



Journal of North East India Studies

ISSN: 2278-1455 (Print) 2277-6869 (Online) Journal homepage: <http://www.jneis.com>

Migration from North Eastern Region to Bangalore: Evidences from Census Data

Marchang Reimeingam

To cite this article: Marchang Reimeingam (2018): Migration from North Eastern Region to Bangalore: Evidences from Census Data, *Journal of North East India Studies*, 8(1): 40-56.

Published online: 10 August 2018.

Submit your article to this journal: editor.jneis@yahoo.com

Terms and conditions of use: This article may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Views expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of Association for North East India Studies.

Migration from North Eastern Region to Bangalore: Evidences from Census Data

Marchang Reimeingam

Migration rate from North Eastern Region (NER) to the rest of India (ROI) in general and to Bangalore in particular has increased. The rate of migration from NER to Karnataka has declined steadily; however, to Bangalore it has slightly increased. Urban people from NER show higher tendency to migrate to Bangalore which is not the case for migrants from NER to ROI. Migration level from NER in Karnataka as well as in Bangalore is relatively insignificant. Migrants from NER are not choosing Karnataka as migration destination as before. Migrants from NER in Bangalore and Karnataka were dominated by males. Conversely, females dominated migration from NER in ROI. Males, unlike females, continue to prefer and choose Bangalore as one of their favourite migration destinations. NE people, particularly males, migrated to Karnataka and particularly to Bangalore mainly for education and employment. Females migrated mostly due to family migration. Migration from NER to Bangalore for employment and education has increased while migration along with their family has declined recently.

Keywords: Migration, migrant, reason, North Eastern Region, Bangalore.

Introduction

Migration from North Eastern Region (NER) of India to the rest of India (ROI) especially in the big cities such as Delhi, Mumbai in Maharashtra, Bangalore in Karnataka, Kolkata in West Bengal and Chennai in Tamil Nadu has been noticeably increasing in recent times. The paper examines the level, pattern and trend of migration from the region – covering Arunachal Pradesh (Ar.P), Assam, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Sikkim and Tripura – specifically to Bangalore urban agglomeration (hereafter Bangalore) using an available secondary data from the Population Census of India. Most of the migrants likely migrated in big cities like Bangalore for various pursuits such as employment or studies apart from other reasons. They migrate to big cities for some definite reason as “new employment opportunities are coming up in

Dr. Marchang Reimeingam is Assistant Professor at Institute for Social and Economic Change, Bangalore – 560 072, India. [Email: reimeingam@isec.ac.in.]

selective sectors and in a few regions/urban centres” (Kundu, 2007:353).

Migrant based on census data in this paper refers to those migrants defined by place of last residence (POLR) with all duration of residence including unspecified durations. POLR unclassifiable as rural or urban is included in the total. For data comparison the reason for migration such as family moved of 1991 was classified as moved with household category of 2001. The reason for migration namely natural calamities like drought, floods, etc. is clubbed in the category others in 1991. The reason for migration such as moved after birth that was added in 2001 census was separately classified.

The basic objective of the study is to understand the underlying reasons for migration from the region. The paper begins by examining the concept and definition of the migrants from Population Census as well as National Sample Survey (NSS) which is followed by a brief review of literature on migration emphasising on migration from the region to elsewhere in India. Subsequently, the level, pattern and trend, and the different reasons such as education, employment etc for out-migration from the region to the rest of India, Karnataka and Bangalore in 1991 and 2001 are analysed using simple proportion.¹ Finally, a precise concluding remark is made.

Concept and Definition of Migrant

Migrants are not required to be registered in India either at the place of origin or at the place of destination (Bhagat, 2005). In lack of registration of migrants, Census and NSS are the two main sources of migration data in India. Census provides data on migrants based on place of birth (POB) and place of last residence (POLR).² Migrants defined on the basis of POB or POLR are called the lifetime migrants because the time of their move is not known (Visaria, 1980). Moreover, POB “migration data are not particularly useful indicator of trends in movement because they provide no information on timing of the movement” (Skeldon, 1986:761).

If the POB or POLR is different from the place of enumeration, a person is defined as a migrant. A person is considered as migrant by POB if the place in which the person is enumerated during the census is other than the person’s POB. As a person could have migrated number of times during his lifetime, migration by POB would not give a correct picture of the migration taking place currently. A person, on the other hand, is considered as migrant by POLR, if the place in which the person is enumerated during the census is other than the person’s place of immediate last residence. By capturing the latest of the migrations in cases where persons have migrated more than once, the concept of migrants by POLR would give a better picture of current migration scenario. At the time of enumeration in census, a person could have moved from another village or town in the same district, or from another district of the state, or another state in India or even from another country. Census provides migration data on all these migration streams by both the concepts to understand the dynamics in the movement of population and the broad reasons behind. Thus a person is considered as a migrant when he/she is enumerated in census at a different place than his/her POB or POLR. Meanwhile NSSO has been carrying out all-India household surveys once in five year in order to know the employment and unem-

ployment situation and information on internal migration in the country. Being sample survey, the data have obvious limitations and are not helpful knowing the district level pattern in the internal migration within each state. The concept of usual place of residence (UPR) is adopted by NSS to define migrants. UPR is defined as a place (village/town) where the person had stayed continuously for a period of six months or more. According to NSS, a migrant is defined if the person had stayed continuously for at least six months or more in a place other than the place where the person was enumerated. The village/town where the person had stayed continuously for at least six months or more prior to moving to the place of enumeration was referred to as the last usual place of residence of that migrated person (NSSO, 2001).

