Pattern and Determinants of Migration - A Study of Kangra District of Himachal Pradesh

Sonia Thakur and Jatinder Kishtwaria

INTRODUCTION

Migration of people from one place to another has been going on since the dawn of human history. A number of factors can be ascribed as the causes of migration viz., the economic, social and environmental. There are many forms of migration such as rural to urban, urban to urban, rural to rural and country to country.

According to the NSS 49th round estimates, about 57.7 lakh persons who were out-migrants from rural areas have left during the last five years and are residing in other states or abroad (Narasimhan and Chandra, 1998).

In Himachal Pradesh due to hilly terrain and inclement weather, the job opportunities are comparatively low as compared to plains. Land holdings are small and the scope of establishment of business is also less. This forces the males from the rural areas of Himachal Pradesh, particularly from the Kangra district which is one of the least developed districts to migrate to neighbouring states to seek employment. Migration of male members may have long term consequences on the family members left behind. Therefore, it becomes imperative to find out the causes and pattern of migration, since this data base will lead to proper intervention and policy formulations at government level.

Hence, the present study was designed and carried out in the Kangra district with specific objective i.e. to ascertain the determinants and pattern of migration.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Descriptive type of survey design was selected for the present study. The study was carried out in the Kangra district of Himachal Pradesh. A multistage random sampling technique was followed to select the blocks, villages and ultimate respondents were selected through proportional allocation method. Sample consisted of 80 respondents. Wives of the migrants acted as the respondents who were interviewed personally and the data were collected using pre-tested, structured interview schedule.

RANKING OF FACTORS WHICH CAUSED MIGRATION

Factors causing migration were ranked. For this, a list of pull and push factors influencing migration was prepared after exhaustive review of literature and discussion with the experts in the field. It consisted of 11 pull factors and 7 push factors. The respondents were asked to rank them in order of preference which caused their husbands to migrate. For these pull and push factors, the order of merit given by the respondents were converted into scores by using the formula:

$$\text{Per cent position*} \quad = \quad \frac{100 \ (R-0.5)}{N}$$

where,
R is the rank of the individual factor in the series ranked by an individual
N is the number of factors ranked by an individual.

The per cent position of each rank obtained was converted into scores with the help of the ranking table given by Garrett and Woodworth (1981). The scores of individual factors were added and the total was divided by the total number of respondents who ranked the particular factor. These mean scores for all the factors were arranged in descending order and the ranks were given and the most influencing factor was identified.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Personal and Family Characteristics

A majority of both respondents (81.25%) as well as their husbands (92.50%) belonged to the age group of 21 - 40 years prior to migration. Similar was the case after migration. Almost similar number of respondents had done matric (28.75%) and primary (26.25%). Least number of

Table 1a: Age-wise distribution of respondents and their husbands

Age (in	Respondents		Husbands	
completed years	Before migration	After migration	Before migration	After migration
Below 21	14 (17.50)	-	-	57 (71.25)
21-40	65 (81.25)	72 (90.00)	74 (92.50)	57 (71.25)
41-60	1 (01.25)	8 (10.00)	6 (7.50)	23 (28.75)
Total	80 (100)	80 (100)	80 (100)	80 (100)

Figures in parenthess indicate percentage of total sample in each category.

Table 1b: Distribution of respondents and their husbands according to their educational level

Eduational level	Respondents	Husbands
Illiterate	15 (18.75)	2 (2.50)
Literate		
Primary	21 (26.25)	15 (18.75)
Middle	15 (18.75)	12 (15.00)
Matric	23 (28.75)	37 (46.25)
Above matric	6 (7.50)	12 (15.00)
Technical Qualification	-	2 (2.50)
Total	80 (100)	80 (100)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage of total sample in each category.

