



## **STUDY ON INDIAN DOMESTIC LABOR MIGRATION: CURRENT TRENDS AND PATTERNS**

**Supriya Ray**

Research Scholar

Department of Economics

Sunrise University, Alwar

Rajasthan

supriyaray68@gmail.com

**Dr. Disha Sharma**

Research Guide

Department of Economics

Sunrise University, Alwar

Rajasthan

### **Abstract**

*Each rising economy sees excess labor force migrate to shortage regions in quest of jobs and better living circumstances. With 1.2 billion people, India has about 30 million internal migrants. Labor migration is crucial to India's prosperity. This research uses NSSO and CSO migration data to track internal mobility between rural and urban regions. Labour migration has increased at the macro level. According to the research, 30% of males in some underdeveloped areas have it for work reasons. 50% of migration is rural-to-urban. Short-term migration varies greatly.*

***Key words:** Short term migration, seasonal unemployment, labour migration.*

### **Introduction**

Economic progress depends on migrations. Migration and urbanization have always been signs of economic progress in space, especially in the current globalized era. Industrialization increases the divide between rural and urban regions, shifting workers to industrializing areas. Agriculture stagnation and lack of sectoral diversification in rural economies have traditionally driven migration and urbanization in developing nations. Many studies have considered growing cities, ever more mobile people, and increasingly specialized products to be essential for economic development (World Development Report, 2009). Even macro-level estimates of trends using both NSSO and Census have shown that economic migration has been increasing in recent years. According to census estimates, economic migrants climbed to 28.9 million in 2001 from 19.8 million in 1991, while urban rural economic migrants made up 42% of the total migrants in 2001. (Thapa and Yadav, 2015). NSSO estimates indicate urban male migration rates rising from 12.68% to 14.4% between 1993 and 2007-08. (Srivastava, 2011).

Consequently, India is an intriguing instance for studying migration and urbanization. India has a GDP in the top five. India is the least urbanized of the top 10 economies, with 31.16 percent of its people residing in cities and towns in 2011. (Chandrasekhar and Sharma, 2014). According to Kotwal, Ramaswami, and Wadhwa (2011), "the percentage of agriculture in employment has not dropped down significantly unlike many others," making India's economic progress unique. India has had a constant increase in agricultural labor whereas all other industrialized nations saw a decrease. The service sector drives India's development. This contrasts with East and Southeast Asian industrial nations. As urbanization means non-agricultural activity, they must be included first. Consequently, analyzing how human-mobility affects destination economies is controversial. According to studies, migration

might negatively affect locally birthed employees with equal abilities, although the consequences are usually minimal. Since civilization began, political, economic, religious, life-threatening, and sociocultural challenges have affected mobility (Roy and Debnath, 2011). This research analyzes Indian migration patterns between urban and rural locations. Compare gender, wealth, and social group effects on migration within the nation.

**DATA AND METHODS**

The Census and National Sample Survey Organisation gather labor migration statistics in India (NSSO). Census surveys migration every 10 years, whereas the NSSO does not. The 64th Wave of NSSO migration data is the latest (2007-08). 2011 population and migration census data is the latest. NSSO and Census migrant definitions disagree. Census classifies migrants by birthplace and residency. Migrants are people who reside in a location other than their place of birth (Place of enumeration). Yet, a person is migrant by location of last residence if the census enumeration is different from his last habitation. The NSSO classifies migrants by asking where they live. NSSO defines a migrant as someone who has lived in a different location for more than six months.

Thus, Census and NSSO are the two largest macro sources of migration data, and the definitions used for migrants in these data sources are not employment related and the estimation of magnitude of migration is not very precise in these official surveys, but the Census data on migrants and the NSSO using information by monthly consumer expenditure of households agree that migration occurs more in households with higher monthly per c (Srivastava, 2011; Bhagat, 2009; Kundu and Sarangi, 2007). Hence, the research used Census and NSSO newest data released by the Indian government (GOI). Tabular analysis is used to investigate migration patterns across distance, time, regions, gender, and social groups.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Temporal and Spatial trends in migration**

To analyze chronological, regional, and gender-specific migration rates, the 2011 census data was used and compared to earlier census reports (1991 & 2001). As shown in the table below, 54% of 2011 migrants were from rural areas, while 47% were urban (Table 1) Throughout time, rural migration has declined while urban migration has grown, showing greater opportunities and facilities in rural regions and the consequences of liberalisation, privatisation, and globalisation (LPG) in terms of more opportunities and amenities.

