

Socioeconomic Conditions of Migrants and Non-Migrants in Haryana

Manvi Khurana¹
Jatinder S. Bedi²

Abstract

Purpose : Internal migration is considered an essential factor that significantly affects the origin and destination areas in varying degrees depending upon the employment situation in the destination region and the characteristics of migrants themselves. Haryana has the highest per-capita income among the major states in India and witnessed increased mobility over the years due to its advanced agricultural base, highly developed industrial sector, and proximity to the National Capital Region. Therefore, the present study examined the socioeconomic conditions of migrants and non-migrants in Haryana.

Methodology : The study is based on secondary as well as primary data. The survey was conducted in four districts randomly selected in the state. A total of 509 households were surveyed from June 2021–February 2022. A detailed questionnaire was used to collect information about the socioeconomic conditions of the migrants and non-migrants. The collected data were analyzed using appropriate statistical techniques.

Findings : The results suggested that most migrants were male heads of households who moved for work/employment to provide better living conditions. There were wide variations among inter-state and intra-state migrants. The level of education was significantly lower among inter-state migrants compared to non-migrants and intra-state migrants. Most inter-state migrants' heads of households were illiterate or literate up to the middle, employed as daily wage casual laborers working in the informal sector, and living in precarious conditions. Such workers generally suffered from low earnings, lack of stability, and durability of employment. The average monthly household income and expenditure of the inter-state migrant household were lower than that of the non-migrants. The reason for low per capita household consumption among inter-state migrant families was that some portion of their relatively low income was also repatriated to the point of origin.

Practical Implications : The findings highlighted that inter-state migration plays an important role in developing the state's economy by providing cheap and flexible labor ready to take up any work.

Originality : This is the only study that attempted to examine the socioeconomic conditions of migrants in various districts of Haryana and their comparison with non-migrants.

Keywords : intra-state migration, inter-state migration, socioeconomic conditions, employment, Haryana

JEL Classification Codes : J23, J46, O15, R23

Paper Submission Date : February 15, 2023 ; **Paper sent back for Revision:** February 20, 2023 ; **Paper Acceptance Date :** February 25, 2023

Migration in India is not new and has occurred for various reasons, such as work, employment, business, marriage, education, etc. There are many economic and non-economic factors behind the decision to migrate. Migrants can be “pushed” out of their homes due to worsening economic conditions or

¹ *Research Scholar*, The Institute for Development and Communication (IDC), Approved Research Centre of Panjab University, Chandigarh - 160 015. (Email : manvik547@gmail.com)

² *Professor of Economics*, The Institute for Development and Communication (IDC), Chandigarh - 160 015. (Email : jsbedi1964@gmail.com)

political unrest or “pulled” into destination areas that offer high wages, good healthcare systems, and strong educational systems (Lee, 1966 ; Simpson, 2022). Individuals compare the net benefits to the migration costs in making their decision.

In India, skilled and unskilled laborers migrate from underdeveloped regions to more prosperous areas for higher remuneration. Haryana has also witnessed increased mobility over the years due to its advanced agricultural base, highly-developed industrial sector, and proximity to National Capital Region. Thus, internal migration is considered an essential factor that significantly affects the origin and destination areas in varying degrees depending upon the relative employment situation at the source and destination areas and the characteristics of migrants. This study focuses on such aspects, emphasizing inter-state migrants in Haryana.

Review of Literature

Internal migration in India has been a significant phenomenon for decades, with millions searching for better employment opportunities. Srivastava (2012) studied an increase in inter-state movement during 1999–2000 and 2007–08, with the higher gross in-migration to higher-income states, such as Haryana, Punjab, etc., stating female predominance mainly due to marriage, a relatively larger share of male migrants in the urban areas and with the increase in distance primarily for economic reasons. Mehra and Singh (2013) also found that economic reasons and social networks are the primary factors responsible for migration to Ludhiana. Malhotra and Devi (2018) conducted a study on the factors influencing internal migration in Ludhiana based on a survey of 250 migrants working in the urban informal sector. The study found that both push and pull factors play a significant role in internal labor migration. Bhagat (2018), in his paper, said that the destination areas benefit due to urban agglomerations, productivity rise, increasing production and consumption, labor market alterations, and innovations. In addition, domestic remittance inflows from migrant workers’ earnings are an important source of income for their households, leading to reduced poverty (Srivastava & Pandey, 2017). But male out-migration for better employment opportunities can affect children’s education (Agasty, 2016) and the health of their wives who are left behind (Lei & Desai, 2021).