Literature Review

The basic cause of voluntary migration is to achieve maximum individual satisfaction through obtaining better employment or wage or security or environment (Santhapparaj, 1996). Indeed people tend to migrate to maximise their welfare (Faggian and McCann, 2006). In India, recent migrants do have a strong tendency to migrate to localities which had previously attracted natives of their region (Greenwood, 1973 as cited in Levy and Wadycki, 1973). It indicates that Indian migration process is largely a type of chain migration. MacDonald and MacDonald (1964:82) defined chain migration as “that movement in which prospective migrants learn of opportunities, are provided with transportation, and have initial accommodation and employment arranged by means of primary social relationships with previous migrants”. Past migrant flows can be expected to influence current migration for several important reasons. Family and friends who have previously migrated from one region to another may provide information about their present location to persons residing in their former place of residence. Former migrants may also provide temporary food and shelter as well as ease social transition (Levy and Wadycki, 1973). NE migration is also largely a chain migration (Marchang, 2011). Chain migration increases the population of migration destination thereby creates certain problems like congestion, overcrowding of educational institutions, unemployment and others that reduce quality of life. However, when they are employed and make some remittances it further contribute to chain migration by aiding in both funding and interest in migration. Dimova and Wolff (2009) noted that besides the recognised benefits remittances provide to the economies of the home countries of immigrants, money sent home can lead to chain migration. They posit that remittances can provide the necessary capital. It benefit not only the money sent to families at home but also valuable information about their life, environment, work, education and information to guide other prospective migrants in the family or community to ease their journey. It is a well-known fact of economic history that material progress usually has been associated with the gradual but continuous transfer of economic agents from rural based traditional agriculture to urban oriented modern industry. A process of labor migration from a low productivity rural job directly to a higher productivity urban industrial job particularly in less developed countries is a one-stage phenomenon. For Todaro (1969) in less developed countries for more realistic picture of labour

migration would be one that views migration as a two-stage phenomenon. In the first stage, the unskilled rural workers migrating to urban area initially spend some time in the so-called urban traditional sector. In the second stage, these migrants eventual engage in a more permanent modern sector job.

Mukherji (2001) pointed out that migration especially towards largest metropolises of India has a nature of low quality – illiterate or semi-literate peasants and laborers – migration. Meanwhile, numerous studies (Jackson, 1969; Rossi, 1980; Friedlander and Roshier, 1966 as cited in Cote, 1997) in Britain have found that the propensity to migrate increases with an increase in educational qualifications. Migration is massively associated with late adolescence and the early 20s (Rees, 1979 as cited in Cote, 1997). In India, the rural to urban migration is the important flow for literate youth migrants (Sebastian, 1989).

North East people are increasingly migrating towards different destinations such as the National Capital Region, Mumbai, Bangalore, Chennai to mention few in search of opportunities despite problems and racial discrimination. Many of them are youth and have substantially increased (Marchang, 2008 and 2011). For example, Census of India (2001) recorded that half of the NE migrants to Delhi were youth in the age group of 15-29 years of age. About 96 percent of the NE migrants to Delhi were youth (Marchang, 2011). A similar study by Usha and Shimray (2010) and Remesh (2012) showed that about 90 percent of the NE migrants were youth in the age group of 15-30 years. Marchang (2008 and 2011), Usha and Shimray (2010), Chandra (2011), (Banati 2015) and Remesh (2012) concluded in their recent studies of NE migrants to Delhi that major push factors include lack of educational infrastructures, growing unemployment problems, social unrest and political tension. Racial prejudice and discrimination were common and obvious to them. Studies by Chandra (2011) concluded that in Delhi a racial discrimination against North East people has increased and social profiling is the root cause of racial discrimination from North East India. Further, Marchang (2008 and 2011), Usha and Shimray (2010), Chandra (2011) and Remesh (2012) concluded that pull factors of migration from NER include better environment of educational and job opportunities. They established that many of them were students or employed in formal and informal salaried employments including retail sectors, hospitality, BPO, etc. Globalisation has widened employment opportunities in BPO, hospitality industries, shopping malls etc. Sachdeva (2005) opined that the culture of bandhs in the NER have created disorder with the education system. Gooptu and Sengupta (2012) assumed that the population of NER in Bangalore was estimated at 0.25 million in 2012.³ A large number of Northeasterners are employed in organised as well as unorganised sectors such as in hospitality, retail and BPO jobs in Bangalore. Moreover, Remesh (2012) established that migrants from the NER to Delhi are from relatively rich segment, better economic condition and better educational background. They are largely educated who have completed matriculation and above education (Marchang, 2011 and Remesh, 2012).

Out-migration from NER

The level of social and economic development at origin and destination of migration

determines the magnitude of migration. People of NER are increasingly migrating outside the region as shown in Table 1. In 1991 only 1.5 percent of the total migrants in the ROI, i.e. states and UTs in India excluding the eight NE states, were from the region. In the following decade it increases to 1.9 percent. Most of them continue to originate from rural areas, as shown in Table 2, which is true for both males and females. In 1991 about 57 percent of the migrants from the region to the ROI were from rural area that has increased to 65 percent in 2001.

During 1991-2001 migration from the region to the state of Karnataka declines from 0.7 to 0.6 percent as shown in Table 3. However, in terms of absolute number it slightly increased from just over eleven thousand in 1991 to over twelve thousand in the following decade as given in Table 2. These migrants largely originated from urban areas as presented in Table 2. Migrants chose to migrate to urban areas due to the better availability of facilities and services such as infrastructure, amenities etc. Migrants from the region are gradually relinquishing Karnataka as their migration destination especially among the females when compared to the migrants from the region to the ROI. As much as three percent of the migrants from the region to the ROI migrated to Karnataka in 1991 as presented in Table 4. In 2001, it dropped to 1.6 percent due to the considerable change in the migration behavior among the females who no longer choose Karnataka as their destination likely due to a far distance factor. During this period, for males, there was a slight increase in the migration level from the region to Karnataka.

