

Internal Migration and its impact on Regional Development in India: An Empirical Evidence

Sarbeswar Padhan

Assistant Professor in Economics, Department of Economics, Dr.Bhim Rao Ambedkar College, University of Delhi, Wazirpur Road, Yamuna Vihar
Email: sarbeswarpadhan0@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper is an attempt to understand the issues of internal migration and its impact on regional development in India. The NSS data 1999-00 and 2007-08 reveals that internal migration patterns depict the heavy concentration of the migrants from lower socio-economic strata for livelihood. Using Binary Logistic regression model for migration, it is also found that those who are belonging to the socially and economically lower strata have higher probability of moving for livelihood and vice versa. The paper also looks at the impact of migration through various uses of remittances in the country. This study helps in formulating policy for a balanced regional development through migration for all social and economic groups including gender.

Keywords

Internal Migration, Regional Development, India, Empirical

Article Received: 10 August 2020, Revised: 25 October 2020, Accepted: 18 November 2020

Introduction

In the early twenty-first century migration has become an important global issue, as more people are found moving than ever. As per the available statistics, three per cent of the world population is presently outside their place of birth and one out of every twenty-five in this globe is a migrant. The latest Human Development Report 2009 there are four times more of internal migration as compared to international migration. Mobility is an integral part of human existence. However, all types of human mobility are not migration. According to 64th round NSSO survey (2007-08), those movement which resulted in change of usual place of residence (UPR) of the individual were treated as migration and a household member whose last usual place of enumeration is considered as migrant.

A plethora of theoretical and empirical literature has attempted to explain the patterns, determinants and its impact on regional development. Study on determinants of migration and its impacts on regional development do not give any conclusive results. Banerjee and Raju,(2009) emphasized on the household income as one of the important factor of migration. In their study they took the MPCE as the proxy variables of household income. Amount of land holding had been discussed by Connel et.al (1976) in their village level studies found that it is the landless people are less likely to migrate. On the other hand,

Yadava et.al (1991) found positive relationship between landholding and migration in India. Rogaly (2002) study about the migration in rural village of West Bengal and found that caste system is one of the important factors relate to migration process in rural place. A set of studies says that migration of all form increasing and it has negative impact on the regional development (Vijay,2005). This literature analyses the fact of rural-urban migration in Andhra Pradesh which is primarily due to the push factor. Again, a similar kind of studies (Gupta and Mitra,2002) says that migration leads to labour segmentation in urban areas and reduces the bargaining power which leads to vulnerability to migrant worker. In contrast to that, another set of studies (Stark and Bloom,1985) consider migration as a family strategy collectively act for the maximize of the income and minimize the risk, diversify their income earning and loosen financial constraints through the use of remittances. So, migration should be considered as an important aspect for regional development.

Given this background the major objective of the paper is to find out the broad patterns and determinants of migration and its impact on regional development in India during 1999-00 to 2007-08. This paper is divided into four sections. Internal migration scenario in India has been discussed in the first section. The second section deals broadly with the characteristics and patterns of migration like, gender, caste, educational

attainment and economic classes. The third section tries to identify the key socio-economic and demographic factors associated with migration in India. The fourth section explores the uses of remittances and its impact of regional development in the country.

Data and Methods

Population Census of India and National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO) are the two most comprehensive sources of data for migration in India. Population Census is providing decade-wise data on various reasons for migration, while NSS provides data on different characteristics and pattern along with the reasons for migration. Usual Place of Residence (UPR)² for migrant were classified under this category. If a person changed UPR to pursue his/her studies and at the same time looked for employment, which was the case in many occasions, the factor which was basic for his/her change of residence were considered.” The present paper uses the unit level data from NSSO 55th (July 1999-June 2000) and 64th round (July 2007-June 2008) of the *Employment and Unemployment and Migration Particular*.