Research Gap

Recent studies have shed light on the patterns, causes, and consequences of internal migration in India. Very few studies have attempted to study the socioeconomic conditions of migrants in various districts of Haryana and their comparison with non-migrants.

Objectives and Methodology

Objective

To examine the socioeconomic conditions of migrants and non-migrants in Haryana.

Methodology

Secondary and primary data sources were used for this study. The latest data from the decennial Population Census, 2011, on migration, estimated based on the last residence criteria, was used. In addition, National Account Data-MoSPI, Statistical Abstract of Haryana, etc., were used. Apart from these secondary sources, a primary survey in four districts (Panipat, Panchkula, Rewari, and Sirsa) of Haryana was undertaken based on a stratified multistage systematic random sampling technique. In the first stage, the districts were listed in

descending order according to the per-capita income level as per 2011 data, the latest year for which this district-wise data was available. Further, the districts were grouped into two categories. The first category includes the top four having high per-capita income and inter-state migration for work/employment/business purposes.

The second category had 10 districts having a medium level of inter-state migration shares for work/employment/business purposes in the respective districts' total population. From each of these categories, two were selected randomly. The other characteristics of these were also observed. From each district, four blocks and four villages were selected. From each village/block, 16 households were chosen from three strata in such a way as to include eight from inter-state migrants' strata randomly, two from within the state migrants from across various districts, and six from non-migrant households. These strata were prepared to have sufficient points for migrants and non-migrants in the sample from the listing done in each area. A total of 509 households were surveyed from June 2021–February 2022. A detailed questionnaire was used to collect information about the socioeconomic conditions of the migrants and non-migrants. Collected data were analyzed using appropriate statistical techniques.

Migration in Haryana

The data from Table 1 shows that according to Population Census, 2011, in Haryana, out of the total 25.4 million population, 41.8% are migrants, while in the previous 2001 Census, the share of migrants in the total population was around 35.8%. The growth rate of total migrants also exceeds the growth rate of the population in Haryana. The state's in-migration has been influenced by several factors, including the growth of the agricultural sector, the acceleration of industrial activity, the expansion of the household sector, and the improvement in transportation networks (Deswal, 2004).

The latest estimates of population census data on migration suggest that lifetime migrants increased to 10.6 million in 2011 from 7.6 million in 2001 and 5.2 million in 1991 in Haryana. Haryana has witnessed an increase in mobility at the intra-state and inter-state levels. Of the total migrant's share of 41.8%, 26.8% are intra-state migrants (intra-district and inter-district), 14.3% of inter-state migrants, and merely 0.6% are inflow of migrants

Table 1. Classification of Migrants (All Durations of Residence) in Haryana: 1991–2011

Different Types of Migration by Place of the Last Residence	Migrants in Haryana (in Millions)					Gr Rt % p.a	Share (%) in Total Migrants (2011)	Migrants' Share in the Total Population(%)			Female Share in Total (%)		
	1991	2001	2011	1991–2001	2001–2011			1991	2001	2011	1991	2001	2011
Intra-State	3.3	4.7	6.8	3.5	3.8	64.2		20.2	22.2	26.8	83.1	80.4	74.7
Intra-district	1.7	2.3	3.6	3.2	4.4	33.8		10.3	11.0	14.1	81.9	78.2	68.2
Inter-district	1.6	2.4	3.2	3.8	3.1	30.4		10.0	11.2	12.7	84.3	82.5	81.8
Inter-state	1.6	2.7	3.6	5.4	3.1	34.3		9.6	12.7	14.3	65.9	59.9	61.6
Last Residence outside India	0.3	0.2	0.2	–2.1	–2.4	1.5		1.5	1.0	0.6	49.3	45.8	49.2
Total Migrants*	5.2	7.6	10.6	3.9	3.4	100.0		31.4	35.8	41.8	76.2	72.2	69.8
Total Population	16.5	21.1	25.4	2.5	1.8			100	100	100	46.4	46.3	46.8

Note. *The place of last residence unclassifiable is included in 'Total Migrants.'