However, migration data on migrants from the region to Bangalore shows a slight improvement in migration rate that is mainly contributed by the male migrants. Table 5 shows that the share of migrants from the region to Bangalore in the all migrants to Bangalore remains at 0.8 percent in both the years. It has declined for migrants from rural NER to Bangalore. Whereas for migrants from urban NER migrating to Bangalore, the share has increased for males as well as for females indicating that urban people from NER in comparison with urban people from other than NER has a higher tendency to migrate to the Bangalore. This seems to be invalid for rural people migrating to Bangalore.

Migration from the region to the ROI is dominated by the females as the sex ratio, as shown in Table 2, is 1259 in 1991. Females became more dominant among the migrants as 2042 female migrated per thousand male migrants in 2001 indicating that there is no gender discrimination in sending those migrants by their parents. Specifically, female migration is largely due to marriage. It is more than the general sex ratio of population of the region where females never outnumbered the males in these years. The pace of female migration from the region to the ROI is increasing; however, the pace is not the same for migrants from the region to Karnataka as well as to Bangalore. In 1991 females outnumbered the males among the migrants from the region to Karnataka; but later in 2001 males greatly outnumbered females or the sex ratio was only 625. Similarly, the sex ratio of migrants from NER to Bangalore was 989 in 1991 however in the following decade it dropped to 685. Presumptuously, females were not under-enumerated during the census enumeration. Then it indicates that females did not like Karnataka or Bangalore as much as before or male preference of Karnataka or Bangalore goes much beyond female preferences. It is

also possible that the opportunities available in Bangalore are more suitable for males.

As expected larger share of the migrants from the region are from the more populated and geographically large states like Assam with 41 percent in 1991 and 58 percent in 2001 as shown in Table 6. However, it is always not the case that most populated state has a higher share of migrants in Bangalore because a smallest and least populated NE state like Sikkim has a larger share of migrants with 22 percent than a more populous state like Manipur with about six percent in 1991. In 2001, Assam continues to dominate in terms of migration level among the NER followed by Manipur with about 13 percent. It is surprising to observe a significant decline in the share of migrants from Sikkim from about 22 to about four percent during the same period. Such decline although low is noticed for Arunachal Pradesh as well as for Mizoram. It suggests that the pace of migration from Assam, Manipur, Meghalaya, Nagaland and Tripura exceed migration from Arunachal Pradesh, Mizoram and Sikkim which are relatively peaceful and politically stable states in the region. Moreover, larger share of the migrants coming to Bangalore are from urban areas that seems to be relatively more informative, educated and affluent. As presented in Table 2, about 66 percent of the migrants from the region to Bangalore originated from urban areas in 1991 which does not change much even after a decade in 2001. This could arise due to a forward migration when people initially migrated from rural to urban areas in their respective state or region; further migrated to Bangalore in urban areas in search of better job, better education, transfer of job, family moved, etc.

All NE states do not migrate uniformly in size across the cities and state outside the region over the years. For example, majority of the NE migrants to Bangalore were from Assam which was followed by Manipur, Meghalaya, and so on; and the least from Mizoram in 2001. In the same year, Assam dominated in the course of migration from the region to the ROI with about 68 percent that was followed by Nagaland, Tripura, Manipur, etc and the least from Mizoram with less than one percent. A similar pattern is observed for males and females. Importantly, the states with smaller population were increasingly migrating outside the region for instance like Nagaland. In 1991, about three percent of the migrants from the region to the ROI were from Nagaland, which has significantly increased to about 19 percent in 2001. Contrary to this, the share of migrants from Mizoram has significantly declined from about six to less than one percent during the same period. It indicates that the extent of migration from each NE state was not consistent at different point of time.

North east people have become increasingly mobile as the share of out-migrants from NER in the population of the region rose from 1.2 percent in 1991 to 1.9 percent in 2001. It was attributed by a significant increase among the female migrants. The size of female migrants became large in number, as shown in Table 2, as well as in proportion, as presented in Table 7, indicating a serious issue at origin of migration. It can be argued that females are finding difficulties in getting job in their region or they preferred job elsewhere with a higher wage. It is also possible that they are increasingly enrolling in higher studies outside their region. Moreover, migrants from NE to Karnataka are not very significant when compared to the size of migrants from the region to the ROI. In 1991, about three percent of the out-migrants from the

region migrated to Karnataka; later in 2001 it decline to 1.6 percent because of the sharp decline among the female migrants. Many females were not choosing Karnataka as their migration destination. This affects the size of out-migrants from the region to Karnataka as well as Bangalore. In 1991, only 0.7 percent of the migrants from outside Karnataka were from NER. In 2001, it has reduced to 0.6 percent. Moreover, only one percent of the out-migrants from the region migrated to Bangalore in pre and during the 1980s, during India's pre-reform period, which was registered in 1991. The size of migrants in number swelled up; however, the share has dropped to less than one percent in 2001. Again the reason is simple that females do not migrate as much as the males to Karnataka or Bangalore. Further, about 34 percent of the out-migrants to Karnataka lived in Bangalore in 1991. In 2001, it has substantially improved to 52 percent suggesting Bangalore the favorite migration destination for the NE people in Karnataka. About half of the male migrants and about 55 percent of the female migrants from the region migrated to Karnataka lived in Bangalore.

