

Inter-state migration and regional disparities in India

Kailash C.Das and Subhasis Saha

Abstract

The main objective of this paper is to study the spatial pattern and levels of inter-state migration and to understand how regional disparities in development influences inter-state migration pattern in India. This study is based on 1991 and 2001 census migration data. In this analysis, two rates namely in-migration and out-migration rates have been computed separately for both males and females. Statistical method of correlation and regression has been used to find the linkage between regional disparities in development and migration. It shows that people mainly moved to the states which have witnessed higher growth rates of urbanization and achieved higher economic development compared to the states where employment opportunities are less. However, there are also some states which are showing significant in-migration as well as out-migration. The decadal growth rate of migration has increased during the period 1991 to 2001. Another important finding is that the overall sex ratio of migrants has reversed favouring males during the last decade. While there is a negative relationship between rate of in-migration and poverty, the volume of in migration is positively correlated with development.

INTRODUCTION

Migration is the geographic movement of people across a specified boundary for the purpose of establishing a new permanent or semi-permanent residence. Along with fertility and mortality, migration is a component of the population change. The term “in migration” and “out migration” are used for movement between areas within a country (internal migration). The parallel terms “immigration” and “emigration” are used to refer to moves between countries (international migration).

There has been a basic difference in the processes of migration in developing countries from that of the developed countries. In developing countries like India, migration mostly takes place not due to the so called pull forces of the destination place as usually happens in case of developed countries, but because of poverty, unemployment, natural calamities and underdevelopment at the origin place. Migration in developing countries is still viewed as a survival strategy. Poverty and prosperity both are responsible for inducing migration. While the former is mostly true in developing countries, the latter kind of migration is found in developed countries.

Migration is the barometer of changing socio-economic and political conditions at the national and international levels. It is also a sign of wide disparities in economic and social conditions between the origin and destination (UNFPA, 1993).

Migration and development is a growing area of interest. There has been much debate on the negative impacts of migration on development and vice - versa. On the one hand, it is argued that underdevelopment is a cause of migration, and on the other hand, prosperity also leads to migration.

The history of migration is the history of people's struggle to survive and to prosper, to escape insecurity and poverty, and to move in response to opportunity. The economist J.K. Galbraith describes migration as "the oldest action against poverty". World wide 175 millions people or just less than three percent of the total population live outside their country of birth.

Migration happens more due to regional disparity in development. People move from backward under-development regions to developed and prosperous areas in order to improve in their living conditions. This is found to be true both in international as well as in internal migration. In the developing countries in general and India in particular the inter-state migration should be viewed in the above context of regional disparity and inequality in development.

"Population pressure on finite resources encourages migration. While urbanization and rural-urban migration are natural outcome of the transition from agriculture-based economy to an industrial economy, the extent of such migration is frequently perceived to be excessive and urban population have been concentrated in the largest urban agglomerations in most of the Third World nations in general and in the Asian and Pacific regions in particular. The migration is seen, not so much as a natural outcome of development, but more as a result distortion in the development process deriving from inappropriate or ineffective planning"(U.N,ESCAPE, 1991,Pp 1-12)

Migration and regional disparities are strongly interlinked. Lee's theory (1965) of volume of migration states that the "volume of migration within a given territory varies with the degree of diversity of areas included in that territory". Economic Criteria is the basic motive behind most of the migration.

In a study (Mukheji, DPFW-93) on "Inter-state migration and regional disparities in India" found that in India, even in recent times, inter-state migration of the males for employment, (as well as of females) is still very much linked with the underdevelopment, poverty, spatial disorganization, regional disparities, social inequalities, rural stagnation, rural neglect and unbalanced regional development over national space. In India, people are still primarily migrating just for the survival.

A study done by economic and social commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP, 1991) observed that "migration from rural to urban areas continues at a rapid pace in many countries of the region, and it was often beyond the capacity of towns, cities and metropolitan areas to cope with the increasing numbers .

Today, throughout the world, migration is contributing to economic and social development by enabling man to overcome the primary policy objective of regional science. The role played by migration in socio-economic

development requires one to view it historically, since its form and role have changed some what over time. Migration is an equilibrating process serving to improve relations between man's numbers and his physical environment or to reduce disparity between communities or regions in different stages of development, or to give rise to an increase in the overall productivity of the factorial equipment of a region or country (Spengler and Myers, 1977).

Lucas (1977) has overviews the role of population migration in promoting economic development through increased efficiency of resources allocation and some aspect of distributional implications. Dyson and Visaria (2004) observe that India is experiencing several changes in its pattern of migration. Migration will become more urban oriented, but increasingly this will happen within expanding regional urban system. Movement to reside in a million plus city will be over shorter distances than applied in the past. Deshingkar and Start (2003) conclude that seasonal and circular migration of labour for employment has become one of the most durable components of the livelihood strategies of people living in rural areas. Migration is not just by the very poor during times of crisis for survival and coping but has increasingly become an accumulative option for the poor non-poor alike.

The relationship between rural-urban migration and development is conclusive and very complex. The process of migration is related to the concept of development. In other words, development activities are met with the quick response in terms of people's mobility (Yadava, 2002). Kulkarni (1985) while analyzing the census data finds that there is considerable internal migration in India, over a third of the population has moved at least once and over a tenth has moved during a decade. In terms of volume, most of the migrants are females and these are mostly due to marriage.

Table a. Inter-state migration stream (Duration 0-9 years), India, 2001

Migration Stream	Persons	Males	Females	2001 (in Percent)		
				Persons	Males	Females
Total	16,826,879	8,512,161	8,314,718	100.00	100.00	100.00
Rural – Rural	4,474,302	1,759,523	2,714,779	26.6	20.7	32.7

Rural – Urban	6,372,955	3,803,737	2,569,218	37.9	44.7	30.9
Urban – Rural	1,053,352	522,916	530,436	6.3	6.1	6.4
Urban – Urban	4,490,480	2,201,882	2,288,598	26.7	25.9	27.5
Unclassified	435,790	224,103	211,687	2.6	2.6	2.5

Source: Table D-2, census of India 2001

The four streams of inter-state migration are presented in the above table. In inter-state migration, rural to rural migration is low in comparison to intra-state category. Only 4.4 million out of 16.8 millions migrants coming from outside the state belong to this stream of rural to rural migration. The rural to urban migration was higher (38 percent) indicating that more people are migrating to cities for employment. Urban to urban migration among inter-state migrants was also quite high (27 percent) and evenly distributed among both males and females (Census 2001).

Table b.

Percentage distribution of reasons for migration by last residence with duration (0-9 years) India 2001

Reason for migration	Persons	Males	Females
Work/Employment	14.7	37.6	3.2
Business	1.2	2.9	0.3
Education	3.0	6.2	1.3
Marriage	43.8	2.1	64.9
Moved after birth	6.7	10.4	4.8
Moved with household	21.0	25.1	18.9
Other	9.7	15.7	6.7

Source: Census of India 2001

The above table shows, the reasons for migration by last residence with duration of residence as 0-9 years. The reason for migration in case of males and females vary significantly. Whereas work or employment was the most important reason for migration among males (37 percent), marriage was the most important reason cited by the female migrants (65 percent). The other important reasons of migration are moved with household and moved after birth.