In order to determine the characteristics associated with internal migration the Binary Logistic Regression Model has been used. The selection of the explanatory variables is based on the availability of data and previous studies on migration. The dependent variable is whether the migrants move for livelihoods. The independent variables are categorised as Gender (Male and Female), Place of Residence (Rural and Urban), Social Groups (ST, SC, OBC, Others), Economic Status (Lowest, Lower, Medium, Higher and Highest quintiles classes) and Educational Attainment (Below Middle, Secondary, Higher Secondary and Graduate and above). In the model

entire independent variables of the first one is the reference category.

$$\text{Log} (p/ (1-p)) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Sex} + \beta_2 \text{Place of Residence} + \beta_3 \text{Social Group} + \beta_4 \text{Educational Status} + \beta_5 \text{Economic Status} + u_i$$

Where, p = the Probability of Migrants.

1-p is Otherwise.

β_0 =Constant

β_1 to β_5 are the regression coefficient associated with the independent variables

u_i is error term.

Analytical Discussion

Table 1.1 shows the pattern of out- migration can be analyzed through the comparison of both the rounds. In 55th round out-migration among others category (25.9%) was less among STs (20.4%) in rural areas. In urban area out-migration is more among STs (34.5%) and less among SCs (30.5%). In rural places the SCs are 24.4 per cent of out-migrants. The OBCs are

24.2 per cent of total out-migrant in rural area but in urban area the percentage has slightly increased to 32.3 per cent.

In gender wise in both the place the female is more migrating than male. While looking at the 64th round others category (28.1%) is more migrating, and follows by OBCs which constitute more than 25 per cent of total rural out-migrants. On the other hand, in the urban place the percentage of STs (35.6%) is quite larger than rural STs (23.8%). The other category people are out- migrating more in rural (28.1%) as well as urban areas (37.9%). So, in the 64th round we found SCs and STs is on average migrating lower than among other groups. In both the round it is the others category people are out-migrating more percentage.

Table 1: Percentage of Migration across Social Group

55 th Round	RURAL			URBAN		
SOCIAL Group	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
ST	5.6	35.7	20.4	28.2	41.1	34.5
SC	6.4	43.4	24.4	22.5	39.3	30.5
OBC	6.5	42.8	24.2	23.7	41.7	32.3
OTHERS	8.1	44.3	25.9	27.6	42.6	34.7
INDIA	6.9	42	24.4	25.7	41.8	33.4

64 th Round						
ST	4.7	44	23.8	28.8	43	35.6
SC	4.9	48.2	26	23.5	44.7	33.7
OBC	5.1	46.8	25.5	23	43.7	33.1
OTHERS	6.8	50.6	28.1	29	47.7	37.9
INDIA	5.4	47.7	26.1	25.9	45.6	35.4

Source: Computed from the unit level data 55th and 64th NSS Rounds

If we look into table 1 the economic status in terms of monthly per capita consumption expenditure (MPCE) quintile of migrants on the basis of across the social group it is the STs (17.07%) people are migrating more from the bottom MPCE quintile in rural place. In rural areas we find another important thing that is SCs (27.27%) are from the bottom quintile migrating highest percentage than any other MPCE quintile. But OBCs are migrating from across the quintile. It constitutes more than 43 per cent of OBCs migrating from rural areas across the MPCE quintile. 'Others' categories migrants are more from top quintile from rural places.

For both the STs and SCs about 4.64 and 26.48 per cent respectively people are migrating from urban place. It is the bottom MPCE quintile STs and SCs are migrating more than any other. Looking at the OBCs it is lower quintile people (47.31%) are migrating more and highest quintile people are less likely to migrant in urban areas. The other category people, around 44 percent of top quintile are migrating from urban places. Therefore, looking at the 64th round data we can't generalized that it is the top quintile people are migrating more across the social group of the country level.