Reason for Migration: NER to Rest of India

People migrated outside NER for various reasons and the reasons are not uniformly distributed for males and females. NE people migrated to the ROI mainly due to the migration along with the household and for marriage. Empirical evidence shows that about 30 percent of the migrants from the region to the ROI migrated due to the migration along with their household in 1991 as shown in Table 8. Such type of migration occurs when transfer of job arises, parents or main income earner migrates and spouse migrated along with spouse and or children. About 29 percent migrated for marriage. Migration for employment and business was about 17 percent. The share of migrants for education was prevailing at over four percent. And the remaining share migrated for various reasons that are not included in the aforementioned reasons. Migration from the region to the ROI for marriage has increased drastically to 44 percent in 2001 which arises mainly with a high female mentioning marriage as their reason for migration. A very insignificant proportion of males migrated for marriage. In 1991 just over two percent of the males migrated for marriage which has gone down to just over one percent in the following decade.

Migration along with the movement of their household or family continues to be significant even in 2001 with a share of about 23 percent. The share of NE people specifically migrated for education decline from 4.6 to 2.9 percent from 1991 to 2001. Similarly, migration for employment and business declined. Females do not migrate for education, employment and business as much as the male counterparts. Migration for education, employment and business among the males and females has declined for the same period. Except an increase of migration for employment for males from about 26 to 31 percent during the same period that implies that unemployment issue in their region was becoming a major reason for migration.

Reason for Migration: NER to Karnataka

Many NE people migrated, similar to all-migrants from outside Karnataka, to Karnataka for different reasons such as employment, education, marriage, etc as shown in Table 9. About 29 percent in 1991 against 24 percent in 2001 migrated from the

region along with the migration of their household in Karnataka. Migration for marriage from the region to Karnataka was not very significant as compared to migration for marriage from the region to the ROI. About 21 percent of migrants from the region to Karnataka migrated due marriage in 1991 which has declined to as low as five percent in 2001. It has declined for both males and females over the years. Nevertheless, migration for marriage was more prominent among the females with about 36 and 12 percent in 1991 and 2001 respectively. Males do not migrate as much as females for marriage. A significant increase in migration for employment and education was evident during the same period. About 13 percent of the NE people migrated to Karnataka for employment in 1991 which has increased to about 17 percent in 2001. Large share of males migrated for employment with about 23 percent as compared to females for employment with about five percent in 1991. It has increased for males but has slightly declined for females. The increase was more prominent for education as the reason for migration. About 12 percent of the NE people migrated for education in 1991 which has substantially increased to about 27 percent in the later year. The level of migration for education for males has increased from 19 to 32 percent during 1991-2001. Similarly, for females it has increased from just over six percent to close to 18 percent during the same period. It indicates that more and more people from the region migrated for employment and education partly due to the better employment avenues and better educational infrastructure and system which is seldom disturb by social unrest, strikes, bandhs and so on in Karnataka. Moreover, the share of migration with household as a reason was significantly higher for females than males; while for employment the share for females was much lower than males indicating that dependent spouse and or family members migrated along with the migration of male income earner of their family.

Further, interestingly, NE people migrated for education was more significant when compared to the all-migrants from outside Karnataka to Karnataka. For example, in 2001, close to 27 percent migrated from the NE to Karnataka for education; however, about four percent of all-migrants from outside Karnataka to Karnataka migrated for the same reason.

Reason for Migration: NER to Bangalore

Migrants in pre and during the 1980s which was recorded in 1991 from the NER migrated to Bangalore mainly because of the family migration with a share of about 46 percent as presented in Table 10. Employment was the second largest reason for migration with a share of about 16 percent followed by the education with 15 percent, marriage with 11 percent and the rest for business and others. Similarly the migrants from the region to Bangalore in the 1990s that was registered in 2001 largely migrated along with the household or family migration with about 29 percent followed by migration for education with a similar share, employment with about 20 percent and so on. During 1991-2001, NE people migration for employment has increased. Their migration for education has shown a substantial increased by about 13 percentage points. As a consequences the share of migration for business, marriage and moved with household has declined. A similar trend prevails for both males and females. Noticeably, a considerable size of females has migrated for education in

the 1990s as compared to the pre and during the 1980s migrants. This situation is mesmerized with the inability to deliver a desirable education at the region. Males largely migrated for employment as well as education while females mostly migrated due to family migration and marriage. A disproportionately large share of males (for example about 30 percent in 2001) when compared to females (five percent in 2001) migrated for employment and a disproportionately small share of males (for example about 17 percent in 2001) when compared to females (46 percent in 2001) migrated due to family or household migration indicates that females are largely a dependent to males for their livelihood. Similarly, a large share of males migrated for employment whereas a large proportion of females migrated for marriage implies that females are unlikely to support their family.

Furthermore, NE migrants migrated to Bangalore for employment and business was not up to the extent of all-migrants from outside Karnataka migrated to Bangalore in 1991 as well as 2001. For example as large as 36 percent of all-migrants to Bangalore migrated for employment and business against 22 percent among the NE migrants for the same reason in 2001 which could be attributed by distance factor where close and adjacent states might have contributed considerably among the all-migrants. However, for education the NE people migrated considerably more than the all-migrants. For education unlike migrants from NE, the share of all-migrants migrated for it does not change at all in 2001 from the previous decade. In 2001, more than 28 percent of the migrants from NE migrated for education, against about four percent for all-migrants, indicating the prevalence of serious problem in the educational system in NE that relates to the law and order problem, strikes, etc.

NE people do not migrate as much as all-migrants for marriage likely due to differences in cultural practice. Migration along with their household is more prominent among the NE migrants than all-migrants. Migration for marriage and migration along with household are more apparent for females when compared to the males. Migration for marriage is insignificant for both the NE and all migrants for males. It is possible that considerable size of females migrated after their marriage to join their husband; specifically migrated for marriage; and joined in migration as a dependent to the main income earner of their family. The share of migration for other reason like natural calamities and not mentioned earlier grouped as others is larger for all than NE migrants to Bangalore can explain partly by location proximity.