Migration primarily occurs due to disparities in regional development. The lack of employment opportunities in the rural areas and better employment prospects and infrastructure facilities in the urban areas motivate people to migrate to urban areas. Some urban centres especially administrative capitals and some other urban pockets are facilitated with adequate and good infrastructure; whereas other parts of the region are not paid sufficient attention. These poor regions are having stagnated rural economy, which lags behind in the process of

development. Underdevelopment, unavailability of resources, poverty and low wages in rural areas push the people to migrate developed areas.

In India there is a lack of data on migration. Census is the primary source of information about migrants in India. It is only in every ten years that we get an opportunity to know about the overall migration scenario in India by studying the census data. The 2001 census data on migration has just been published. It is important to know what has happened to the migration pattern during the last decade especially after the era of liberalization, privatization and globalization started in 1991. It was expected that this shift in economic policy would bring about a change in the pattern of migration in India. Hence, it was felt that there is a need to analyze the recent census data on migration which might throw some light on the pattern of inter-state migration in the context of development and regional disparity. The present study is an humble attempt in that direction.

OBJECTIVES

Keeping the above discussion in mind, this study has following objectives:

- 1) To study the pattern and levels of inter-state migration in India.
- 2) To understand how regional disparity in development influences inter-state migration pattern in India.

DATA AND METHODS

This study is based on 1991 and 2001 census data for the construction of migration matrix based on the place of last residence . The socio-economic variables are collected from various sources like report of Planning Commission, Census of India, Central Statistical Organization and CMIE reports. Data on the place of last residence also suffers from absence of a definite time reference. The place of last residence does not indicate a definite period of in-migration. So, persons who have migrated ten years ago or even before and persons who migrated recently, may be a few days ago will be grouped together and called as “migrants”. Besides, it dose not provide many other detailed micro level information about the migrants.

In this analysis, two rates namely in-migration rate and out-migration rate have been computed. These have been computed separately for both males and females.

In-migration rate may be defined as the number of migrants enumerated in the state, who have come from other states of the same country, per hundred enumerated population of the state of destination.

$$\text{In-migration rate} = \frac{\text{Volume of in-migration to the state}}{\text{Total enumerated mid year population of the state}} * 100$$

Out-migration rate may be defined as the number of persons who have migrated out of the state to other state of the country, per hundred enumerated population of the origin state.

$$\text{Out-migration rate} = \frac{\text{Volume of out migration from the state}}{\text{Total enumerated mid year population of the state}} * 100$$

In the present paper simple percentage distribution has been used to describe the inter-state migration pattern. Statistical method of correlation has been used to find the linkage between development, underdevelopment and migration.

Migration variables: a) Volume of migration, b) Rate of migration, c) Share of the states total migration to country's total migration.

Development variables: 1) Percent below poverty line, 2) Per-capita income, 3) Percent urban population, 4) Female literacy rate, 5) Per capita bank deposit, 6) Public & private investment, 7) Per capita net state domestic product at current prices, 8) Per capita bank credit to industry, 9) Percent in service sector to the total main workers, 10) Percent in manufacturing sector to the total main workers, 11) Percent of agricultural laborer.

Cartographic techniques have been used to study the flow the migration streams

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

Pattern of Migration:

Table-1.1, 1.2 and 1.3. present the pattern of sex wise internal migration in India (2001). These tables are also showing the volume of in-migration and out-migration, rate of in and out-migration, share of in and out-migration for males and females separately. According to 1991 census, 5164594 males and 5754389 females crossed the state boundary. The picture indicates the predominance of female mobility over male mobility in India. The sex ratio among migrants thus comes to 90males per 100 females. Thus, inter state migration is more female selective.

In-migration:

The tables- 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3, reveals that rate of in-migration from other states by total as well as sex-wise. Here we see that, Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Haryana, Maharashtra, Uttaranchal, Andaman and Nicobar Island, Chandigarh and Delhi are experiencing very high rate of in-migration. The administrative capital of Delhi, Chandigarh and the business capital Mumbai are important centres for in-migration. Maharashtra received more males than females. In-migration rates of Maharashtra are 3.8 and 2.8 for males and females respectively. But in Chandigarh and Delhi, in-migration rate shows minor difference between males and females. The in-migration of males and females constitute 26 percent and 27 percent respectively in Chandigarh. On the other hand, in Delhi the in-migration of males and females are of 16 percent and 15 respectively.

Other important states attracting in-migration are Uttarakhand, A & N Island, Sikkim, Punjab, Arunachal Pradesh, Haryana and Goa. Economically these states are in better position than many other states. Compared to the males, females make much less moves for employment in all the states.

Thus, the note worthy feature is that migration occurs as a response to regional disparities in levels of socio-economic development over the national space. In general, movements are mostly from economically less developed regions to relatively more developed regions.

Share of total in migration: The major urban, administrative and business centres of developed states attract the migrants from the rural agricultural areas of backward states. Maharashtra, Delhi, Gujarat, Haryana, Karnataka and Punjab are the main states where share of in-migration is much higher than other states. Maharashtra and Delhi are the two main states where the largest in migration during the last ten years occurred. Maharashtra received 19 percent and Delhi received 13 percent share of total in-migrants for various states.

Out-migration:

The tables-1.1, 1.2 and 1.3, show that the states where in-migration is high (as discussed earlier), some of these states also show high out migration, like Goa, Haryana, Uttarakhand, Chandigarh and Delhi. On the other hand Bihar, Jharkhand, Himachal Pradesh, Chattisgarh, Mizoram, Nagaland and Uttar Pradesh are the states having very high out-migration.

In-migration and out-migration are very high in some states due to many socio-economic reasons. Haryana, Chandigarh and Delhi are economically growing at a faster rate than many other states of India. Prosperity may be inducing both in and out-migration in these states.

On the other hand, Uttar Pradesh and Bihar have witnessed significant out flow of migrants to other states. In Uttar Pradesh (2001 census) 1078751 persons in-migrated from other states and 3791774 persons out-migrated to the other states resulting in around 2.7 million net out-migration. The ratio between males and females among the out-migrants from the state is in favor of males (130 per 100 females).

In case of Bihar during 2001 census period, 460346 persons migrated into Bihar from other states and 2225514 persons migrated out to other states, resulting in around 1.7 million net out-migration. The ratio of the two sexes among the out migrants from the states is highly in favor of males (168 males per 100 females). All these states are basically poor and dependant on the agriculture for livelihood. There are not sufficient secondary and tertiary sectors to absorb rural labour force. That is why these states are not able to hold their population. Hence out migration is occurring from these states.

There are some notable states where in-migration as well as out-migration rate is low, like Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh., Manipur, Meghalaya, Orissa, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal. Earlier the state like West Bengal received heavy migrants, but it has declined during the last two census periods. The 2001 census data shows that the total out migration rate from the states is 0.91 per cent and total

in-migration rate is 0.90 per cent. The main reason is that West Bengal is experiencing a declining trend of industrialization and job opportunities. It is the state having highest number of sick industries in India.

Share of total out migrants:- The four BIMARU states (Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh) are the main states where share of total out migration is much higher than other states. Uttar Pradesh and Bihar are the two most important states where share of total out migration is highest (Uttar Pradesh 23 percentage and Bihar 13 percentage).

Variation of In-migration and Out-migration in 1991 and 2001 census: Table-3. indicates sex wise variation of in-migration and out-migration during the last two censuses. Table shows that India's total increase of migration is 52 per cent. In case of males it is 62 per cent among females it is 42 per cent.