Source: Population Census, 1991, 2001, and 2011. Authors' calculations.

Table 2. Share of Migrants in Total Population in Haryana by Duration of Residence: 2011

Different Types of Migration by Place of the Last Residence	Duration of Residence (% Share in the Total Population)				
	All	< 1 year	1–4 years	5–9 Years	Ten years & above
Intra-state	26.8	0.8	3.5	3.6	15.6
Intra-district	14.1	0.4	1.8	1.9	7.5
Inter-district	12.7	0.4	1.7	1.8	8.1
Inter-state	14.3	1.2	2.7	2.3	7.0
Last residence outside India	0.6	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.4
Total migrants*	41.8	2.1	6.2	6.0	23.0
Total population (millions)	25.4				

Note. 'All durations of residence' includes 'unspecified duration.'* The place of last residence unclassifiable is included in 'Total Migrants.'

Source : Population Census of India, 2011.

from abroad. Intra-state migration accounted for 64.2% of total migrants, while inter-state migrants accounted for 34.3% (Table 1). Females' share in inter-state migration was 65.9% in 1991, which declined to 61.6% by 2011.

Duration of stay varies among migrants; 23.0% of the total migrants in the population stated their period of residence as ten years and above in Haryana (Table 2). For intra-state and inter-state migrants in the population, 15.6% and 7.0%, respectively, stated their duration of residence at the present place of enumeration as 10 years and above.

Table 3. The Proportion of Lifetime In-Migrants in Haryana by Reason for Migration: 2011

Different Types of Migration by Place of the Last Residence	% Share in Total Migrants	Reason for Migration (% Share)							Total
		Work/ Employment	Business	Education	Marriage	Moved after birth	Moved with household	Others	
Total									
Intra-state	64.2	7.7	0.4	0.7	58.0	4.0	15.3	13.8	100.0
Intra-district	33.8	7.6	0.4	0.7	48.8	5.9	16.9	19.7	100.0
Inter-district	30.4	7.9	0.4	0.8	68.2	2.0	13.5	7.3	100.0
Inter-state	34.3	21.6	0.6	0.6	36.1	3.1	28.2	9.9	100.0
Last residence outside India	1.5	14.6	0.7	0.3	12.9	1.3	36.6	33.6	100.0
Total migrants* (In 000s)	100.0 (10,585)	12.6	0.4	0.7	49.8	3.7	20.1	12.8	100.0
Males									
Intra-state	53.9	26.1	0.9	1.7	3.6	9.6	28.4	29.7	100.0
Intra-district	35.6	20.8	0.8	1.3	2.5	11.1	26.6	37.0	100.0
Inter-district	18.3	36.5	1.2	2.4	5.8	6.7	31.8	15.6	100.0
Inter-state	43.6	48.7	1.1	0.9	1.7	4.9	29.5	13.3	100.0
Last residence outside India	2.5	24.6	0.9	0.4	0.8	1.6	33.5	38.3	100.0
Total migrants* (In 000s)	100.0 (3,196)	35.9	1.0	1.3	2.7	7.3	29.0	22.8	100.0

				Females					
Intra-state	68.7	1.5	0.2	0.4	76.4	2.1	10.9	8.5	100.0
Intra-district	33.0	1.5	0.2	0.4	70.4	3.5	12.5	11.7	100.0
Inter-district	35.7	1.5	0.2	0.5	82.0	0.9	9.4	5.5	100.0
Inter-state	30.2	4.7	0.3	0.4	57.5	2.0	27.5	7.7	100.0
Last residence outside India	1.1	4.3	0.5	0.2	25.3	1.0	39.8	28.9	100.0
Total migrants*	100.0	2.5	0.2	0.4	70.2	2.1	16.2	8.4	100.0
(In 000s)	(7,390)								

Note. 'All durations of residence' includes unspecified duration. *The place of last residence unclassifiable is included in 'Total Migrants.'