**Table 1. Temporal and Spatial trends in migration.**

Census year	Place of residence	Number of Migrants (millions)	% of migrants in rural or urban areas		
			Persons	Rural	Urban
1991	Total	225		70.5	29.5
	Rural	159			
	Urban	66			
2001	Total	309		67.2	32.8

	Rural	207				
	Urban	101				
2011	Total	1253		53.5	46.5	
	Rural	670				
	Urban	582				

**Table 2. Trends in migration based on Gender over the period.**

Census year	Number of Migrants (millions)			% of migrants as male or female		
	Persons	Male	Female		Male	Female
1991	225	61	164		27.06	72.94
2001	309	90	218		29.31	70.69
2011	1253	370	882		29.58	70.42

urban migration since 1990's LPG reforms (Singh, 2016). The migration trends by gender (male, female) show that across various periods, the rate of female migration is quite high, and accounts to 70% in 2011 where as the male migration stands out to be just 30% (Table 2). Marriage contributes more than 50% share in female migration, but in case of male, marriage is not the case of migration but other reasons of job, lucrative wages are prominent and for female more. Employment comes second to marriage in Indian migration (Deshingkar, 2006).

**Migration based on different social categories**

Long-term migration is also impacted by social groupings, with general category persons being more likely to migrate than SC, ST, and other backward classes. This may be because higher caste people can afford to travel to cities for better jobs and education, or for labor work if they are destitute. Table 3 compares NSS 2007-08 and NSS 1999-2000 migration patterns for male and female social groupings.

It is further supported by the fact that 55% of long-term migrants in Punjab working as migratory labor belong to general caste owing to the social stigma of working as a laborer (Kaur et al. 2011). SC and ST migrants are mostly laborers and short-term wage earners, and both men and women travel among the lower classes for seasonal job and marriage-related reasons (Srivastava, 2003). Research also suggest that upper castes travel more than lower castes since caste is endogamous and determined at birth (Bhagat, 2014).

**Table 3. Migration by different Social category.**

All India proportion of migrants within each social group for each category of persons (%)

Social groups	1999-2000			2007-08		
	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons
SC	5.6	35.7	20.4	4.7	44.0	23.8
ST	6.4	43.4	24.4	4.9	48.2	26.0
OBC	6.5	42.8	24.2	5.1	46.8	25.5
Others	8.1	44.3	25.9	6.8	50.6	28.1

All	6.9	42.6	24.4		5.4	47.7	26.1	
-----	-----	------	------	--	-----	------	------	--

**Case of Short Duration Migration**

The 64th Round (2007-08) of the NSSO, the most comprehensive migration survey, gathers short-term migration data. Short-term migrants labor for 30–180 days. NSSO helps explain seasonal migration. We can observe that most movement comes from rural streams, hence most rural-rural migration is seasonal and follows the agricultural cycle of the specific area (Table 4). Short-term migration is mostly caused by rural unemployment and undeveloped non-farm sectors. Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, West Bengal, Rajasthan, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Gujarat, and Nagaland have the largest proportion of short-term migrants in India (Thapa and Yadav, 2015; NSS, 2007-08). Short-term migration was mostly done by men (Table 4).

The table below displays short-term migration patterns by monthly per capita expenditure (MPCE) class. Lower MPCE groups migrate more than higher income groups, indicating that short-term migration is more prevalent in lower income groups.

**Table 4. Short term migration based on MPCE classes (1000 persons).**

All India MPCE classes	Category of persons						
	Rural			Urban			
	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female	Person	
0-10	45	10	27	10	1	5	
10-20	39	9	24	11	1	6	
20-30	37	7	22	9	2	5	
30-40	32	5	18	6	1	4	
40-50	32	6	19	5	1	3	
50-60	26	4	15	4	1	3	
60-70	21	3	12	6	2	4	
70-80	22	3	13	6	1	4	
80-90	16	3	9	5	1	3	
90-100	14	2	8	3	1	2	
All Classes	28	5	17	6	1	4	

Short-term migration is more common among unstable income categories due to rural seasonal unemployment. Based on NSS statistics, rural and urban male mobility has increased sharply (Srivastava and Bhattacharya, 2002).