In-migration Variation: In case of in-migration variation among males, we see that A.P., Assam, Bihar, M.P, Manipur, T.N, A & N Island are indicating negative growth rate among in-migration from the 1991 census to 2001 census. There are many reasons behind this declining in-migration of the state. Declining opportunity, poverty, anti-migrant movement and political instability may be the main reasons of reduced in-migration. On the other hand Haryana, H.P, Maharashtra, Punjab, Sikkim and Tripura indicate a high percentage of positive growth of in-migration. Again prosperity and development in these states may have increased in-migration over time.

Out-migration Variation: Variation in out-migration reveals that, states like Arunachal Pradesh, Kerala, Meghalaya, Punjab, Sikkim and Tripura have negative growth in 2001. Arunachal Pradesh indicates very high negative growth among out migration (-23 per cent). Sikkim also shows very high negative growth of out migration (-46 per cent). Other states like Punjab and Kerala also indicates negative growth rates.

Inter-state flow of migration stream: The inter-state flows of migration streams for two consecutive censuses of 1991 and 2001 have been shown in two maps. Map 1 show the inter-state migration for the 1991 and Map 2 shows it for 2001 census. It is observed that from 1991 to 2001 census the flow of migration has increased a lot, but the pattern of migration has more or less remained same. The flow of migration shows U.P, Bihar, M.P, Rajasthan are the main places for out-migration, whereas, Delhi, Maharashtra, Haryana, Punjab and Gujarat are the main places of destination. It can also be seen that in West Bengal there is a decrease in the flow of in-migration over a period of time.

Sex ratio of migrants: Over all sex ratio of the migrants in 1991 census is dominated by the female. But in 2001 census gives an opposite picture of sex ratio of the total migrants. U.P and Bihar shows very peculiar picture. Sex ratio of in-migration is very much female dominated in Bihar; on the other hand out-migration is very much male dominated. Same situation is in U.P also. The table shows sex ratio of the migrants for the major states of India.

Regional disparities in development:

Table 5 provides the basic information on the socio-economic background of major states of India

(1) Population living below poverty line is an important indicator of development in India. There is great variation among states in percent of BPL i.e. Punjab (6), Haryana (7) and HP (8) have very low level of BPL. On the other hand, state like Orissa (48), Bihar (44) and Assam (40) have higher per cent under BPL. This describes the wide regional disparities in development within the country.

(2) Per capita income is another important indicator which reflects the level of development condition. Here, it can be observed that per capita incomes in Bihar (6, 015) and UP (9,895) are very much low compared to other states like Punjab (25,652) and Haryana (26,632).

(3) The level of urbanization is also an important indicator of level of development. Within India, there is great variation in level of urbanization, i.e. Bihar: 11 percent, Assam: 13 percent and HP: 10 percent. On the other hand, Maharashtra: 42 percent and Tamil Nadu: 44 percent indicate great variation among states.

(4) Female literacy is also very good indicator to shows socio-economic development. Here, we also see that, Bihar (34 percent), UP (43 percent) indicate very low level of female literacy. On the other hand, we see state like Kerala (88 percent), Maharashtra (68 percent) and HP (68 percent) indicate higher female literacy.

(5) Percent of agricultural laborer also indicate the level of development. Here, the relationship between agricultural laborers and development is negative. The table shows that Bihar and MP have much higher percentage of labours engaged in agricultural sector. Where in Kerala and Punjab have been showing very less percent of labours engaged in agriculture.

(6) Per capita bank deposit of Bihar (3,548), Orissa (5,292) and Rajasthan (5,863) reveals that it is very low in comparison with Maharashtra (25,166) and Punjab (22,587).

(7) Public and Private Investment create more industries as well as job opportunities. Table 5 shows that Gujarat (171,399), Maharashtra (169,855) and AP (162,416) have very high amount of public and private investment. On the other hand, Bihar (23,634) and Rajasthan (38,194) show low amount of investment.

(8) Per capita net state domestic product in Bihar (5,445) and UP (9,749) shows very low compared to others. On the other hand Maharashtra and Punjab have high per capita net state domestic product.

(9) Data shows that in states like Assam, Bihar and Haryana, percentage share of persons engaged in manufacturing is very low (from 7 percent to 15 percent), while in Maharashtra and Gujarat, it is very high.

(10) Per capita bank credit to industry indicates great variation among the states in India. Bihar (304), Assam (386) and Orissa (373) have low bank credit. On the other hand, Maharashtra (5,708) and Tamil Nadu (3,375) have very high amount of bank credit to industry.

Linkage between socio-economic indicators of development and migration by correlation:

As we mentioned earlier, 11 important variables have been chosen. The Correlation matrix in table 6 reveals relations between migration and socio-economic indicators.

Rate of in-migration: There is a negative relationship between rate of in-migration and poverty (-.58*). That means if the level of poverty is high, there will be less in-migration to these states. On the other hand it is positively correlated with per capita bank deposit (.58*), per capita net state domestic product at current prices (.72**) and per capita bank credit to industries (.52*). When level of poverty declines and per capita bank deposit, per capita bank credit to industries increase, there will be more in migration. It means increasing economic development will ultimately attract more migrants.

Rate of out-migration: There is a negative relationship between rate of out-migration and public and private investment (-.70**) which means that those states where the public and private investment is less, there rate of out migration will be high.

Volume of in-migration: The volume of in-migration is positively correlated with percentage of urban (.59*), per capita bank deposit (.56*) and per capita bank credit to industry (.80**). It indicates that those states which have high percentage of urban population, high capita bank deposit and high bank credit to industry will have high volume of in-migration.

Volume of out-migration: Here, the total out-migration is negatively correlated with female literacy (-.56*) that means those states which have low female literacy will have more out migration.

Result of linear regression between migrations with socio-economic variables:

In linear regression analysis only most significant variables emerged which survived through statistical test. Table 7 shows the analysis of migration with socio-economic variables.

Rate of In-Migration: Percent of Below Poverty Line is negatively related to rate of in-migration, explains 33 percent change. Per capita income is highly positive co-related to rate of in-migration. It explains 55 percent change. On the other hand per capita bank deposit (34 percent), per capita Net State Domestic Product (51 percent) and per capita bank credit to industry (27 percent) positively related to rate of in-migration.

Volume of In- Migration: In case of volume of in-migration, percent of urban and Per capita bank deposit positively co-related to volume of in-migration. Where per capita bank credit to industry is highly co-related to volume of in-migration, explains 65 percent change.

Rate of Out-Migration: There is negative relationship between migration to Public and Private Investment. It explains 49 percent change.

