This table 3C.1.2 also shows that for unmarried Buddhist males has increased likelihood to migrate than unmarried Hindu males with same type of household (through the probabilities are less than 0.50 for both communities), odds ratio being 1.79. Unmarried Buddhist males are likely to migrate more than unmarried Hindu males with same educational level (above matric), type of household and standard of living index. Odds ratio (1.68) shows that male of Buddhist community has increased likelihood to migrate than male of Hindu. Similar pattern has been seen among out-migrants of tribal region.

3C.2 Logistic regression analysis for all migrants of non-tribal region

Independent (explanatory) variables are:

SEX: 1 for male, 0 for female

EDUCATION 2: 1 for matric, 0 otherwise

EDUCATION 3: 1 for above matric, 0 otherwise

SC: 1 for caste SC, 0 otherwise

OBC: 1 for above OBC, 0 otherwise

RESIDENCE: 1 for urban, 0 for rural

SLI 2: 1 for SLI 26-40 score, 0 otherwise

SLI 3: 1 for SLI 41+ score, 0 otherwise

HHTYPE: 1 for joint type of household, 0 otherwise

Dependent variable:

MGSTATUS: 1 for migration (migrants), 0 otherwise

Table 3C.2.1 Logistic regression analysis (Non-tribal region, Migration) Dependent variable: Migration status (MGSTATUS)

Covariate	B	p-value	Exp (B)
SEX	1.111	0.000	3.037
EDUCATION 2	0.686	0.017	1.985
EDUCATION 3	0.579	0.050	1.784
SC	-1.551	0.000	0.212
OBC	-0.084	0.760	0.920
RESIDENCE	0.143	0.783	1.153
MGSTATUS	-0.497	0.037	0.609
SLI 2	-1.265	0.000	0.282
SLI 3	-0.066	0.817	0.936
HHTYPE	-0.172	0.481	0.842
CONSTANT	-1.893	0.000	0.151

-2 log likelihood	Cox & Snell R ²
479.386	0.11

Estimation terminated at iteration number 6.

Table 3C.2.2 Probabilities

Covariates	Probability	Odds ratio
Unmarried Rural male with HHTYPE	0.31	1.16
Unmarried Urban male with HHTYPE	0.28	
Unmarried Rural male with HHTYPE EDUCATION 3	0.35	1.53
Unmarried Rural male with HHTYPE SLI 3	0.26	

Table 3C.2.1 (Non-tribal) reveals that, holding other variables constant, male population migrates more than female one. Educational level of population is statistically significant at 5 percent and is found to be affecting migration directly. Scheduled caste population migrates less than general caste. Urban population migrates more than rural, but level of significance shows that there is hardly any rural-urban differential. Household standard of living index indicates that population of lower level of index migrates relatively more, as the estimate of the parameter is highly significant.

Another table 3C.2.2 shows that probability of unmarried, rural male population with type of household (joint versus nuclear) has higher probability of migration (0.31 percent) than unmarried urban male population with same type of household (0.28 percent).

Tables 3C.2.1 and 3C.2.2 showing probabilities and odds ratio for migration and out-migration indicate that unmarried rural male with same type of household is likely to migrate and out-migrate more than unmarried urban male. Odds ratio also reveals that rural unmarried males have increased likelihood to migrate as well out-migrate than unmarried urban males with same type of household, educational level and household standard of living index (odds ratio is 1.53 and 8.84 for non-tribal migrants and out-migrants, respectively).

4. Policy Implications

Migration has both positive and negative consequences, therefore, such policy should be framed that can focus on eliminating the negative impact. More efforts are required from the Government side for the development of tribal region and rural areas of non-tribal region, in general, and its villages, in particular. More investment is required especially in education, health sectors, infrastructure and other areas of social sector to improve the income, employment and living conditions of rural households and to abate undesirable flow of rural workforce to the urban areas. Research and development, irrigation and labour intensive activities in rural areas and agriculture sector should be promoted through planning and government programmes enhancing on-farm employment via raising agriculture activities and stimulating rural non-farm activities through backward and forward linkages. Region and areas-specific policy interventions may be more effective.

Bibliography

- Bhende, A. A., & Kanitkar, T. (1997). *Principles of Population Studies*. Mumbai: Himalaya Publishing House.
- Chand, J. (1996). *An Econometric Analysis of Determinants of Out-Migration*. Shimla: Populationa Research Centre, Himachal Pradesh.
- Damodar N Gujrati, D. C. (2012). *Basic Econometrics* (Fifth ed.). New Delhi: McGraw Hill Education (India) Private Limited.
- Fei, J. C., & Ranis, G. (1961). A Theory of Economic Development. *The American Economic Review*, 51(No 4), 533-652.
- Gosh, B. N. (1989). *Population Theories and Demographic Analysis*. New Delhi: Meenakshi Prakashan.
- Gulati, S. C. (1991). Population Growth and Development a District Level Analysis. *Demography India*, 20(2), 199-208.
- Harold, F. D. (1959). *The Study of Population*. Mumbai: Asia Publishing House.
- Hussain, S. S., Hussan, B. N., & Muhammad, Z. Y. (2004). A Sociological Study of Factors Responsible for Migration: A Case Study of Fasalabad City. *International Journal of Agriculture and Biology*, 6(4), 683-685.
- Jha, V. (2005). Migration of Orissa's Tribal Women: A New Story of Exploitation. *Economic and Political Weekly*, XL(15), 1495-1496.
- Joshi, Y. G. (1997). *Tribal Migration*. New Delhi: Rewat Publication.
- Kumar, A., & Verson, J. (2015). *Dynamics of International Out-Migration from Punjab*. Chandigarh: Centre for Research in Rural and Industrial Development (CRRID).
- Lee, E. S. (1966). A Theory of Migration. *Demography*, 3(1), 47-57.
- Lewis, W. A. (1954). Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour. *Manchester School of Economics and Social Studies*, XXII, 139-191.
- Majumdar, P. S., & Majumdar, I. (1978). *Rural Migrants in an Urnban Setting*. Delhi: Hindustan Publishing House.
- Mason, A., & Westley, S. B. (2002). *The Future of Population in Asia*. Honolulu, Hawaii, USA: East-West Centre.
- Ravenstein, E. G. (1885, June). The Law of Migration. *Journal of the Statistical Society of London*, 48(2), 167-235.
- Ravenstein, E. G. (1889, June). The Laws of Migration. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 52(2), 241-305.
- Singh, S., & Kaur, A. (2007). Causes and Consequences of Migrant Labour in Ludhiana City: A Case Study. *Social Action*, 57(1), 56-64.
- Stark, O., & Bloom, D. E. (1985). The Economics of Labour Migration. *The American Economic Review*, 75(2), 173-178.

Stouffer, S. A. (1940, December). Intervening Opportunities: A Theory Relating Mobility and Distance. *American Sociological Review*, 5(6), 845-867.

Todaro, M. (1969). A Model of Labour Migration and Urban Unemployment in Less Developed Countries. *American Economic Review*, 59, 138-148.

United Nations, Department of Economics and Social Affairs, Population Division (2017). International Migration Report 2017: Highlights, 1.

World Bank. (2009). *Reshaping Economic Geography*. Washington D. C.: Oxford University Press.

