RETURN MIGRATION IN HIMACHAL PRADESH: A CASE STUDY

Dr. Surinder Singh

Associate Professor

Department of Economics

Government Degree College Bilaspur

District Bilaspur, Himachal Pradesh, India

Abstract: This study has been undertaken to assess the nature, extent and pattern of return migration in Himachal Pradesh. A total sample comprises 200 households from both tribal and non-tribal regions in Himachal Pradesh collected in 2015. Results show that out of total migration in tribal region, 85.4 percent are out-migrants, 9.2 percent in-migrants and 5.4 percent return-migrants. Out of total migration in rural areas of non-tribal region, 94 percent are out-migrants, 6 percent return-migrants and none, in-migrant. Whereas in urban areas of non-tribal region, the percentage of out-migrants (20 percent) is lower than in-migrants (80 percent) and none return migrant. In study area, a relatively higher percentage of return-migrants, moved within the state (78.6 percent) as compared to those from outside state (21.4 percent) and none returned from another country. Overall, a higher percentage of return-migrants moved in from another district (64.3 percent) as compared to same district (14.3 percent). Urban to rural return-migration has been the most dominant migration stream, accounting for 57 percent of the total internal return-migration, followed by rural to rural (42.9 percent).

Keywords: Migrant, Out migration, Return migration, Tribal and non-tribal region.

1. Introduction

More than ever before, migration is increasing day by day. Modern transportation has made it easier, cheaper and faster for people to move in search of job, education and quality of life. The great majority of the people in the world do not migrate across borders, much larger migrates within countries. Migration plays an important role in the distribution of population of any country, and determines the growth of labour force in any area. Migration may increase or decrease the size and change the structure of any area drastically at any point of time. The existing studies on migration show that migration is, by and large, closely linked with two basic arguments, development-driven factors and distress-driven factors. Migration

is selective process, migrants respond positively to plus factors at destination and negatively to minus factors at origin. Economic, social, political and geographical push and pull factors are responsible for the movement of people within the nation and across the nations.

Internal migration may be classified into three migration streams- intra-district, inter-district and inter-state migration. On the basis of rural or urban movement internal migration is classified in to four migration streams- rural to rural, rural to urban, urban to rural and urban to urban. The reason for movement of people from one place to another place may not be the same for all. Migration is a complex phenomenon that touches on a multiplicity of economic, social and security aspects. Migration has major impacts on both the people and places involved. In India, apart from conflicts and disaster, over the years, development projects have displaced large numbers of people from different parts of country. Three groups of person are more affected by mobility of their family members: women, children and elderly.

In India, undesirable influx of rural workforce to urban areas has adversely affected the carrying capacity of urban centres and a large proportion of urban workforce either is openly unemployed or has entered the informal and unorganised sector. Many people are living in slumps without adequate access to basic amenities, education, health and sanitation facilities. Therefore identification of causes of migration and examination of nature and pattern of migration for appropriate policy intervention is required. A population policy would address itself both to the situation arising out of fast rising population in any area as well as out of declining population in any particular area. The future population is to be so planned that the present and future of the existing numbers are not adversely affected.

2. Methodology

2.1 Objective

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

2.2 Sampling design

In order to achieve the objectives of the present study, the primary data has been collected from Himachal Pradesh in 2015. A systematic, multi-stage stratified random sampling design has been adopted to collect data. In sampling procedure block, panchayat, village, town, ward and household are the different stages of random sampling. For this purpose, two districts i.e. Lahul & Spiti (tribal region) and Una (non-tribal region) out of twelve districts in Himachal Pradesh have been selected following simple random sampling, while arranging them in ascending order on the basis of their respective population. The entire sample for the study has been designed in such a manner that comparison can be made according to region

(tribal and non-tribal regions), residence (rural and urban areas in non-tribal region) and migration status (migrant and non-migrant).

Sample selection in tribal region

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

Sampling selection in non-tribal region

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

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

3. Migration status, types and return-migration

This section has been divided into two sub sections. Section 3A, throws a light on migration status and types of migration; whereas section 3B presents various features of return-migration.

3A. Migration status and types of migration

3A.1 Migration status

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

Table 3A.1 indicates distribution of migrants (out-migrants, in-migrants and return-migrants) and non-migrants according to residence and region. Any former member of the household who left the household, any time in the past, for stay outside the village/town, has been considered as out-migrant, provided he/she was alive as on the date of study. In this study information about out-migrant member(s) of the household has been collected from each of the selected household. But information about out-migration of entire household from a village/town could not be collected in this study. In present study, a phenomenon in which the migrants return to their earlier usual place of residences (UPR) from where they had migrated in the past, and who are intending to stay in their present place for at least six months, is termed as return-migration. Any migrant who reported present place of enumeration as usual place of residence (UPR) in the past has been considered as return-migrant. Any present member of the household whose last place of residence (any time in the past) was different from present place of enumeration, outside the village/town, excluding return migrants has been considered as in-migrant.