Volume of Out-Migration: On the other hand per capita income and female literacy are negatively co-related with volume of out-migration. It explains 24 and 31 percent respectively.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

- 1) Areas with urban centres, administrative head quarters, and business sectors attract the migrants from backward areas where employment opportunities are very less. Maharashtra and Delhi witnessed largest in-migration of population during the last ten years from different states. Maharashtra received 20percent and Delhi received 13percent share of total in-migration from the various states of India.
- 2) On the other hand, U.P and Bihar are the two most important states where share of the total out-migration is highest, U.P. - 23 percentage and Bihar 13 percentage of share in total out-migration of the country.
- 3) In some of the states like Haryana, Gujarat, Maharashtra, Punjab, Delhi, etc there is significant in-migration as well as out-migration. Development may be responsible for both in and out migration.
- 4) Total migration variation among 1991-2001 census periods is positively 52 percent increasing. And in case of male it is 62 percent and female it is 43 percent positively increase.
- 5) Sex ratio of in-migration and out-migration of India in 1991 is 90 males per 100 females. But in 2001 census shows opposite picture of sex ratio of migrants. It shows 102 males per 100 female. It means male migration has increased in 2001 census.
- 6). But in 2001 census gives an opposite picture of sex ratio of the migrants in some states. U.P and Bihar show very peculiar picture. Sex ratio of in-migration is very much female dominated on the other hand out-migration is very much male dominated
- 7) There is a negative relationship between rate of in-migration and poverty. That means if the level of poverty is high, there will be less in-migration to these states, when level of poverty declines and per capita bank deposit, per capita bank credit to industries increase, there will be more in migration. It means increasing economic development will ultimately attract more migrants.
- 8) The volume of in-migration is positively correlated with percentage of urban, per capita bank deposit and per capita bank credit to industry. It indicates that those states which have high percentage of urban population, high capita bank deposit and high bank credit to industry will have high volume of in-migration.
- 9) Regional disparity in development influences flow of inter-state migration streams.

Migration is a natural outcome of inequality in the distribution of resources. It is positively related to modernization, industrialization and development. So, migration is essential for development. It is a desirable phenomenon. But what is not desirable is the distressed migration found in most of the developing countries resulting in over crowding of cities and mushrooming of slums. In India the inter-state migration pattern reflects that there is an inequality in the regional development. Some states which have higher investment and resources

for development experience high in migration. At the same time, the backward states like U.P, Bihar, M.P, etc are experiencing heavy out-migration. Hence, there is a need for balanced regional development. More focus for development and investment should be given to those states which are lagging behind in development parameters. This may retain the labour force at the native state and thereby reduce overcrowding and congestion in cities. This will result in a more prosperous and balanced migration flow leading to a qualitative shift in the pattern and trend of migration flow in India. The migration policy should focus more on the development at the area of origin rather than at the destination place.

REFERENCES

Bose, Ashish (1983); "*Migration in India: Trends and Policies*", Oberai, A.S. (ed), State Policies and Internal Migration, Studies in Market and Planned Economics, Pp. 137-180.

Censuses of India, volume on migration, D series, RGI, New Delhi, 1991 and 2001.

- Dyson, T. and Pravin Visaria (2004); *“Migration and Urbanization, Retrospect and Prospects”*, in Tim Dyson, Robert Cassen and Leela Visaria (eds), *Twenty First Century India*, Oxford: New Delhi, Pp. 108-129.
- Economic Survey 2003-04, Government of India, Ministry of Finance Economic Division.
- Gupta, K. (1993); *“Women Migrants and their Economic Roles in Indian Metropolises”*, *Dynamics of Population and Family Welfare*, Pp. 161-186.
- Huser. P.M. (1985); *“Urbanization and Migration in Asian Development: Introduction and Overview”*, National Institute for Research Advancement, Tokyo.
- Manpower Profile, India year book 2004, Institute of Applied Manpower Research by concept publishing company, New Delhi
- Kulkurni, P.M. (1985); *“International Migration and Urbanization in India – trends and Policy Interventions,”* IIPS, National Seminar.
- Kundu, Amitabh and Shalini Gupta (1996); *“Migration, Urbanization and Regional Inequality,”* *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 301, No. 50, Dec.
- Mukherji, S. (1991); *“The Nature of Migration and Urbanization in India: A Search for Alternative Planning Strategies,”* *Dynamics of Population and Family Welfare*, Mumbai, Pp. 203-245.
- Mukherji, S. (1995); *“Poverty-Induced Migration and Urban Involution in India: Causes and Consequences,”* IIPS, Monograph, Pp. 21-137.
- Premi, M.K. (1981), *“Internal Migration in India”*, *Policies Relating to International and Internal Migration*, IIPS, Pp. 1-16.
- Sebastian, A. (1991); *“Salient Features of Internal Migration in India”*, *Dynamics of Population and Family Welfare*, Pp. 153-177.
- Shrivastava, R. and Sasikumar, S.K. (2004); *“An Overview of Migration in India, its Impact and Key Issues”*, *Migration and Development Pro-poor Policy Choices*, DIFD, U.K.
- Statistical Outline of India 2004-05, TATA Services Limited, Department of Economics and Statistics, Bombay House, Mumbai- 1.
- Yadava, K.N.S. and et.al. (2002); *“Migration, Urbanization and Economic Development in India”*, in *Population Stabilization and Development*.

Table 1.1 Rate and share of in-migration and out - migration (Total) - India, 2001

States (2001)	Total In-migrants from other states	Total Out-migrants to other states	Total pop	Rate of In Migration	Rate of Out-Migration	Share of Total In-Migrants	Share of Total Out-Migrants
India	16,576,233	16,576,233				100.00	100.00
1.Andhra Pradesh	420,981	627,958	75,727,541	0.56	0.83	2.54	3.79
2.Arunachal Pradesh	71,776	12,471	1,091,117	6.58	1.14	0.43	0.08
3.Assam	121,781	280,867	26,638,407	0.46	1.05	0.73	1.69
4.Bihar	460,346	2,225,514	82,878,796	0.56	2.69	2.78	13.43
5.Jharkhand	502,723	613,761	26,909,428	1.87	2.28	3.03	3.70
6.Goa	120,626	32,274	1,343,998	8.98	2.40	0.73	0.19
7.Gujarat	1,120,284	431,741	50,596,992	2.21	0.85	6.76	2.60
8.Haryana	1,231,358	587,533	21,082,989	5.84	2.79	7.43	3.54
9.HP	188,203	165,609	6,077,248	3.10	2.73	1.14	1.00
10.J&K	86,760	122,048	10,069,917	0.86	1.21	0.52	0.74

<i>11.Karnataka</i>	877,437	766,483	52,733,958	1.66	1.45	5.29	4.62
<i>12.Kerala</i>	230,828	421,279	31,838,619	0.72	1.32	1.39	2.54
<i>13.MP</i>	814,570	840,317	60,385,118	1.35	1.39	4.91	5.07
<i>14.Chattisgarh</i>	338,727	443,875	20,795,956	1.63	2.13	2.04	2.68
<i>15.Maharashtra</i>	3,229,733	877,169	96,752,247	3.34	0.91	19.48	5.29
<i>16.Manipur</i>	4,527	30,825	2,388,634	0.19	1.29	0.03	0.19
<i>17.Meghalaya</i>	33,705	20,405	2,306,069	1.46	0.88	0.20	0.12
<i>18.Mizoram</i>	22,598	31,724	891,058	2.54	3.56	0.14	0.19
<i>19.Nagaland</i>	33,574	51,817	1,988,636	1.69	2.61	0.20	0.31
<i>20.Orissa</i>	229,610	436,327	36,706,920	0.63	1.19	1.39	2.63
<i>21.Punjab</i>	810,916	500,986	24,289,296	3.34	2.06	4.89	3.02
<i>22.Rajasthan</i>	723,416	991,882	56,473,122	1.28	1.76	4.36	5.98
<i>23.Sikkim</i>	22,457	6,227	540,493	4.15	1.15	0.14	0.04
<i>24.Tamil Nadu</i>	243,387	589,547	62,110,839	0.39	0.95	1.47	3.56
<i>25.Tripura</i>	40,262	23,495	3,191,168	1.26	0.74	0.24	0.14
<i>26.UP</i>	1,078,751	3,791,774	166,052,859	0.65	2.28	6.51	22.87
<i>27.Uttranchal</i>	352,379	353,862	8,479,562	4.16	4.17	2.13	2.13
<i>28.WB</i>	724,396	726,865	80,221,171	0.90	0.91	4.37	4.38
<i>29.A&N Island</i>	29,442	7,856	356,265	8.26	2.21	0.18	0.05
<i>30.Chandigarh</i>	239,227	106,674	900,914	26.55	11.84	1.44	0.64
<i>31.Delhi</i>	2,171,453	457,068	13,782,976	15.75	3.32	13.10	2.76