These migrants mostly originated from urban areas in 1991 and 2001, as given in Table 11, indicating that urban people are more informative about the migration destination concerning the possible employment availability, educational system etc. NE migrants from urban areas were about 66 percent in 1991 which does not change even after a decade in 2001; whereas, for all-migrants the share of urban migrants gradually declines with an increase in the share of rural migrants from 31 to 37 percent during the same period. Similarly, majority of the migrants for employment, business, education, marriage etc were from urban areas. During 1991-2001, NE migrants migrated from rural areas has increased for employment from about 20 to 30 percent and for migrants migrated along with their household from 26 to 34 percent. The share of rural migrants for the rest reasons from NE to Bangalore have

declined. In case of all-migrants, migrants originated from rural areas for employment, business, marriage and family moved as a reason of migration have increased; while for education and others have declined. It suggests that rural people of NE are not mobile as the rural all-migrants perhaps explain by their economic background.⁴ It also indicates that affluent urban people have a higher tendency to migrate irrespective of the distance between origin and destination of migration.

Conclusion

Migration from NER to the rest of India in general and to Bangalore in particular is increasing over the years. Urban people from NER have a higher tendency to migrate to Bangalore. On the contrary, migration from the region to the rest of India is dominated by the rural migrants. Migration from the region to Karnataka is not very significant in comparison with all-migrants from outside Karnataka to the state. Less than two percent of the out-migrants from the region migrated to Karnataka. Migrants from the region are not choosing Karnataka as migration destination as before. An insignificant size of below one percent of migrants from outside Karnataka to Bangalore is from NER. Males greatly outnumbered the females for migration from the region to Bangalore as well as to Karnataka which is not the case for migrants from the region to the rest of India. Female migrants from the region are increasingly choosing other than Bangalore as their migration destination. However, males continue to prefer and choose Bangalore as one of their favorite migration destinations. There is an inconsistency in the level of out-migration from each states of the region; nevertheless, populated states have a greater tendency to out-migrate from their state. Migration from the region to the rest of India is largely for employment for males while for females the reason is mainly for marriage. NE people, particularly males, migrated to Karnataka in general and Bangalore in particular mainly for education and employment. Females migrated mostly due to family migration. Conversely, most of the migrants from outside Karnataka to Bangalore were for employment for males and marriage for females. Migration from NER to Bangalore for employment and education has increased while migration along with their family has declined recently. It depicts a lack of educational infrastructures and unemployment problems in the region. It calls forth to formulate and create adequate educational infrastructure, proper educational system and economic opportunities in the region. Nonetheless, migration from the region to the rest of India is to be encouraged to promote the national integrity.

Notes

1 Census of India 2011 has not released D3 Tables of D-Series migration data till date. NSS data on migration could not be incorporated due to the differences in coverage; for example census data is available for Bangalore UA whereas NSS does not provide unit level data for the same.

2 According to the census of India (2001) till 1961 census, migration data was presented with reference to POB only. The information on POB was being collected since 1872. In 1961 the scope of collecting information on migration was enlarged

by including the rural or urban status of the place of birth and duration of residence at the place of residence. Since 1971 Census, data are being collected on the basis of POLR in addition to question on birth place. In 1981 census, the scope of enquiry on migration has been further widened by collecting information on reason for migration from POLR in addition to the enquiry made in 1971 census. Thus a question on reason for migration was introduced for the first time in 1981. The pattern adopted in 1991 and 2001 Census remained the same as in 1981 except that in 2001 Census the rural urban status of POB was not collected. The reasons for migration includes employment, education, family moved (moved with households in 2001), marriage, and others in 1981; two category such as business and natural calamities like drought etc were included in 1991; however, the category natural calamities as one of the reasons for migration in 1991 was excluded and a new reason such as moved after birth was added in 2001. The “others” includes all other reasons for migration not covered by work/employment, business (1991 and 2001), education, family moved, marriage, natural calamities (1991) and moved after birth (2001). This includes cases like movement due to retirement, movement for economic reasons such as setting up of shops, starting of business, etc in 1981. However, since the census of 1991, “business” has been categorized as one separate reason for migration.

³ This figure seems to be overestimated when compared with the size and trend of census data. However, a recent study by the Centre for North East Studies and Policy Research, Jamia Millia Islamia, entitled as “Discrimination and Challenges before Women from North East India: Case Studies from four metros - New Delhi, Mumbai, Kolkata and Bengaluru” estimated migrants from NER to Delhi, Mumbai, Kolkata, Bangaluru, Hyderabad, Pune and Lucknow to be over 414850 (India Tomorrow News, 2014). [For](#) women migrants, the study concluded that Delhi is the most unsafe place (81% responded they were harassed or discriminated) followed by Bangalore (60%) and Kolkata; and Mumbai the safest city.

⁴ In Bangalore, unlike in Delhi where one month rent is given in advance, tenants deposit rent for 10 months in advance as security of house on leased to the house owner which is a disincentive for modest economic background rural people. It might have led to choose other than Bangalore as a destination for migrants particularly originated from rural areas from NE.

References

- Banati, N. (2015). In Search of Diverse Prospects of Existence in a New Conurbation. *Journal of North East India Studies*, 5(2), 67-81.
- Bhagat, Ram B., 2005, Conceptual Issues in Measurement of Internal Migration in India. Paper presented at the XXVth IUSSP International Conference, Tours, France.
- Chandra, Madhu, 2011, North East Migration and Challenges in Mega Cities. Available at <http://nehelpline.net/?p=490>, accessed on 22 June 2012.
- Cote, Guy L., 1997, Socio-economic Attainment, Regional Disparities, and Internal Migration. *European Sociological Review*, 13(1):55-77.