---

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

Table 3A.1 Percent distribution of migrants and non-migrants by migration status, according to residence and region

Category of persons			Migration status				All	Number of persons
			Non-migrants	Out-migrants	In-migrants	Return-migrants		
Tribal		Male	62.5	30.2	4.4	2.9	100.0	315
		Female	76.7	22.0	1.0	0.3	100.0	287
		Persons	69.3	26.2	2.8	1.7	100.0	602
Non-tribal	Rural	Male	79.9	18.6	0.0	1.5	100.0	274
		Female	95.2	4.8	0.0	0.0	100.0	249
		Persons	87.2	12.0	0.0	0.8	100.0	523
	Urban	Male	80.7	5.5	13.8	0.0	100.0	109
		Female	86.4	1.0	12.6	0.0	100.0	103
		Persons	83.5	3.3	13.2	0.0	100.0	212
	Total	Male	80.2	14.9	3.9	1.0	100.0	383
		Female	92.6	3.7	3.7	0.0	100.0	352
		Persons	86.1	9.5	3.8	0.6	100.0	735

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

3A.2 Types of migrants

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

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

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

3B. Return-migration

In present study, a phenomenon in which the migrants return to their earlier usual place of residences (UPR) from where they had migrated in the past, and who are intending to stay in their present place for at least six months, is termed as return-migration. Any migrant who reported present place of enumeration as usual place of residence (UPR) in the past has been considered as return-migrant.

3B.1 Rate of return-migration

Table 3B.1 Rate of return-migration (per 100 migrants) according to residence and region

Category of persons	Tribal	Non-tribal			Overall
		Rural	Urban	Total	
Male	7.6	7.3	0.0	5.3	6.7
Female	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
Persons	5.4	6.0	0.0	3.9	4.9

The rate of return-migration, calculated as the number of return migrants per 100 migrants, is presented in table 3B.1. Overall the rate of return migration is five percent. The rate of return migration in tribal region (5.4 percent) and rural areas of non-tribal region (6 percent) is almost similar. However, the rate of return migration for males in the tribal region and rural areas of non-tribal region (7.6 percent and 7.3 percent, respectively) is higher than that of the females (1.5 percent and none, respectively).

3B.2 Last place of residence of return-migrants

In table 3B.2, the distribution of return-migrants by last place of residence is presented. Overall, in study area, a relatively higher percentage of return-migrants, moved within the state (78.6 percent) as compared to those from outside state (21.4 percent) and none returned from another country. Overall, a higher percentage of return-migrants moved in from another district (64.3 percent) as compared to same district (14.3 percent). A relatively lower percentage of male return-migrants (76.9 percent) moved within state as compared to all females.

Intra-state movement of tribal return-migrants are higher (90 percent) as compared to inter-state (10 percent), whereas there was no return-emigrant. A higher percentage of tribal return-migrants, whose last place of residence has been another district (70 percent), is higher as compared to same district (20 percent). No tribal female return-migrants moved in from another state as compared to 11 percent tribal male. No tribal male or female migrant has been return-emigrant. Half of rural non-tribal return-migrants moved within the state and from another state, whereas there is no return-migrant in urban areas.

Table 3B.2 Distribution of return-migrants (per 100 persons) by last place of residence for each category of persons according to residence and region

Category of persons			Rural areas of			Urban areas of			Other countries	All
			Same state		Other states	Same state		Other states		
			Same district	Other district		Same district	Other district			
Tribal		Male	22.2	66.7	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100
		Female	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100
		Persons	20.0	70.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100
Non-tribal	Rural	Male	0.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	100
		Female	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
		Persons	0.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	100
	Urban	Male	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
		Female	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
		Persons	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
	Total	Male	0.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	100
		Female	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
		Persons	0.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	100
Overall		Male	15.4	61.5	15.4	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	100
		Female	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100
		Persons	14.3	64.3	14.3	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	100

3B.3 Internal return-migration among different types of migration streams

Table 3B.3 Distribution of internal return-migrants (per 100 persons) over the four types of rural-urban migration streams

Category of persons	Migration stream				All	Number of persons
	Rural to rural	Rural to urban	Urban to rural	Urban to urban		
Male	46.2	0.0	53.8	0.0	100.0	13
Female	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	01
Persons	42.9	0.0	57.1	0.0	100.0	14

Table 3B.3 presents the distribution of internal return-migrants, by four types of migration streams, namely rural-rural, rural-urban, urban-rural and urban-urban. Urban to rural return-migration has been the most dominant migration stream, accounting for 57 percent of the total internal return-migration, followed by rural to rural (42.9 percent). There has been no return-migrant from urban to urban. The pattern of return-migration among male and female is different. Urban to rural return-migration has been the most dominant migration stream with lower percentage among males (53.8 percent) of the total internal male return-migrants as compared to females (all). This is followed by rural to rural return-migration stream among male (46.2 percent).

4. Policy Implications

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

Bibliography

Bhende, A. A., & Kanitkar, T. (1997). Principles of Population Studies. Mumbai: Himalaya Publishing House.

Gill, K. K. (1993). Economic Development and Population Growth: Empirical Evidence from Punjab. Man and Development, 15(4), 17.

Government of India. India Urban Poverty Report 2009. Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Hussain, S. S., Hussan, B. N., & Muhammad, Z. Y. (2004). A Sociological Study of Factors Responsible for Migration: A Case Study of Fasalabad City. International Journal of Agriculture and Biology, 6(4), 683-685.

Kumar, A., & Verson, J. (2015). Dynamics of International Out-Migration from Punjab. Chandigarh: Centre for Research in Rural and Industrial Development (CRRID).

Lee, E. S. (1966). A Theory of Migration. Demography, 3(1), 47-57.

Lewis, W. A. (1954). Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour. Manchester School of Economics and Social Studies, XXII, 139-191.

Ravenstein, E. G. (1885, June). The Law of Migration. Journal of the Statistical Society of London, 48(2), 167-235.

Ravenstein, E. G. (1889, June). The Laws of Migration. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, 52(2), 241-305.

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

United Nations. (1951). U. N. Measures for the Economic Development of Underdeveloped Countries. Report by a Group of Experts Appointed by the Secretary General, New York.

United Nation (2018).World Migration Report 2018. International Organisation for Migration, Geneva.

United Nations. (2009). International Migration 2019:Report. Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

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