Poor rural families adopt seasonal or temporary migration as a livelihood strategy (Deshingkar and Farrington, 2009; De Haan, 2011; Keshri and Bhagat, 2012). Temporary migration exceeds permanent migration by seven times annually (Keshri and Bhagat, 2013).

**Reasons for migration and net migration across different regions in India**

According to Census statistics (2011), males migrate for job, followed by relocating with

families and other reasons. In the table below, female marriage is the leading reason of migration, followed by migrating with families and others (Table 5). Numerous research have revealed that males migrate for job while females migrate for marriage or family settling (Bhagat, 2014). Based on 2001 census statistics, 38% of males moved for work, compared to 3% of women (Thapa and Yadav, 2015). Employment is the main economic cause for migration for both genders. Better social networks, communication, transport, and labor contract systems have lowered risks and costs, making migration more appealing (Bagchi and Majumdar, 2011; Baily, 2011).

Net migrants and net migration rates vary throughout the nation. Only Chhattisgarh in the central region and Maharashtra in the western region show net positive migration, while other major states like Bihar in west, UP in north, Kerala in south, and Assam in north east show net negative migration rates. Overall, eastern and northern regions have the highest net negative migration rates due to Bihar and UP. According to NSS definition, net migration is the difference between in-migrants and out-migrants from a state over a time.

Although UP and Bihar are more populated, West Bengal has more out migrants seeking job and livelihood in other developed and richer states. South Karnataka has positive net migration, although Kerala has large outmigrants owing to business.

**Table 5. All-India % of migrants based on reasons for migration.**

Reasons	Number of migrants (Million) and % of migrants		
	Persons	Male	Female
Total migrants	453	140	312
Work	46 (10.2)	39 (27.7)	7 (2.4)
Business	4 (1.1)	3 (2.3)	1 (0.4)
Education	8 (1.8)	4 (3.4)	3 (1.03)
Marriage	223 (49.4)	6 (4.3)	217 (69.7)
Moved after birth	47 (10.6)	28 (20.3)	19 (6.2)
Moved with household	69 (15.4)	313 (22.3)	38 (12.3)
Others	53 (11.7)	27 (19.8)	25 (8.1)

**Table 6. Region wise net migrants (millions) and net migration rates across India (Per1000 population).**

Regions	Population (millions)	Net migrants (millions)	Net migration rates
Eastern	215.0	-4.1	-19.1
Northern	239.7	-4.1	-16.9
Southern	215.5	-2.4	-11.0
North eastern	36.2	-0.2	-4.4
Central	83.5	0.2	2.7
Western	203.8	4.3	21.1





reasons, and Andhra Pradesh, therefore even the Southern region has a negative net migration rate, as seen in Table 6. According to the latest NSS data (2007-08), Maharashtra, Punjab, Haryana, Gujarat, and Karnataka get the most migrants, while Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Jharkhand, and Orissa send the most (Bhagat, 2014). Due to lots of chances in metropolitan cities like Delhi, Mumbai, Chennai, Bangalore, Hyderabad, Pune, etc., a "hub and spoke" migratory pattern has emerged (Srivastava, 2012).

## CONCLUSION

Migration and development are linked, and migration is the dynamic force in both rural and urban regions. The Lewis Model's core assumption that rural-urban movement would be impacted by excess labor in the migrants' rural origins is supported by empirical evidence. Data shows that higher MPCE families migrate more for better income and living situations. Short-term migration is more prevalent in lower MPCE classes, unlike long-term migration. Poor Schedule Caste and Schedule Tribe families migrate short-term. Distress is the major source of economic inequality. The data show that poorer families from surplus labor areas may not travel as often as wealthier ones for long-term migration, either because to insecurity at the new location or because they can now fill the positions left by the migrated upper class individuals at the original and be better off. Thus, in the long run, these unequal migration trends tend to equalize income gaps in both rural and urban areas, leading to economic development. Internal migration can help prevent households from falling into poverty in both sending and receiving areas through its own mechanism and sideways development. Cheap labor is helping the Indian economy expand quicker.