- Dimova, Ralitzka and Francois Charles Wolff, 2009, Remittances and Chain Migration: Longitudinal Evidence from Bosnia and Herzegovina. Discussion Paper No. 4083, Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA), Bonn.
- Faggian, Alessandra and Philip McCann, 2006, Human Capital Flows and Regional Knowledge Assets: A Simultaneous Equation Approach. *Oxford Economic Paper*, 52:475-500.
- Gooptu, Biswarup and Devina Sengupta, 2012, North East Exodus: Bangalore businesses facing the impact. 17 August. *The Economic Times*. Available at <http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/politics-and-nation/north-east-exodus-bangalore-businesses-facing-the-impact/articleshow/15525819.cms>, accessed on 17 September 2014.
- Greenwood, M. J., 1973, The Influence of Family and Friends on Geographic Labor Mobility in a Less Developed Country: the Case of India. *Review of Regional Studies*, in Levy, Mildred B. and Wadycki, Walter J., 1973, The Influence of Family and Friends on Geographic Labor Mobility: An International Comparison. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 55(2):198-203.
- India Tomorrow News, 2014, 81% of North East women harassed in Delhi: Survey. 24 January. *India Tomorrow*. Available at <http://www.indiatomorrow.net/eng/81-of-north-east-women-harassed-in-delhi-survey>, accessed on 24 September 2014.
- Kundu, Amitabh, 2007, Mobility of Population. In: Kaushik Basu (ed.), *The Oxford Companion to Economics in India*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi.
- Levy, Mildred B. and Walter J. Wadycki, 1973, The Influence of Family and Friends on Geographic Labor Mobility: An International Comparison. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 55(2):198-203.
- MacDonald, John S. and Leatrice D. MacDonald, 1964, Chain Migration Ethnic Neighborhood Formation and Social Networks. *The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly*, 42(1): 82-97.
- Marchang, Reimeingam, 2008, Educated Unemployed Youth and Migration from North Eastern Region: A Case Study of Migrants from Ukhrul District to Delhi. Thesis Unpublished, JNU, Delhi.
- Marchang, Reimeingam, 2011, Unemployment, Job Aspiration and Migration: A Case Study of Tangkhul Migrants to Delhi. *Eastern Quarterly*, 7(3&4):128-139.
- Mukherji, Shekhar, 2001, Low Quality Migration in India: The Phenomena of Distressed Migration and Acute Urban Decay. Paper presented at the 24th IUSSP International Conference on 'Internal Migration – Social Processes and National Patterns, Salvador, Brazil.
- Remesh, Babu P., 2012, Migration from North-East to Urban Centres: A Study of Delhi Region. NLI Research Studies Series No. 094/2012, V.V. Giri National Labour Institute, Noida.
- Sachdeva, Gulshan, 2005, Preparing the Northeastern Economy for the Future. *Eastern Quarterly*, 3(3).

- Santhapparaj, A. Solucis, 1996, Job Search and Earnings of Migrants in Urban Labour Market: A Study of Madurai Metropolis. *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 39(2):269- 286.
- Sebastian, A., 1989, Youth Migrants for Employment in India. In: P.S. Nair et al. (eds), *Indian Youth: A Profile*, Mittal Publications, Delhi.
- Skeldon, Ronald, 1986, On Migration Patterns in India during the 1970s. *Population and Development Review*, 12(4):759-779.
- Todaro, Michael P., 1969, A Model of Labor Migration and Urban Unemployment in Less Developed Countries. *The American Economic Review*, 59(1):138-148.
- Usha, Devi M.D. and U.A. Shimray, 2010, Migration from the North Eastern Region: A Study of Educated Youth from NER in Bangalore and Delhi. Bangalore, ISEC.
- Visaria, Pravin, 1980, The Level and Pattern of Economic Activity by Migration Status in India. *Demography India*, 9(1&2):1-14.

Tables

Table 1: Share (%) of migrants from NER to ROI

Migration stream	1991			2001		
	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female
T-R	2.0	2.5	1.8	3.2	2.2	3.7
R-R	1.8	2.3	1.7	3.3	1.9	3.9
U-R	2.1	2.5	1.9	2.2	2.3	2.1
T-U	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.3
R-U	1.0	0.9	1.1	0.9	0.8	1.1
U-U	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.6	1.6	1.6
T-T	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.9	1.3	2.3
R-T	1.4	1.3	1.4	1.9	1.0	2.6
U-T	1.5	1.6	1.4	1.7	1.7	1.7

Notes: T – total, R – rural and U – urban. ROI figures include migrants from NER; however, the total states exclude NER. ROI in 1991 excludes J&K and eight NE states of India; and in 2001 all eight NE states are excluded.

Source: Author's calculation based on Census of India (1991; 2001).

Table 2: Rural-urban distribution (%) of migrants from NER to Bangalore, Karnataka and ROI