Table-1.2 Migrants across Social Group on MPCE Quintile

RURAL						
SOCIAL GROUP	LOWEST	LOWER	MEDIUM	HIGHER	HIGHEST	TOTAL
ST	17.07	11.79	8.98	7.36	5.24	11.00
SC	27.27	23.41	19.58	17.14	10.94	21.09
OBC	40.54	45.52	47.25	43.50	40.99	43.82
Others	15.11	19.27	24.19	32.00	42.83	24.09
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
URBAN						
MPCE	Lowest	Lower	Medium	Higher	Highest	Total
ST	4.64	4.37	3.05	2.78	2.40	2.89
SC	26.48	23.29	19.62	17.07	9.54	14.93
OBCs	44.33	47.31	47.99	42.39	29.89	29.89
Others	24.55	25.03	29.34	37.76	58.17	44.38
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Computed from the unit level data 64th NSS Rounds

Results of Binary Logistic Model:

To discuss the determinants of migrants we have taken the help of binary logistic regression model. In comparing the result, we found from both rounds are almost same result. After taking into account others variable in the model, the person having lower MPCE quintile is 2 times more chances of migrants as compared to lowest MPCE quintiles in both the round. As the MPCE quintiles level of a person increase the chances to

migrants become less. Taking into account all others variable in the model, among the social group being a SC category individual 2 times more chances to migrate as compared to reference category, ST in 55TH round. But in 64th round a SC person 1.38 times more chances to migrate. And being a OBCs individual 23 and 28 times more chances to migrate in 55th and 64th round respectively. For the others category also in the

64th round relatively more likely to migrate as compared to ST.

Table-1.3 Binary Logistic Regression for Migrants in India

VARIABLE	55 th NSSO ROUND		64 th NSSO ROUND	
	Standard Error	Odds Ratio	Standard Error	Odds Ratio
MPCE				
LOWEST®	-	-	-	-
LOWER	0.01	2.19***	0.89	2.43***
MEDIUM	0.02	2.03***	0.80	2.22***
HIGHER	0.01	1.95***	0.75	2.11***
HIGHEST	0.01	1.66***	0.56	1.75***
SOCIAL GROUP				
ST®	-	-	-	-
SC	0.69	2.00***	0.32	1.38***
OBC	0.21	1.23***	0.25	1.29***
OTHERS	0.13	1.14***	0.21	1.24***
LAND POSSESSED				
BELOW 1 HECTARE®-		-	-	-
BETWEEN 1-4 HECTARE	-0.54	0.58***	-0.38	0.69***
BETWEEN 4-8 HECTARE	-0.23	0.79***	0.05	1.05***
ABOVE 8 HECTARES	0.03	1.03***	0.11	1.11***
EDUCATIONAL STATUS				
NOT LITERATE®	-	-	-	-
LITERATE BUT BELOW MIDDLE	-0.63	0.53***	-0.90	0.41***
MIDDLE BUT BELOW SECONDARY	-0.38	0.69***	-0.50	0.61***
SECONDARY AND ABOVE	-0.01	0.99***	-0.12	0.89***
AGE				
BELOW 14 YEARS®	-	-	-	-
BETWEEN 15-59 YEARS	2.62	13.69***	2.98	19.61
ABOVE 60 YEARS	0.02	1.02	-0.09	0.91
RELIGION				
HINDU®	-	-	-	-
MUSLIMS	-0.35	0.71***	-0.21	0.81***
OTHERS	0.36	1.43***	0.39	1.48***
SEX				
MALE®	-	-	-	-
FEMALE	1.64	5.13***	2.26	9.57***
PLACE OF RESIDENCE				
RURAL®	-	-	-	-
URBAN	0.04	1.04***	0.263	1.3***
Constant=-0.029	N=598177	Constant=-0.796	N=570768	

Source: Computed from the unit level data 64th NSS Rounds

Note: *** indicates 1 per cent level of significance.