Table 1.2 Rate and share of in-migration and out – migration among males - India, 2001

States	Total In-migrants from other states	Total Out-migrants to other states	Total pop	Rate of In Migration	Rate of Out-Migration	Share of Total In-Migrants	Share of Total Out-Migrants
Male In and out Migration	8,375,120	8,375,120				100.00	100.00
<i>1.Andhra Pradesh</i>	183,484	287,946	38,286,811	0.48	0.75	2.19	3.44
<i>2.Arunachal Pradesh</i>	41,916	6,492	573,951	7.30	1.13	0.50	0.08
<i>3.Assam</i>	64,085	125,910	13,787,799	0.46	0.91	0.77	1.50
<i>4.Bihar</i>	94,827	1,394,861	43,153,964	0.22	3.23	1.13	16.65
<i>5.Jharkhand</i>	201,145	288,951	13,861,277	1.45	2.08	2.40	3.45
<i>6.Goa</i>	66,953	14,530	685,617	9.77	2.12	0.80	0.17
<i>7.Gujarat</i>	689,821	193,570	26,344,053	2.62	0.73	8.24	2.31
<i>8.Haryana</i>	575,500	205,212	11,327,658	5.08	1.81	6.87	2.45

9.HP	107,279	78,331	3,085,256	3.48	2.54	1.28	0.94
10.J&K	44,836	58,887	5,300,574	0.85	1.11	0.54	0.70
11.Karnataka	439,718	343,733	26,856,343	1.64	1.28	5.25	4.10
12.Kerala	124,672	210,451	15,468,664	0.81	1.36	1.49	2.51
13.MP	314,667	345,449	31,456,873	1.00	1.10	3.76	4.12
14.Chhattisgarh	153,825	201,148	10,452,426	1.47	1.92	1.84	2.40
15.Maharashtra	1,921,711	380,286	50,334,270	3.82	0.76	22.95	4.54
16.Manipur	2,405	17,011	1,207,338	0.20	1.41	0.03	0.20
17.Meghalaya	18,217	9,286	1,167,840	1.56	0.80	0.22	0.11
18.Mizoram	14,712	16,500	459,783	3.20	3.59	0.18	0.20
19.Nagaland	20,719	16,139	1,041,686	1.99	1.55	0.25	0.19
20.Orissa	103,943	252,318	18,612,340	0.56	1.36	1.24	3.01
21.Punjab	442,840	203,922	12,963,362	3.42	1.57	5.29	2.43
22.Rajasthan	291,242	461,687	29,381,657	0.99	1.57	3.48	5.51
23.Sikkim	12,846	3,062	288,217	4.46	1.06	0.15	0.04
24.Tamil Nadu	116,211	304,925	31,268,654	0.37	0.98	1.39	3.64
25.Tripura	20,208	11,935	1,636,138	1.24	0.73	0.24	0.14
26.UP	398,095	2,141,550	87,466,301	0.46	2.45	4.75	25.57
27.Uttaranchal	175,116	163,431	4,316,401	4.06	3.79	2.09	1.95
28.WB	362,801	383,800	41,487,694	0.87	0.93	4.33	4.58
29.A&N Island	16,570	3,579	192,985	8.59	1.85	0.20	0.04
30.Chandigarh	131,795	51,350	508,224	25.93	10.10	1.57	0.61
31.Delhi	1,222,961	198,868	7,570,890	16.15	2.63	14.60	2.37

Table 1.3 Rate and share of in-migration and out – migration among females - India, 2001

States	Total In-migrants from other states	Total Out-migrants to other states	Total pop	Rate of In Migration	Rate of Out-Migration	Share of Total In-Migrants	Share of Total Out-Migrants
Female In and out Migration	8,201,113	8,201,113				100.00	100.00
1.Andhra Pradesh	237,497	340,012	37,440,730	0.63	0.91	2.90	4.15
2.Arunachal Pradesh	29,860	5,979	517,166	5.77	1.16	0.36	0.07
3.Assam	57,696	154,957	12,850,608	0.45	1.21	0.70	1.89
4.Bihar	365,519	830,653	39,724,832	0.92	2.09	4.46	10.13

5. <i>Jharkhand</i>	301,578	324,810	13,048,151	2.31	2.49	3.68	3.96
6. <i>Goa</i>	53,673	17,744	658,381	8.15	2.70	0.65	0.22
7. <i>Gujarat</i>	430,463	238,171	24,252,939	1.77	0.98	5.25	2.90
8. <i>Haryana</i>	655,858	382,321	9,755,331	6.72	3.92	8.00	4.66
9. <i>HP</i>	80,924	87,278	2,991,992	2.70	2.92	0.99	1.06
10. <i>J&K</i>	41,924	63,161	4,769,343	0.88	1.32	0.51	0.77
11. <i>Karnataka</i>	437,719	422,750	25,877,615	1.69	1.63	5.34	5.15
12. <i>Kerala</i>	106,156	210,828	16,369,955	0.65	1.29	1.29	2.57
13. <i>MP</i>	499,903	494,868	28,928,245	1.73	1.71	6.10	6.03
14. <i>Chhattisgarh</i>	184,902	242,727	10,343,530	1.79	2.35	2.25	2.96
15. <i>Maharashtra</i>	1,308,022	496,883	46,417,977	2.82	1.07	15.95	6.06
16. <i>Manipur</i>	2,122	13,814	1,181,296	0.18	1.17	0.03	0.17
17. <i>Meghalaya</i>	15,488	11,119	1,138,229	1.36	0.98	0.19	0.14
18. <i>Mizoram</i>	7,886	15,224	431,275	1.83	3.53	0.10	0.19
19. <i>Nagaland</i>	12,855	35,678	946,950	1.36	3.77	0.16	0.44
20. <i>Orissa</i>	125,667	184,009	18,094,580	0.69	1.02	1.53	2.24
21. <i>Punjab</i>	368,076	297,064	11,325,934	3.25	2.62	4.49	3.62
22. <i>Rajasthan</i>	432,174	530,195	27,091,465	1.60	1.96	5.27	6.46
23. <i>Sikkim</i>	9,611	3,165	252,276	3.81	1.25	0.12	0.04
24. <i>Tamil Nadu</i>	127,176	284,622	30,842,185	0.41	0.92	1.55	3.47
25. <i>Tripura</i>	20,054	11,560	1,555,030	1.29	0.74	0.24	0.14
26. <i>UP</i>	680,656	1,650,224	78,586,558	0.87	2.10	8.30	20.12
27. <i>Uttaranchal</i>	177,263	190,431	4,163,161	4.26	4.57	2.16	2.32
28. <i>WB</i>	361,595	343,065	38,733,477	0.93	0.89	4.41	4.18
29. <i>A&N Island</i>	12,872	4,277	163,280	7.88	2.62	0.16	0.05
30. <i>Chandigarh</i>	107,432	55,324	392,690	27.36	14.09	1.31	0.67
31. <i>Delhi</i>	948,492	258,200	6,212,086	15.27	4.16	11.57	3.15