Course of migration	LR	PE	1991			2001			Sex Ratio [#]	
			Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female	1991	2001
NER to Bangalore	T	UA	<i>0.004</i>	<i>0.002</i>	<i>0.002</i>	<i>0.006</i>	<i>0.004</i>	<i>0.003</i>	989	685
	R	UA	27.8	24.2	31.4	27.4	27.5	27.2	--	--
	U	UA	66.1	67.4	64.9	66.3	66.0	66.6	--	--
NER to Karnataka	T	T	<i>0.011</i>	<i>0.005</i>	<i>0.006</i>	<i>0.012</i>	<i>0.008</i>	<i>0.005</i>	1232	625
	R	T	45.2	33.7	54.5	37.7	38.4	36.6	--	--
	U	T	49.7	59.3	42.0	55.5	55.1	56.3	--	--
Outside Karnataka* to Karnataka	T	T	<i>1.6</i>	<i>0.7</i>	<i>0.9</i>	<i>2.1</i>	<i>0.9</i>	<i>1.1</i>	1308	1195
	R	T	51.5	45.8	56.0	52.6	47.9	56.6	--	--
	U	T	46.7	52.2	42.5	41.0	45.3	37.4	--	--
NER to ROI	T	T	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.8</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.5</i>	1259	2042
	R	T	56.6	51.9	60.4	65.0	48.8	73.0	--	--
	U	T	39.4	43.7	36.0	27.4	39.6	21.4	--	--
NER population	T		<i>32.0</i>	<i>16.6</i>	<i>15.4</i>	<i>38.9</i>	<i>20.1</i>	<i>18.8</i>	925	937
	R		86.2	85.8	86.6	84.3	84.0	84.7	--	--
	U		13.8	14.3	13.4	15.7	16.0	15.3	--	--

Notes: T – total, R – rural, U – urban, UA – urban agglomeration, LR – last residence and PE – place of enumeration. Italic figures are in numbers in million. Migrant figures (%) may not sum up to 100 due to the exclusion of unclassifiable migrants in rural or urban. ROI includes all states of India excepting J&K and eight NE states in 1991 and eight NE states in 2001. *States in India beyond the state (Karnataka) of enumeration. # Number of females per 1000 males.

Source: Same as Table 1.

Table 3: Migrants from NER to Karnataka as percentage to outside Karnataka to Karnataka

Migration stream	1991			2001		
	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female
T-R	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.5	1.0	0.3
R-R	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.4	0.8	0.2
U-R	1.0	1.3	0.8	1.0	1.4	0.6
T-U	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.7	0.5
R-U	0.6	0.5	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.4
U-U	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.8	0.9	0.6
T-T	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.8	0.4
R-T	0.6	0.5	0.7	0.4	0.6	0.3
U-T	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.8	1.0	0.6

Notes: T – total, R – rural and U – urban. Outside Karnataka – States in India beyond the state (Karnataka) of enumeration.

Source: Same as Table 1.

Table 4: Migrants from NER to Karnataka as percentage to NER to ROI

Migration stream	1991			2001		
	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female
T-R	2.8	2.9	2.7	0.9	2.8	0.4
R-R	2.4	2.0	2.5	0.6	2.7	0.3
U-R	4.1	4.9	3.5	3.1	4.6	1.9
T-U	3.1	3.1	3.2	2.6	3.2	2.0
R-U	2.4	1.9	2.8	1.8	2.1	1.4
U-U	3.6	3.8	3.4	3.3	4.2	2.6
T-T	3.0	3.0	2.9	1.6	3.0	0.9
R-T	2.4	1.9	2.6	0.9	2.4	0.5
U-T	3.7	4.0	3.4	3.3	4.2	2.5

Notes: T – total, R – rural and U – urban. ROI includes all states of India excepting J&K and eight NE states in 1991 and eight NE states in 2001.

Source: Same as Table 1.

Table 5: Migrants from NER to Bangalore as percentage to all-migrants from outside Karnataka to Bangalore

Last residence		1991			2001		
		Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female
NER	Total	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.7
	Rural	0.7	0.6	0.8	0.6	0.6	0.6
	Urban	0.8	0.8	0.8	1.0	1.1	0.9
Outside Karnataka to Bangalore* (Nos. in million)	Total	0.49	0.25	0.23	0.81	0.45	0.36
	Rural	0.15	0.08	0.07	0.30	0.17	0.13
	Urban	0.32	0.16	0.16	0.44	0.24	0.20

Note: *States in India beyond the state (Bangalore) of enumeration.

Source: Same as Table 1.

Table 6: Migrants from NE states as percentage to NER in Bangalore/ROI

Last residence	NE states to Bangalore % NER to Bangalore						NE states to ROI % NER to ROI					
	1991			2001			1991			2001		
	P	M	F	P	M	F	P	M	F	P	M	F
Ar. P	9.3	9.5	9.0	3.9	3.9	3.8	7.3	7.0	7.7	1.7	2.5	1.4
Assam	40.7	34.7	46.8	57.9	58.4	57.1	53.0	55.8	50.8	67.5	67.9	67.4
Manipur	6.1	6.3	5.9	13.1	13.1	13.1	6.0	5.3	6.5	3.1	4.8	2.3
Meghalaya	7.7	10.5	4.8	8.1	7.2	9.5	5.2	4.8	5.4	2.9	4.2	2.2
Mizoram	5.3	5.3	5.3	3.0	2.6	3.5	5.8	6.0	5.7	0.7	1.2	0.5
Nagaland	3.7	3.7	3.7	5.4	5.5	5.4	3.2	3.0	3.4	18.8	11.4	22.5
Sikkim	22.5	25.3	19.7	3.6	3.4	3.9	9.0	8.1	9.8	1.7	2.4	1.4
Tripura	4.8	4.7	4.8	5.1	6.0	3.8	10.5	10.0	10.8	3.5	5.7	2.5
NER (Nos. in million)	0.004	0.002	0.002	0.006	0.004	0.003	0.379	0.168	0.212	0.754	0.248	0.506

Note: P – person, M – male and F – female.

Source: Same as Table 1.

Table 7: Migrants from NER to Bangalore, Karnataka and ROI as percentage to total migrants from NER in Karnataka, ROI and NER population

Particulars	1991			2001		
	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female
NER to Bangalore % NER to Karnataka	33.8	37.9	30.5	52.5	50.6	55.4
NER to Karnataka % Outside Karnataka* to Karnataka	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.8	0.4
NER to Bangalore % NER to ROI	1.0	1.1	0.9	0.9	1.5	0.5
NER to Karnataka % NER to ROI	3.0	3.0	2.9	1.6	3.0	0.9
NER to ROI % NER population	1.2	1.0	1.4	1.9	1.2	2.7
NER population (Nos. in million)	32.0	16.6	15.4	38.9	20.1	18.8

Notes: ROI includes all states of India excepting J&K and eight NE states in 1991 and eight NE states in 2001. *States in India beyond the state (Karnataka) of enumeration.