Source : Population Census of India, 2011.

Table 4. Distribution of Lifetime Internal Migrants by Migration Streams (2011): Haryana

Migration Streams	Intra-state			Inter-state		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Rural to Rural	51.6	18.3	62.9	30.8	18.4	38.6
Rural to Urban	20.0	34.1	15.2	30.5	40.5	24.2
Urban to Rural	4.5	5.2	4.2	4.2	3.0	5.0
Urban to Urban	15.0	25.4	11.5	29.8	33.1	27.7
Unclassified	8.9	17.0	6.2	4.7	5.0	4.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(in 000s)	(6,798)	(1,722)	(5,076)	(3,626)	(1,392)	(2,234)

Note. The place of the last residence unclassifiable as 'Rural' or 'Urban' is included in 'Total.' Figures in parentheses are in %.

Source : Population Census of India, 2011.

It is important to mention that the reasons for migration vary significantly between males and females. Table 3 depicts that migration among females is essentially marriage migration (70.2%), whereas migration among males is mainly for work/employment (35.9%). The second most important reason for migration among males (29.0%) and females (16.2%) is moved with the household. Among inter-state migrants, 48.7% of males and 4.7% of females migrate for work-employment in Haryana.

The primary focus of the study is on internal migration (intra-state and inter-state). So, the migration streams among intra-state and inter-state migrants are presented in Table 4. The rural-to-rural migration stream constituted almost half (51.6%) of the intra-state migrants, compared to less than one-third (30.8%) of the inter-state migrants. At the same time, the rural-to-urban migration stream accounted for 20.0% and 30.5% of intra-state and inter-state migrants, respectively. Among males, the rural-to-urban migration stream dominates, compared to rural-to-rural among females, both for intra-state and inter-state migrants. Livelihood strategies of migrants from rural areas have increasingly relied on seasonal and circular migration for employment. They travel seasonally from rural areas to work in cities, farms, or industries yearly. India's factories, farms, and construction sites could not function without them. They often work in low-paying, hazardous conditions with little social security or employee safety (Venkataramakrishnan, 2020).

Migrants, usually leaving their native places in search of work/employment or better prospects in urban areas, form a major part of the workforce. Also, as per Population Census 2011, Haryana has the highest share among the

18 major Indian states¹ in terms of lifetime inter-state migrants moving for work/employment/business, accounting for 3.2% of the state's population, followed by Uttarakhand (3.0%), Maharashtra (2.6%) and Punjab (2.2%). Major migrant-sending states to Haryana are Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Rajasthan, Punjab, and Delhi. The Population Census data on migration shows that Faridabad, Gurgaon, and Panipat receive 52.3% of the inter-state migrants for work/employment/business purposes. Females dominate the migration in India and the state of Haryana largely for social and cultural reasons; however, males move for economic reasons. However, this does not present an accurate picture. There are various reasons why women who migrate for marriage may end up working. Some women may be interested in pursuing their education or career after marriage, leading them to seek employment in their new location. Therefore, it is important to acknowledge that the number of migrant women who work after marriage could be much higher than estimated.

However, the Census fails to provide detailed information related to the socioeconomic characteristics of the migrants. For this, a primary survey was conducted to study this in detail, and the classification of the migrants is based on the last residence of the head of the household. Therefore, it is taken as the same for all the members of the same household.

Analysis and Results

The study analyzes the profile of sample migrant households in Haryana and the socioeconomic characteristics of migrants and non-migrants, including their education/skill levels, types of jobs, earnings, etc.

Profile of Sample Migrant Households in Haryana

Migration of head of households by last residence in rural and urban areas is dominated by the migration of households from the rural areas (Table 5). Nearly 42.9% of urban migrants (rural-urban) and 39.2% of rural migrant (rural-rural) heads of households migrated from rural areas. Additionally, 13.2% and 4.6% of the migrant head of households moved from urban-to-urban areas and urban-to-rural areas, respectively.