Table 1c: Family characteristics of sampled households

S. No.	Particulars	Households
1.	Caste	
	Upper Castes (Rajput, Brahmin)	25 (31.25)
	Intermediate castes (Choudhary, Chimery, Kumhar)	42 (52.50)
	Lower Castes (Julaha, Harijan)	9(11.25)
	Scheduled Tribes (Gaddi)	4 (5.00)
	Total	80 (100)
2.	Family Type	
	Nuclear	60 (75.00)
	Joint	20 (25.00)
	Total	80 (100)
3.	Family Size	
	Upto 4	44 (55.00)
	Above 4	36 (45.00)
	Total	80 (100)
4.	Landholding Size (Kanals)	
	Below 7	50 (62.50)
	7 and above	30 (37.50)
	Total	80 (100)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage of total sample.

Table 1d: Total yearly income before and after migration of the sampled households

Income range (Rs.)	Before migration	After migration
15,000 and below	55 (68.75)	-
15,001 - 30,000	18 (22.50)	14 (17.50)
30,001 - 45,000	3 (3.75)	16 (20.00)
45,001 - 60,000	1 (1.25)	18 (22.50)
60,001 - 75,000	-	12 (15.00)
75,001 - 90,000	1 (1.25)	6 (7.50)
90,001 and above	2 (2.50)	14 (17.50)
Total	80 (100)	80 (100)

Figures in parenthess indicate percentage of total sample in each category.

respondents had education above matric i.e. 7.50 per cent. Majority of the households (68.75%) has income in the range of Rs. 15000 and below prior to whereas, after migration majority had in the range of Rs. 45,001 - 60,000 that is, 22.50 per cent and almost equal number of households (20.00%) had income in the range of Rs. 30,001 - 45,000. Sampled households were mainly nuclear families (74.00%) and had family size upto 4 members. table 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d.

B. Pattern of Migration

1. Nature of Migration: Majority of the migrants (81.25 %) migrated to other states while the remaining eighteen per cent went outside India. This shows the predominance of interstate migration probably so because migrating out of the country requires a large amount of money which was unaffordable by the majority of the sampled households (Table 2). Gulati (1987) found that substantial amount of money was spent by those who migrated to Middle East which they paid to the private agents.

2. Number of Years of Husband's Migration: Table 2 depicts that majority of the migrants (38.75 %) had migrated since 2-5 years followed by 35 per cent who had migrated since 6-9 years while the least i.e. 26.25 per cent had migrated since ten years and more.

3. Frequency of Husband's Visit to Home: In case of international migrants, forty per cent visited their home once in 2 years followed by 33 per cent who visited once in a year, 27 per cent who visited once in 3 years.

In case of interstate migration, majority of the migrants (35.38 %) visited home once in 6 months

Table 2: Pattern of migration

Particulars	Migrants
1. *Nature of migration*	
a. Interstate	65(81.25)
b. International	15(18.75)
Total	80(100)
2. *Number of years of husband's migration*	
a. 2-5	31(38.75)
b. 6-9	28(35.00)
c. 10 and above	21(26.25)
Total	80(100)
3. *Frequency of husband's visit to home*	
a. International migration	
i. Once in a year	5(33.00)
ii. Once in 2 years	6(40.00)
iii. Once in 3 years	4(27.00)
Total	15(100)
b. Interstate migration	
i. Once in a week	3(4.61)
ii. Once in a month	9(13.84)
iii. Once in 3 months	11(16.92)
iv. Once in 6 months	23(35.38)
v. Thrice a year	2(3.07)
vi. Once in a year	16(24.61)
vii. More than a year	1(1.53)
Total	65(100)
4. *Number of days for which husband stays in a year*	
a. 12-48	53(66.25)
b. 49-85	23(28.75)
c. 86-122	4(5.00)
Total	80(100)
Frequency of respondent's visit to the place of migration	
a. Once a month	2(2.50)
b. Once in 6 months	2(2.50)
c. Once in a year	4 (5.00)
d. Once in 2 years	7 (8.75)
e. Once in 5 years and above	2 (2.50)
f. Never visited	63(78.75)
Total	80 (100)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages

followed by 24.61 per cent who visited once in a year and 16.92 per cent who visited once in 3 months.

4. Duration of Stay: Majority of the migrants (66.25 %) stayed with their families for 12-48 days in a year followed by 28.75 per cent who stayed for 49-85 days. Least number of migrants i.e. 5 per cent stayed with their families for 86-122 days. This shows that migrants stayed with their families for a period of short duration (Table 2).