Source: Same as Table 1.

Table 8: Share (%) of reason for migration for migrants from NER to the ROI

Reason	1991			2001		
	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female
Work/employment	13.3	25.8	3.4	11.4	31.0	1.8
Business	3.3	5.6	1.4	1.1	3.0	0.2
Education	4.6	7.3	2.4	2.9	6.5	1.2
Marriage	29.2	2.5	50.4	44.5	1.4	65.6
Moved after birth	--	--	--	1.2	2.1	0.7
Moved with household	30.5	32.5	28.9	22.5	28.6	19.6
Others	19.2	26.4	13.5	16.4	27.5	10.9
All (Nos. in million)	0.38	0.17	0.21	0.75	0.25	0.51

Note: ROI includes all states of India excepting J&K and eight NE states in 1991 and eight NE states in 2001.

Source: Same as Table 1.

Table 9: Share (%) of reason for migration for migrants from NER/ states in India beyond Karnataka to Karnataka

Reason	NER to Karnataka						Outside Karnataka [#] to Karnataka					
	1991			2001			1991			2001		
	P	M	F	P	M	F	P	M	F	P	M	F
Work/employment	13.2	23.0	5.4	17.4	25.3	4.7	18.8	37.2	4.7	23.6	44.8	5.9
Business	3.1	2.4	3.7	1.6	2.2	0.6	3.5	6.9	0.8	2.7	5.2	0.5
Education	12.0	18.8	6.5	26.6	32.2	17.5	3.7	6.6	1.6	3.6	5.5	2.1
Marriage	20.8	1.8	36.1	5.1	0.4	12.5	32.0	1.7	55.1	28.8	1.5	51.7
Moved after birth	--	--	--	2.1	1.9	2.4	--	--	--	7.0	8.9	5.4
Moved with household	29.1	26.6	31.1	23.8	14.5	38.8	23.8	24.0	23.7	18.5	15.8	20.7
Others	21.8	27.5	17.2	23.5	23.5	23.5	18.2	23.5	14.1	15.9	18.2	13.9
All (Nos. in million)	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	1.60	0.69	0.91	2.07	0.95	1.13

Notes: [#] States in India beyond the state (Karnataka) of enumeration. P – person, M – male and F – female.

Source: Same as Table 1.

Table 10: Share (%) of reason for migration of migrants from NER/outside Karnataka to Bangalore

Reason	NER to Bangalore						Outside Karnataka [#] to Bangalore					
	Person		Male		Female		Person		Male		Female	
	1991	2001	1991	2001	1991	2001	1991	2001	1991	2001	1991	2001
Work/ Employment	16.1	19.9	28.4	29.9	3.7	5.2	29.1	32.5	49.8	52.3	6.6	8.0
Business	2.4	2.1	3.2	3.1	1.6	0.7	4.1	3.3	7.1	5.4	0.9	0.8
Education	15.1	28.5	22.6	32.8	7.5	22.2	4.0	4.0	5.9	5.4	1.9	2.3
Marriage	11.1	4.3	1.6	0.2	20.7	10.3	19.9	17.3	1.0	1.0	40.5	37.4
Moved after birth	--	1.8	--	1.6	--	2.1	--	4.9	--	4.8	--	4.9
Moved with household	45.8	28.9	35.3	17.0	56.4	46.3	29.6	21.1	22.9	14.7	36.9	28.9
Others	9.5	14.6	9.0	15.5	10.1	13.2	13.3	17.0	13.4	16.5	13.2	17.8
All (Nos. in million)	0.004	0.006	0.002	0.004	0.002	0.003	0.488	0.809	0.255	0.446	0.234	0.362

Note: [#]States in India beyond the state (Bangalore) of enumeration.

Source: Same as Table 1.

Table 11: Rural-urban distribution (%) of migrants by reason from NER/outside Karnataka to Bangalore

Course of migration	Year	LR	Total migrants	Work/employment	Business	Education	Marriage	Moved after birth	Moved with household	Others
NER to Bangalore	1991	T*	3780	610	90	570	420	--	1730	360
		R	27.8	19.7	44.4	31.6	38.1	--	26.0	27.8
		U	66.1	70.5	55.6	59.7	54.8	--	69.4	69.4
	2001	T*	6429	1278	135	1833	275	115	1857	936
		R	27.4	29.6	19.3	21.8	28.0	31.3	33.7	23.2
		U	66.3	67.7	77.0	75.3	70.6	64.4	64.6	47.1
Outside Karnataka [#] to Bangalore	1991	T^	0.49	0.14	0.02	0.02	0.10	--	0.14	0.06
		R	31.4	35.4	32.2	24.9	31.8	--	29.3	28.2
		U	65.2	61.1	63.9	71.9	65.1	--	68.0	66.9
	2001	T^	0.81	0.26	0.03	0.03	0.14	0.04	0.17	0.14
		R	37.3	45.6	36.1	24.3	40.0	32.6	35.5	25.6
		U	55.0	52.3	61.3	73.3	56.9	61.5	61.0	43.3

Notes: Figures (%) may not sum up to 100 due to the exclusion of unclassifiable migrants in rural or urban. [#]States in India beyond the state (Bangalore) of enumeration. LR – last residence, T – total, R – rural and U – urban. *Numbers. ^ Numbers in million.

Source: Same as Table 1.