People and families migrate from rural areas because there is no viable way to escape poverty in their region of origin, and migration is a part of the development process. With the structural transformation of economies and the decline of the agricultural sector, people will inevitably need to move to better employment opportunities

Table 5. Share (%) of Migrants' Head of Households Classified by Last Residence

Place of Enumeration	Within District: Rural	Within District: Urban	Same State but another District: Rural	Same State but another District: Urban	Another state: Rural	Another state: Urban	Total
	Last Residence						
Rural	2.0	0.3	1.7	0.7	35.6	3.6	43.9
Urban	10.6	3.6	1.3	2.0	31.0	7.6	56.1
Total (%)	12.5	4.0	3.0	2.6	66.7	11.2	100.0
(No.)	(38)	(12)	(9)	(8)	(202)	(34)	(303)

Source : Derived using Primary Survey.

¹ Eighteen major Indian states: Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Odisha, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand, West Bengal.

Table 6. Last Residence of Head of Household

State of Last Residence	Freq.	%
Haryana	70	23.1
Uttar Pradesh	77	25.4
Bihar	50	16.5
Madhya Pradesh	24	7.9
Rajasthan	23	7.6
Punjab	22	7.3
Other States/UTs	37	12.2
Total	303	100.0

Source : Derived using Primary Survey.

Table 7. Reason for Migration of Head of Household

Reason for Migration of Head of Household	Sample Migrant Households		
	Inter-state	Intra-state	Total
Work/Employment	97.0	38.8	84.2
Business	0.4	0	0.3
For Children's Future	0.4	3	1.0
Moved with Household	1.3	3	1.7
Better Living Conditions	0.8	55.2	12.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
(No.)	(236)	(67)	(303)

Source : Derived using Primary Survey.

within and across regions. Migration should be a choice and not a necessity. As a result of socioeconomic factors, including poverty, food insecurity, unemployment, limited social protection, environmental degradation, and climate change, many are forced to move (“Food and Agriculture Organization,” 2016).

Table 6 shows that 25.4% of migrant heads of households are from Uttar Pradesh, followed by Bihar (16.5%), and 23.1% moved within the state, according to place of last residence. The results depict that migration is an important coping strategy, especially for the inter-state migrants migrating from backward rural areas of other states.

Migration has occurred for various reasons, such as work, employment, business, marriage, education, etc. Thus, apart from a better livelihood, people move out of their houses searching for work/employment because of various social, economic, and political factors. However, the reason for migration may vary depending on the

Table 8. Duration of Stay of Head of Household

Duration of Residence	Sample Migrant Households		
	Inter-state	Intra-state	Total
Less than one year	12.7	0.0	9.9
1–4 Years	19.5	14.9	18.5
5–9 Years	17.8	23.9	19.1

10–20 Years	39.4	40.3	39.6
21 Years & above	10.6	20.9	12.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
(No.)	(236)	(67)	(303)

Source : Derived using Primary Survey.

education and skills of the migrants. Most of the migrant's head of household migrated for work/employment (84.2%), followed by better living conditions (12.9%), with wide variations among inter-state and intra-state migrants. Most inter-state migrants moved for work/employment (97.0%), while 55.2% of intra-state migrants moved for better living conditions (Table 7).

Table 8 shows that nearly half of the sample migrant heads of household have been staying at the place of enumeration for ten years or more. Among inter-state migrant heads of household, 12.7% of them stated their duration of stay as less than a year, while among the intra-state migrant head of households, 61.2% stated their period of stay as 10 years and above.

Socioeconomic Characteristics of Migrant and Non-Migrant Households

Studying some of the basic characteristics of migrants are important to analyze the determinants and consequences of migration and how they differ from non-migrants. Therefore, this section presents the socioeconomic profile of the migrants and non-migrants based on the field survey regarding their social group, age, education levels, employment status, income, and consumption.