While we look into the educational status there is a negative relationship between the educational status and migrants. Those who have below middle literacy level 47 and 49 per cent less chances to migrate as compared to illiterate one in

55th and 64th round respectively. Secondary and above have very less chances to migrate as compared to illiterate one in both the round. Therefore, as the literacy level goes up people tend to migrate less. After controlling all the

variable in the model those who 15-59 years of age group have 13 times more chances to migrate as compared to below 14 years of age group 55th round but for the age group it has slightly higher (19%) more chances to migrate to migrate. For the age group of above 60 years 2 per cent more chances to migrate in 1999-2000 but in 64th round 10 per cent people of that age group less likely to migrate.

Taking into account all others variables in the model, being a Muslims 29 per cent are less chances to migrate in 55th round but in 64th round it has declined to 19 per cent less tend to migrate. Others religious category is 40 per cent more chances to migrants than the Hindu religion. Keeping all the variables in the model, being a female in 55th round have 5.13 times more chance to migrate than having a male. And being a female in 64th round it is 9.57 times more chances to migrate than being a male. Being a person urban place of residence 4 per cent more chances to migrate as compared to rural place of residence in 55th round and 3 per cent more chances to migrate in 64th round.

Migration and Regional Development:

The linkages of migration and its impacts can be overlooked through the changes in the worker principal activity status before and after migration.

The shift in the structure of workforce has changed in terms of usual principal status before and after migrants. The percentage of self-employment in total rural male migrants has increased from 10.56 per cent to 16.36 per cent after migration but the females have stable. The

regular employee has also increased from 9.36 per cent to 9.47 per cent in total. For females it is same. Overall unemployed are decrease for males from 2.59 per cent to less than 1 per cent. The percentage of self-employment in total urban male migrants has increased from 11 per cent to 14 per cent. The share of regular employment has increased from 12 per cent to 18 per cent and nearly 2 per cent to 5 per cent for the female migrants. The regular employee for

female has increased in urban migrants than rural migrants. The share of casual labour has reduced from 7.72 per cent to 5.14 per cent for males and for females it has also decreased marginally. The unemployed has changed drastically from 9 to 1 per cent. Those who are not in labour force also reduced significantly for both males and females in urban areas. The use of remittances for various diversified way. The total remittances by out-migrants have reached Rs.490 billion and out of which the share of internal migrants is about two-thirds⁴. So in this connection we try to see the use of remittances by specific states. These states are quite different in the use of total received remittances in different ways.

Table 4 shows that the variation in the use of remittances in some selected states. The north-eastern states like Meghalaya, Mizoram, and Manipur spends more than 52 percent of total remittances received than the all-India average. Since education is one of the important indicators of human resource development in the use of remittances have a significant role in augmenting the educational standard of these states.

Table-1.4 Use of Remittances in Selected States

Uses of Remittances	Selected State	% of RRH reporting use of remittances	All India
Education	Meghalaya, Mizoram, Manipur,	More than 52%	31%
Debt Payment	Kerala, Karnataka, Tamilnadu, Andhra Pradesh	Above 20%	10.2%
Health care	Rajasthan ,Sikkim	Less than 10%	36%
Saving and Investment	Goa, Chandigarh	More than 39%	6.4%

Source: Computed from the unit level data 64th NSS Rounds

Relatively better states like Kerala, Tamandu and Andhra Pradesh are spending more than 20 percent of total remittances received in the use of past debt payment. Rajasthan and Sikkim spend more than 10 per cent of total received

remittances in the use of basic health care. At the same time Goa and Chandigarh use their remittances in the form of saving and investment. Even though Indian migrants spends a higher proportion of total remittances in the consumption

of household expenditure we find some diversification in their earning in different ways it has an positive impact for livelihood of the migrants.