Table 2.1 Rate and share of in-migration and out – migration (Total), INDIA, 1991

States	Total in migrants from other states	Total out migrants to other states	Total pop	Rate of in Migration	Rate of out Migration	Share of Total in Migrants	Share of Total out Migrants
India In and out Migration	10,918,983	10,918,983				100.00	100.00
1. <i>Andhra Pradesh</i>	453,073	485,710	66,508,008	0.68	0.73	4.15	4.45
2. <i>Arunachal Pradesh</i>	66,403	17,637	864,558	7.68	2.04	0.61	0.16

3. Assam	169,543	172,741	22,414,322	0.76	0.77	1.55	1.58
4. Bihar	319,737	1,225,897	86,374,465	0.37	1.42	2.93	11.23
5. Goa	85,952	28,351	1,169,793	7.35	2.42	0.79	0.26
6. Gujarat	694,863	293,500	41,309,582	1.68	0.71	6.36	2.69
7. Haryana	697,211	561,399	16,463,648	4.23	3.41	6.39	5.14
8. HP	120,032	144,257	5,170,877	2.32	2.79	1.10	1.32
9. J&K		81,212	7,718,700		1.05		
10. Karnataka	683,409	581,416	44,977,201	1.52	1.29	6.26	5.32
11. Kerala	218,886	430,939	29,098,518	0.75	1.48	2.00	3.95
12. MP	952,628	596,698	66,181,170	1.44	0.90	8.72	5.46
13. Maharashtra	1,612,078	762,721	78,937,187	2.04	0.97	14.76	6.99
14. Manipur	4,702	17,302	1,837,149	0.26	0.94	0.04	0.16
15. Meghalaya	30,913	22,587	1,774,778	1.74	1.27	0.28	0.21
16. Mizoram	5,929	11,812	689,756	0.86	1.71	0.05	0.11
17. Nagaland	24,401	12,732	1,209,546	2.02	1.05	0.22	0.12
18. Orissa	199,778	267,325	31,659,736	0.63	0.84	1.83	2.45
19. Punjab	543,819	513,667	20,281,969	2.68	2.53	4.98	4.70
20. Rajasthan	603,503	768,671	44,005,990	1.37	1.75	5.53	7.04
21. Sikkim	12,509	11,529	406,457	3.08	2.84	0.11	0.11
22. Tamil Nadu	303,240	606,228	55,858,946	0.54	1.09	2.78	5.55
23. Tripura	19,561	27,080	2,757,205	0.71	0.98	0.18	0.25
24. UP	725,029	2,455,024	139,112,287	0.52	1.76	6.64	22.48
25. WB	596,378	454,312	68,077,965	0.88	0.67	5.46	4.16
26. A&N Island	37,183	7,478	280,661	13.25	2.66	0.34	0.07
27. Chandigarh	194,674	79,209	642,015	30.32	12.34	1.78	0.73
28. Delhi	1,543,549	281,549	9,420,644	16.38	2.99	14.14	2.58

Table 2.2 Rate and share of in-migration and out – migration among males, INDIA, 1991

States	Total in migrants from other states	Total out migrants to other states	Total male pop	Rate of in Migration	Rate of out Migration	Share of Total in Migrants	Share of Total out Migrants
--------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------	----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------

<i>India</i>	5,164,594	5,164,594				100.00	100.00
<i>1.Andhra Pradesh</i>	189,044	214,714	33,724,581	0.56	0.64	3.66	4.16
<i>2.Arunachal Pradesh</i>	39,720	8,720	465,004	8.54	1.88	0.77	0.17
<i>3.Assam</i>	97,134	88,487	11,657,989	0.83	0.76	1.88	1.71
<i>4.Bihar</i>	105,424	699,560	45,202,091	0.23	1.55	2.04	13.55
<i>5.Goa</i>	45,000	11,875	594,790	7.57	2.00	0.87	0.23
<i>6.Gujarat</i>	373,826	126,493	21,355,209	1.75	0.59	7.24	2.45
<i>7.Haryana</i>	284,166	196,258	8,827,474	3.22	2.22	5.50	3.80
<i>8.HP</i>	64,920	69,554	2,617,467	2.48	2.66	1.26	1.35
<i>9.J&K</i>		42,266	4,014,100		1.05		
<i>10.Karnataka</i>	318,133	241,170	22,951,917	1.39	1.05	6.16	4.67
<i>11.Kerala</i>	117,333	224,148	14,288,995	0.82	1.57	2.27	4.34
<i>12.MP</i>	399,330	209,373	34,267,293	1.17	0.61	7.73	4.05
<i>13.Maharashtra</i>	861,601	320,428	40,825,618	2.11	0.78	16.68	6.20
<i>14.Manipur</i>	2,968	8,811	938,359	0.32	0.94	0.06	0.17
<i>15.Meghalaya</i>	17,248	9,890	907,687	1.90	1.09	0.33	0.19
<i>16.Mizoram</i>	3,954	5,738	358,978	1.10	1.60	0.08	0.11
<i>17.Nagaland</i>	16,236	6,288	641,282	2.53	0.98	0.31	0.12
<i>18.Orissa</i>	83,422	135,157	16,064,146	0.52	0.84	1.62	2.62
<i>19.Punjab</i>	254,463	222,910	10,778,034	2.36	2.07	4.93	4.32
<i>20.Rajasthan</i>	224,719	334,805	23,042,780	0.98	1.45	4.35	6.48
<i>21.Sikkim</i>	7,076	4,842	216,427	3.27	2.24	0.14	0.09
<i>22.Tamil Nadu</i>	135,351	312,978	28,298,975	0.48	1.11	2.62	6.06
<i>23.Tripura</i>	9,731	12,044	1,417,930	0.69	0.85	0.19	0.23
<i>24.UP</i>	248,613	1,315,377	74,036,957	0.34	1.78	4.81	25.47
<i>25.WB</i>	298,693	193,410	35,510,633	0.84	0.54	5.78	3.74
<i>26.A&N Island</i>	21,320	3,294	154,369	13.81	2.13	0.41	0.06
<i>27.Chandigarh</i>	104,111	36,933	358,614	29.03	10.30	2.02	0.72
<i>28.Delhi</i>	841,058	109,071	5,155,512	16.31	2.12	16.29	2.11

Table 2.3 Rate and share of in-migration and out – migration among females, INDIA, 1991