Hence, only continuous rural and urban operations can effectively use this labor base. NSDC (National skill development council) and ASCI (Agricultural skills council of India) - National Skill Certificate and monetary prize. Consider rural programs like MGNAREGA, which assist desperate migrants avoid slums. The government should focus more on planned development of cities and neglected urban areas to allow for even migration, balance mass flow and resource exploitation, and utilize the country's demographic dividend, which if left unchecked could lead to a global demographic disaster.

## REFERENCES

1. Bagchi K.K. and Majumdar S. 2011. *Dynamics of out migration of agricultural labourers: A micro level study in two districts of West Bengal*. *Agri. Econ. Rsch. Revw.*, **24**: 568-573
2. Baily A. 2011. *In search of livelihoods: Migration and mobility from Karnataka and Goa*. *India migration report*, Routledge, New Delhi.
3. Bhagat R.B. 2009. *Internal migration in India: Are the underclass more mobile?* *IUSSP General population conference Marrakech Morocco*.
4. Bhagat R.B. 2014. *Urban migration trends challenges and opportunities in India*. *Background paper on World migration report (2015)*, Published by International Organisation for Migration (IOM).
5. *Census report. 2011. Census of India. Office of the registrar general and census commissioner,*



GOI, New Delhi.

6. Chandrasekhar S. and Sharma A. 2014. *Urbanization and spatial patterns of internal migration in India*. Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research, Mumbai.
7. Haan A. 2011. *Inclusive growth? Labour migration and poverty in India*. ISS working paper No. 513, Institute of social studies, The Hague.
8. Deshingkar P. 2006. *Internal migration, poverty and development in Asia*. Manuscript. Institute of Development Studies, Sussex.
9. Deshingkar P. and Farrington J. 2009. *A framework of understanding circular migration*. In: *Circular migration and multilocal livelihood strategies in rural India*. Oxford university press, New York.
10. Kaur B., Singh J.M., Garg B.R., Singh J. and Singh
11. S. 2011. *Causes and impact of labour migration: A case study of Punjab agriculture* *Agricultural Economics Research Review*. **24**: 459-466.
12. Keshri K. and Bhagat R.B. 2012. *Temporary and seasonal migration: Regional patterns, characteristics and associated factors*. *Econ polwky*. **47**(4): 81-88.
13. Keshri K. and Bhagat R.B. 2013. *Socio-economic determinants of temporary labour migration in India*. *Asian Popn Stud*. **9**(2): 175-195.
14. Kotwal A., Ramaswami B. and Wadhwa W. 2011. *Economic liberalization and Indian economic growth: what's the evidence?* *Journal of econ lit*. **49**(4): 1152-1199.
15. Kundu A. and Sarangi N. 2007. *Migration, employment status and poverty, an analysis across urban centers*. *Econ. and Pol. Wkly*, **42**(4).
16. National Sample Survey Office (NSSO). 2001. *Migration in India 1999-2000*, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India, New Delhi.
17. National Sample Survey Office (NSSO). 2010. *Migration in India 2007-08*, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India, New Delhi. Ministry of Finance.
18. Roy N. and Debnath A. 2011. *Impact of migration on economic development: A Study of some selected State*. *International Conference on Social Science and Humanity, IPEDR*. **6**(5): 198-202.
19. Singh H. 2016. *Increasing rural to urban migration in India: A challenge or an opportunity*. *International Journal of Applied Research*, **2**(4): 447-450.
20. Srivastava R.S. and Bhattacharya S. 2002. *Globalisation, reforms and internal labour mobility: Analysis of recent Indian trends*. Presentation at seminar 'Labour Mobility and Globalising world: Conceptual and Empirical Issues'. V.V.Giri National Labour Institute, ISLE, and IHD.
21. Srivastava R.S. 2003. *Labour migration and agrarian change in Eastern Uttar Pradesh*. IDPAD study report, New Delhi.
22. Srivastava R.S. 2011. *Labour migration in India, recent trends, patterns and policy issues*. *Indian Journal of Labour Econo*, **54**(3): 411-440.
23. Thapa R. and Yadav S.K. 2015. *Rural labour migration in India: Magnitude and characteristics*. *International Journal of Applied Research*, **1**(2): 114-118.
24. World Bank. *World Development Report*. 2009. *Reshaping Economic Geography*. The World Bank, Washington, DC.