Conclusion

There is a negative relationship between economic status and migration. It means as MPCE quintiles increases the probability of migration decreases. It implies that lower economic status people are migrating more. As far as patterns of migration across the social group among the MPCE quintiles, in both rural and urban India lower social group SC and ST having lower MPCE quintile are migrating more whereas the OBC are migrating heavily across the MPCE quintile. Other social group having a higher economic status are migrating more. On the determination of migration, it is lower economic status, lower social group, and illiterate and being in the age group of 15-59 years are migrating more and more. Regarding the migration and its impact on regional development, the working status of the migrants have changed significantly after migration. More particularly regular employment has increased significantly among the urban female migrants, which is the positive impact on the economy. Use of remittances have been diversify in such a way that apart from consumption expenditure on food, it is being invested in productive activities like education, debt payments, health, saving and investment which show a positive impact on migrants and regional development.

References

- [1] Banerjee, A and S Raju (2009): Gender Mobility; Women Migrants and Works in Urban India”, *Economic and Political Weekly*. Vol. 54(28) p.p. 115-23.
- [2] Bhagat, R.B (2010), “Internal Migration in India: Are the Underprivileged Migrate More”,Asia-Pacific Popouation Journal,Vol.25,No.1,pp.27-45.
- [3] Chyrmang, R (2011), “Magnitude of Migration from the North-eastern Region of India”. in Irudaya Rajan, S.(ed), Migration, Identity and Conflict: India Migration Report 2011, Rutledge ,New Delhi.
- [4] Gupta, I. and A, Mitra (2002): “Rural Migrants and Labour Segmentation, Micro-Level Evidence from Delhi Slums” *Economic and Political Weekly* Vol.34.p.p 163-168
- [5] Connel, J., B. Dasgupta, R. Laishley, and M. Lipton (1976): *Migration from Rural Areas: The Evidence from Village Studies*, Delhi: Oxford University Press
- [6] National Sample Survey Office (2001), “Migration in India”, Report No. 470, NSSO 55th Round, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, New Delhi
- [7] National Sample Survey Office (2007-08), “Migration in India”, Report No. 533, NSSO 64th Round, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, New Delhi
- [8] Keshari K and R B Bhagat (2012), “Temporary and Seasonal Migration: Regional Pattern, Characteristics and Associated Factors” *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 57, No.6,pp. 81-88.
- [9] Kundu, Amitabh and N, Sarangi (2007), “Migration, Employment Status and Poverty: An Analysis across Urban Centres”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 42, No. 4, pp.-299-306.
- [10] Padhan, Sarbeswar (2013), “Characteristics and Patterns of Education Related Migration in India” Unpublished M.Phil Dissertation, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi.
- [11] Shanthi ,K (2006), “Female Labour Migration in India: Insight from NSS Data” Working Paper No.4, Madras School Of Economics, Chennai.
- [12] Srivastava, Ravi (1998), “Migration and the Labour Market in India”, *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, Vol.41, No.4, pp.583-616.
- [13] Srivastava, Ravi (2011) “Labour Migration in India: Recent Trends, Patterns and Policy Issues”, *India Journal of Labour Economics*, Vol.54, No.3, pp. 411–440
- [14] Srivastava, Ravi (2012) “Internal Migration in India: An Overview of its Features, Trends and Policy Changes”, Workshop Compendium, Vol.II: Workshop Recent Trends, Patterns and Policy Issues”, *India*

- Journal of Labour Economics*, Vol.54, No.3, pp. 411–440
- [15] Stark, Odak and D E Bloom (1985):” The Economics of Labour Migration” *American Economic Review*. Vol. 75(2) p.p 173-78
- [16] Rogaly, B.J Biswas, D Coppard, A, Rafique, K. Rana and A, Sengupta (2001): Seasonal Migration, Social Change and Migrants Rights: Lessons from West Bengal” *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 36(49)p.p-4547-59.
- [17] Vijay, G (2005): Migration and Vulnerability and Insecurity in New Industrial Labour Markets”. *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 40(22) P.P.2304-12.
- [18] Yadava, K.N.S., S.S Yadava and R.K. Sinha (1996): Rural Out-Migration and its Economic Implication on Migrants Households in India-A Review .*The Indian Economic Journal*, Vol.44,No.2:21-38