States	Total in migrants from other states	Total out migrants to other states	Total female pop	Rate of in Migration	Rate of out Migration	Share of Total in Migrants	Share of Total out Migrants
<i>India</i>	5,754,389	5,754,389				100.00	100.00
<i>1.Andhra Pradesh</i>	264,029	270,996	32,783,427	0.81	0.83	4.59	4.71
<i>2.Arunachal Pradesh</i>	26,683	8,917	399,554	6.68	2.23	0.46	0.15
<i>3.Assam</i>	72,409	84,254	10,756,333	0.67	0.78	1.26	1.46
<i>4.Bihar</i>	214,313	526,337	41,172,374	0.52	1.28	3.72	9.15
<i>5.Goa</i>	40,952	16,476	575,003	7.12	2.87	0.71	0.29
<i>6.Gujarat</i>	321,037	167,007	19,954,373	1.61	0.84	5.58	2.90
<i>7.Haryana</i>	413,045	365,141	7,636,174	5.41	4.78	7.18	6.35
<i>8.HP</i>	55,112	74,703	2,553,410	2.16	2.93	0.96	1.30
<i>9.J&K</i>		38,946	3,704,600		1.05		
<i>10.Karnataka</i>	365,276	340,246	22,025,284	1.66	1.54	6.35	5.91
<i>11.Kerala</i>	101,553	206,791	14,809,523	0.69	1.40	1.76	3.59
<i>12.MP</i>	553,298	387,325	31,913,877	1.73	1.21	9.62	6.73
<i>13.Maharashtra</i>	750,477	442,293	38,111,569	1.97	1.16	13.04	7.69
<i>14.Manipur</i>	1,734	8,491	898,790	0.19	0.94	0.03	0.15
<i>15.Meghalaya</i>	13,665	12,697	867,091	1.58	1.46	0.24	0.22
<i>16.Mizoram</i>	1,975	6,074	330,778	0.60	1.84	0.03	0.11
<i>17.Nagaland</i>	8,165	6,444	568,264	1.44	1.13	0.14	0.11
<i>18.Orissa</i>	116,356	132,168	15,595,590	0.75	0.85	2.02	2.30
<i>19.Punjab</i>	289,356	290,757	9,503,935	3.04	3.06	5.03	5.05
<i>20.Rajasthan</i>	378,784	433,866	20,963,210	1.81	2.07	6.58	7.54
<i>21.Sikkim</i>	5,433	6,687	190,030	2.86	3.52	0.09	0.12
<i>22.Tamil Nadu</i>	167,889	293,250	27,559,971	0.61	1.06	2.92	5.10
<i>23.Tripura</i>	9,830	15,036	1,339,275	0.73	1.12	0.17	0.26
<i>24.UP</i>	476,416	1,139,647	65,075,330	0.73	1.75	8.28	19.80
<i>25.WB</i>	297,685	260,902	32,567,332	0.91	0.80	5.17	4.53
<i>26.A&N Island</i>	15,863	4,184	126,292	12.56	3.31	0.28	0.07
<i>27.Chandigarh</i>	90,563	42,276	283,401	31.96	14.92	1.57	0.73
<i>28.Delhi</i>	702,491	172,478	4,265,132	16.47	4.04	12.21	3.00

Table 3. Decadal growth rate of in-migration and out – migration by sex - INDIA, 1991 and 2001

States	SEX	Variation in out-migration	Variation in in-migration	States	SEX	Variation in out-migration	Variation in in-migration
ALL INDIA	P	51.8	51.8	14.Manipur	P	78.2	-3.72
	M	62.2	62.2		M	93.1	-18.97
	F	42.5	42.5		F	62.7	22.38
1.Andhra Pradesh	P	29.3	-7.08	15.Meghalaya	P	-9.7	9.03
	M	34.1	-2.94		M	-6.1	5.62
	F	25.5	-10.05		F	-12.4	13.34
2.Arunachal Pradesh	P	-29.3	8.09	16.Mizoram	P	168.6	281.14
	M	-25.6	5.53		M	187.6	272.08
	F	-32.9	11.91		F	150.6	299.29
3.Assam	P	62.6	-28.17	17.Nagaland	P	307.0	37.59
	M	42.3	-34.02		M	156.7	27.61
	F	83.9	-20.32		F	453.7	57.44
4.Bihar	P	81.5	43.98	18.Orissa	P	63.2	14.93
	M	99.4	-10.05		M	86.7	24.60
	F	57.8	70.55		F	39.2	8.00
5.Goa	P	13.8	40.34	19.Punjab	P	-2.5	49.12
	M	22.4	48.78		M	-8.5	74.03
	F	7.7	31.06		F	2.2	27.21
6.Gujarat	P	47.1	61.22	20.Rajasthan	P	29.0	19.87
	M	53.0	84.53		M	37.9	29.60
	F	42.6	34.09		F	22.2	14.10
7.Haryana	P	4.7	76.61	21.Sikkim	P	-46.0	79.53
	M	4.6	102.52		M	-36.8	81.54
	F	4.7	58.79		F	-52.7	76.90
8.HP	P	14.8	56.79	22.Tamil Nadu	P	-2.8	-19.74
	M	12.6	65.25		M	-2.6	-14.14
	F	16.8	46.84		F	-2.9	-24.25
9.J&K	P	50.3		23.Tripura	P	-13.2	105.83
	M	39.3			M	-0.9	107.67
	F	62.2			F	-23.1	104.01
10.Karnataka	P	31.8	28.39	24.UP	P	54.4	48.79
	M	42.5	38.22		M	62.8	60.13
	F	24.2	19.83		F	44.8	42.87
11.Kerala	P	-2.2	5.46	25.WB	P	60.0	21.47
	M	-6.1	6.25		M	98.4	21.46
	F	2.0	4.53		F	31.5	21.47
12.MP	P	40.8	-14.49	26.A&N Island	P	5.1	-20.82
	M	65.0	-21.20		M	8.7	-22.28
	F	27.8	-9.65		F	2.2	-18.86
13.Maharashtra	P	15.0	100.35	27.Delhi	P	62.3	40.68
	M	18.7	123.04		M	82.3	45.41

Table 4. Sex ratio of in-migration and out migration - India, 1991 and 2001(males per 100 females)

States	1991		2001	
	Sex ratio of in migrant	Sex ratio of out migrant	Sex ratio of in migrant	Sex ratio of out migrant
<i>India</i>	89.75	89.75	102.12	102.12
<i>1.Andhra Pradesh</i>	71.60	79.23	77.26	84.69
<i>2.Arunachal Pradesh</i>	148.86	97.79	140.38	108.58
<i>3.Assam</i>	134.15	105.02	111.07	81.25
<i>4.Bihar</i>	49.19	132.91	25.94	167.92
<i>5.Jharkhand</i>	NA	NA	66.70	88.96
<i>6.Goa</i>	109.88	72.07	124.74	81.89
<i>7.Gujarat</i>	116.44	75.74	160.25	81.27
<i>8.Haryana</i>	68.80	53.75	87.75	53.68
<i>9.HP</i>	117.80	93.11	132.57	89.75
<i>10.J&K</i>	NA	108.52	106.95	93.23
<i>11.Karnataka</i>	87.09	70.88	100.46	81.31
<i>12.Kerala</i>	115.54	108.39	117.44	99.82
<i>13.MP</i>	72.17	54.06	62.95	69.81
<i>14.Chhattisgarh</i>	NA	NA	83.19	82.87
<i>15.Maharashtra</i>	114.81	72.45	146.92	76.53
<i>16.Manipur</i>	171.16	103.77	113.34	123.14
<i>17.Meghalaya</i>	126.22	77.89	117.62	83.51
<i>18.Mizoram</i>	200.20	94.47	186.56	108.38
<i>19.Nagaland</i>	198.85	97.58	161.17	45.24
<i>20.Orissa</i>	71.70	102.26	82.71	137.12
<i>21.Punjab</i>	87.94	76.67	120.31	68.65
<i>22.Rajasthan</i>	59.33	77.17	67.39	87.08
<i>23.Sikkim</i>	130.24	72.41	133.66	96.75
<i>24.Tamil Nadu</i>	80.62	106.73	91.38	107.13
<i>25.Tripura</i>	98.99	80.10	100.77	103.24
<i>26.UP</i>	52.18	115.42	58.49	129.77
<i>27.Uttaranchal</i>	NA	NA	98.79	85.82