5. Frequency of Respondent's visit to Their Husband's Place: Out of total, about two fifth of the respondents (78.75 %) had never visited their husbands' place. Nearly one-tenth of the respondents visited their husbands' place once in 2 years. This clearly suggests that majority of the respondents never visited their husbands' work place probably so, because many of the husbands were living in a shared room or accommodation where the wives could not stay. Also high cost of travelling was involved in cases where husbands had migrated to some other country.

C. Place - wise Break up of Migrants

The destination chosen by most of the interstate migrants was Delhi (27.68 %) followed by Punjab (18.46 %). Since both these states are industrially developed and urbanised states having plenty of scope for the migrants to get employment. Further, both these states are close enough to Himachal Pradesh. It is in congruence to the fact that people generally migrate from the areas of limited economic opportunities to the developed and developing areas where migrants can expect greater monetary gains and conse-

Table 3: Place-wise break-up of migrants

Particulars	Migrants
A. *State and Union Territory*	
1. Punjab	12(18.46)
2. Uttar Pradesh	6(9.23)
3. Jammu & Kashmir	3(4.61)
4. West Bengal	3(4.61)
5. Rajasthan	1(1.50)
6. Maharashtra	6(9.23)
7. Gujarat	2(3.07)
8. Tamil Nadu	2(3.07)
9. Madhya Pradesh	1(1.50)
10. Orrisa	1(1.50)
11. Karnataka	1(1.50)
12. Chandigarh	9(13.84)
13. Delhi	18(27.69)
Total	65(100)
B. *Country*	
1. Saudi Arabia	4(26.60)
2. South Africa	1(6.70)
3. UAE (Abu Dhabi, Dubai)	7(46.60)
4. Iraq	1(6.70)
5. U.S.A.	1 (6.70)
6. Australia	1(6.70)
Total	15(100)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage to the total

quently a better level of living. Subramanian and Hegde (1997) also found that the places of destination of the migrant workers were urban areas, particularly the fast developing outskirts, where the work potential was very high.

Migrants who moved out of India mainly went to Middle East countries with maximum number to United Arab Emirates (46.60%) followed by 26.60 per cent to Saudi Arabia. This is probably due to the reason that these nations are rich in oil reserves as well as the employment potential is high for unskilled to skilled workers. Weiner (1982) studied the number of Indian migrants in Middle East countries and found that the maximum strength was in U.A.E. working in semi-skilled as well as skilled occupations (Table 3).

D. Information Sources Facilitating Migration

The analysis of the sources of information facilitating migration of the husbands revealed that in large number of cases, relatives (31.25 %) and friends (20.0%) helped them. The results of the studies conducted by Tiwari (1991), Santhapparaj (1996) and Chand et al. (1998) are in congruence with the present finding. The role of formal channels like newspaper advertiseme-nts, employment exchanges was almost insignifi-cant (8.75 %). A study conducted by Papola and Subrahmanian (1973) also pointed out the predominance of informal channels and the virtual insignificance of formalised channels such as employment exchange as a source of information for migrants (Table 4).

Table 4: Distribution of migrants according to their source of information facilitating migration

Source of information	Migrants
Self	21(26.25)
Relatives	25(31.25)
Friends	16(20.00)
Private agents	11(13.75)
Newspaper advertisements	6(7.50)
Employment exchange	1(1.25)
Total	80(100)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages to the total sample in each category.

E. Factors Causing Migration

Both push and pull factors causing migration of the husbands were ranked. It was observed that among pull factors the top ranked factor was better employment at the place of migration (mean score = 70.13). The similar observation was made by Santhapparaj (1998). The next ranked factor was better income (mean score = 57.16). In case of push factors the major factor influencing migration was observed to be unemployment (mean score = 69.72) followed by less income (mean score = 52.72), poverty (mean score = 42.38), lack of job opportunities (mean score = 40.51) and small landholdings (mean score = 39.82) (Table 5). Santhapparaj (1998) also found unemployment as the prime push factor compelli-ng people to migrate. Tiwari (1991) observed low income to be the major push factor motivating people to migrate (Table 5).