28.WB	100.34	74.13	100.33	111.87
29.A&N Island	134.40	78.73	128.73	83.68
30.Chandigarh	114.96	87.36	122.68	92.82
31.Delhi	119.73	63.24	128.94	77.02

Table 5. Socio-economic & Migration Variables for Major states of India

State	% of BPL (2001-2002)	Per Capita Income (2001-2002)	% of Urban (2001)	Female Literacy (2001)	Per Capita Bank Deposit (2003)	Pub. & Pvt. Invest (2003)	Per Capita NSDP (2001-2002)	Per Capita Bank Credit to Indus (2001)	% in Service Sector (2001)	% in Manuf. Sect (2001)	% in Agri. Labour (2001)	Volume of In-migr. (2001)	Volume of Out-Migr. (2001)	Rate of In-migr. (2001)	Rate of Out-migr. (2001)
Andhra Pradesh	10.50	17642	27.10	51.17	9470	162416	17642	1401	23.47	29.36	62.30	399764	588347	0.53	0.78
Assam	40.20	10951	12.70	56.03	4693	112303	10951	386	29.04	11.51	50.70	86296	163591	0.32	0.61
Bihar	44.00	6015	10.50	33.57	3548	23634	5445	304	21.94	15.94	77.40	259751	1380125	0.31	1.67
Gujarat	12.40	21276	37.40	58.6	13572	171399	21276	2921	15.99	33.24	52.00	1080024	405190	2.13	0.8
Haryana	7.40	26632	29.00	56.31	12316	19399	24820	2144	25.07	6.54	51.60	997130	360986	4.73	1.71
H.P	7.50	22576	9.80	68.08	15833	31664	21543	822	48.21	14.04	68.70	142453	105036	2.34	1.73
Karnataka	16.90	18324	34.00	57.45	13841	130651	18324	2009	20.3	27.93	55.90	842640	693423	1.60	1.31
Kerala	9.40	21310	26.00	87.86	18362	38955	21310	1195	19.33	19.97	23.30	219359	370248	0.69	1.16
M.P	37.20	11438	26.70	50.28	5993	44001	12027	769	26.7	26.85	71.60	689891	691070	1.14	1.14
Maharashtra	23.30	24736	42.40	67.51	25166	169855	24736	5708	22.08	29.96	55.40	2970512	780894	3.07	0.81
Orissa	47.80	10103	15.00	50.97	5292	93694	10234	373	25.84	23.83	64.70	148401	316646	0.40	0.86
Punjab	6.00	25652	34.00	63.55	22587	30818	25652	2493	23.62	27.29	39.40	689558	363584	2.84	1.5
Rajasthan	13.40	13066	23.40	44.34	5863	38194	13825	717	20.54	24.98	66.00	674623	875960	1.19	1.55
Tamil Nadu	20.10	21738	43.90	64.55	13523	163303	21239	3375	20.77	33.65	45.60	231939	551095	0.37	0.89
U.P	31.00	9895	20.80	42.98	6249	54859	9749	501	21.81	36.45	66.00	669627	2512018	0.40	1.51
W.B	31.70	17769	28.00	60.22	10449	57058	17769	1625	20.77	31.11	43.90	531838	475593	0.66	0.59

- Sources:
- Planning Commission of India, 2001-2002, HDI report
 - Census of India 2001
 - Economic Survey 2003-2004.
 - CMIE report 2001
 - Directorate of economics and statistics of respective state Govt. 2004.
 - Statistical outline India 2004-2005.
 - Manpower year book 2004.

Table 6. Pearson Correlation Matrix

Indicator	% of BPL	Per capita income	% urban pop	Female literacy rate	Per capita bank deposit	Public & pvt. invest	Per capita NSDP	Per capita bank credit to industry	% in Service Sector	% in Man fact	% of agri. laborer	Vol. of in migr	Vol. of out migr	Rate of in Migration	Rate of out migr
% of BPL	1														
per capita income	-.806(**)	1													
% urban pop	-0.429	.633(**)	1												
Female literacy rate	-.516(*)	.717(**)	0.375	1											
Per capita bank deposit	-.638(**)	.867(**)	.617(*)	.756(**)	1										
Public & pvt invest	-0.016	0.173	.553(*)	0.131	0.206	1									
Per capita NSDP	-.809(**)	.996(**)	.666(**)	.732(**)	.884(**)	0.200	1								
Per capita bank credit to industry	-0.369	.711(**)	.852(**)	0.430	.779(**)	.575(*)	.727(**)	1							
Services	-0.054	0.062	-.563(*)	0.107	0.004	-0.311	0.028	-0.291	1						
Manufacturing	0.011	-0.017	.572(*)	-0.039	0.148	0.497	0.037	0.352	-.506(*)	1					
% of agricultural laborer	0.446	-.603(*)	-0.459	-.804(**)	-.594(*)	-0.067	-.623(**)	-0.349	0.338	-0.048	1				
Vol. of in migration	-0.161	0.412	.590(*)	0.124	.565(*)	0.359	0.432	.804(**)	-0.265	0.265	-0.036	1			
Vol. of Out migration	0.287	-0.489	-0.090	-.555(*)	-0.317	-0.134	-0.495	-0.164	-0.304	0.405	0.400	0.127	1		
Rate of in migration	-.576(*)	.741(**)	0.344	0.252	.585(*)	-0.131	.717(**)	.516(*)	0.164	-0.321	-0.161	.564(*)	-0.288	1	
Rate of out migration (person)	-0.312	0.032	-0.309	-0.224	-0.001	-.701(**)	-0.007	-0.279	0.312	-0.383	0.293	-0.112	0.313	0.380	1

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Result of linear regression between migration and socio-economic variables

Dependent variable	Independent variable	Multiple R	R square	%Individual explanation	Beta	t	Sig.	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Rate of in-migration	% of BPL	0.576	0.331	33.1	-0.576	-2.633	0.02	% of BPL negatively related to rate of in migration, Explains 33% change.
	Per capita income	0.741	0.548	54.8	0.741	4.123	0.001	Per capita income positively related to rate of in-migration
	Per capita bank deposit	0.585	0.342	34.2	0.585	2.699	0.017	Per capita bank deposit positively related to rate of in-migration
	Per capita NSDP	0.717	0.513	51.3	0.717	3.843	0.002	Per capita NSDP positively related to rate of in-migration
	Per capita bank credit to industry	0.516	0.266	26.6	0.516	2.255	0.041	Per capita bank credit to indust. positively related to rate of in-migration
Vol. of in-migration	% of urban	0.59	0.348	34.8	0.59	2.735	0.016	% of urban positively co-related to vol.of in-migration.
	Per capita bank deposit	0.565	0.319	31.9	0.565	2.56	0.023	Per capita bank deposit positively co-related to vol.of in-migration.
	Per capita bank credit to industry	0.804	0.647	64.7	0.804	5.067	0	Per capita bank credit to indust. positively co-related to vol.of in-migration.
Rate of out-migration	Pub & Pvt. Investment	0.701	0.492	49.2	-0.701	-3.683	0.002	Pub & Pvt. Investment negatively related to rate of out-migration.
Vol. of out-migration	Per capita income	0.489	0.239	23.9	-0.489	-2.096	0.055	Per capita income negatively related to vol. of out migration.
	Female literacy	0.555	0.308	30.8	-0.555	-2.498	0.026	Female literacy negatively related to vol.of out-migration