Table 5: Factors causing migration of the husbands

Factors	Number of indivi--duals who ranked the particular factor (A)	Sum of scores for the particular factor (B)	Mean score C=B/A	Order of of merit (D)
A. Pull Factors				
1. Better employment	64	4488	70.13	I
2. Better income	63	3601	57.16	II
3. Better work opportunities	23	981	42.65	III
4. Better living conditions	72	2894	40.19	IV
5. Better job security	53	1896	35.77	V
6. Higher economic gains	13	430	33.08	VI
B. Push Factors				
1. Unemployment	57	3974	69.72	I
2. Less income	74	3901	52.72	II
3. Poverty	56	2373	42.38	III
4. Lack of job opportunities	49	1985	40.51	IV
5. Small land holding	17	677	39.82	V

CONCLUSIONS

- Interstate migration was found to be prevalent. Migrants preferred nearby industry-centered, developed states viz., Delhi and Punjab. Small percentage managed to cross the border of the country. Middle East countries were chosen by most who went outside the country.

- Economic factors were found to be responsible for the migration of the husbands. Among pull factors, the hope of getting better employment at the place of migration was found to be the most important influencing migration while unemployed state of migrants was the most important factor pushing them out of the villages.

KEY WORDS Migration. Pattern. Determinants.

ABSTRACT The present study was conducted in district Kangra of Himachal Pradesh to determine the existing pattern of migration of people and the various factors which motivate people to migrate. The results revealed that husbands alone migrate leaving behind their wives and family in a bid to seek better employment so as to improve thair living standards. Destination places were mainly neighbouring states such as Punjab and Delhi with a few international migrants. The frequency of the visit back home ranged from once in 6 months to once in 2 years; with greater frequency for interstate migrants. Relative and friends were instrumental in facilitating the migration. Economic factors were found to be responsible for the migration.

REFERENCES

Chand, K., Singhal, K.C. and Modi, I.: Socio-economic variables and process of migration in sugar industry of Punjab. *Indian Journal of Labour Economics,* **41:** 675-693(1998).

Garrett, H. and Woodsworth, R.S.: *Statistics in Psycology and Education*. Vikil, Feffer and Simon Pvt. Ltd., Bombay (1981).

Gulati, L.: Coping with male migration. *Economic and Political Weekly,* **22:** WS-41-WS-46 (1987).

Narsimhan, R.L. and Chandra, H.: Sources of data on migration and recent trends. *Indian Journal of Labour Economics,* **41:** 633-643 (1998).

Papola, T.S. and Subrahmanian, K.K.: Structure of a local labour market. Ahmedabad. *Economic and Political Weekly,* **8:** 26-29 (1973).

Santhapparaj, A.S.: Job research and earnings of migrants in urban labour market: A study of Madurai metropolis. *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, **39:** 269-286 (1996).

Santhapparaj, A.S.: Internal migration, remittance and determinants of remittance : An emmpirical analysis. *Indian Journal of Labour Economics,* **41:** 645-652 (1998).

Singh, M.K., Kaur, M., Miglani, S.S. and Randhawa, R.K.: Efficiency of advertising media in selection and purchase of interior home furnishings. *Journal of Research, PAU Ludhiana,* **28(2):** 288-297 (1991).

Subramanian, M.P. and Hegde, M.R.: Migrant workers in Udupi Taluk. *Economic and Political Weekly,* **32:** 1953-1954 (1997).

Tiwari, R.S.: Migration and informal sector workers in Kanpur metropolis : An empirical analysis. *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, **34:** 352-256 (1991).

Wansik, B. and Ray, M.L.: Estimating advertisements impact on one's consumption of brand. *Journal of Advertising Research, May-June* 9-16 (1992).

Weiner, M. : International migration and development: Indians in the persian gulf. *Population and Development Review,* **8:** 1-36 (1982).

Authors' Address: **Sonia Thakur and Jatinder Kishtwaria,** Scientist, College of Home Science, CSKHPKV, Palampur 176 062, Himachal Pradesh, India