Table 9. Household Size among Sample Households for Migrants and Non-Migrants in Haryana

No. of Members	Sample Migrant Households			Sample Non-Migrant Households	Total Sample Households
	Inter-state	Intra-state	Total		
(%)					
1	28.4	4.5	23.1	0.5	14.0
2	8.9	9.0	8.9	3.9	6.9
3	7.6	29.9	12.5	14.6	13.4
4	17.8	17.9	17.8	34.0	24.4
5	18.2	20.9	18.8	22.8	20.4
6	13.1	11.9	12.9	13.1	13.0
7	4.7	3.0	4.3	3.9	4.1
8	0.4	1.5	0.7	2.4	1.4
9	–	1.5	0.3	2.4	1.2
10	–	–	–	1.9	0.8
12	0.9	–	0.7	–	0.4
15	–	–	–	0.4	0.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(No.)	(236)	(67)	(303)	(206)	(509)

Source : Derived using Primary Survey.

The average number of members staying at the place of enumeration among migrant households is 3.67, and that of non-migrants is 4.75, as migrants do not always move with their families. The average household size of inter-state migrant households is 3.56. The average household size of migrants is smaller than non-migrants, as it is usually the male member who migrates alone or, in some cases, with their wives and children. Table 9 shows that 23.1% of the migrant households are single migrants, while among inter-state migrants, 28.4% are single migrants. However, the household size varies from 1–12 among migrants, ranging from 1–15 among non-migrant households.

Table 10. Share (%) of Head of Sample Households among Migrants and Non-Migrants

	Sample Migrant Households			Sample Non-Migrant Households	Total Sample Households
	Inter-state	Intra-state	Total		
Sex					
Male	97.0	97.0	97.0	99.0	97.8
Female	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	2.2
Social Group					
SC	30.9	23.9	29.4	12.6	22.6
ST	5.5	0	4.3	0	2.6
OBC	33.1	19.4	30	31.6	30.7
General	30.5	56.7	36.3	55.8	44.2
Age Group					
15–64	99.2	92.5	97.7	90.8	94.9
65 & above	0.9	7.5	2.3	9.2	5.1
Marital Status					
Never Married	10.2	1.5	8.3	2.4	5.9
Married	85.2	94.0	87.1	92.7	89.4
Widowed/Divorced/Separated	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.9	4.7
Education Level					
Illiterate	45.3	14.9	38.6	12.1	27.9
Literate upto Middle	33.1	11.9	28.4	20.4	25.2
Secondary and Higher Secondary	15.3	28.4	18.2	40.3	27.1
Diploma and Certificate Course	0.9	4.5	1.7	2.9	2.2
Graduate and above	5.5	40.3	13.2	24.3	17.7
Occupational Status					
Employed	96.6	91.0	95.4	87.4	92.1
Unemployed	0.4	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.2
Dependent	0.9	3.0	1.3	8.3	4.1
Retired/Pensioner	0.9	3.0	1.3	3.4	2.2
Out of Labour Force	.	.	.	1.0	0.4
Attended Household Duties Only	1.3	3.0	1.7	0.0	1.0
Type of Residence by Ownership					
Owned	10.2	64.2	22.1	97.1	52.5

Rented	55.5	28.4	49.5	2.9	30.6
Temporary Settlements	34.3	7.5	28.4	0.0	16.9
i. On-site/Landowner's House	31.4	7.5	26.1	0.0	15.5
ii. Squatter Settlements*	3.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	1.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(No.)	(236)	(67)	(303)	(206)	(509)

Source : Derived using Primary Survey.

Note. * Squatting settlers typically refer to people who occupy land or property they do not own or have legal permission to use in a certain vicinity of the workplace.

Social group is an important indicator of social status in India. There are historically marginalized social groups, such as the scheduled castes (SC) and scheduled tribes (ST), who comprise 25.3% of India's total population (Census of India, 2011). In Haryana, SC constitutes 20.2% of the state's total population. Migrants in the informal sector are largely linked with groups closely associated with poverty, social identity, and poor work conditions (Bora, 2014). Table 10 also shows that most migrants from rural areas are SCs and OBCs (Other Backward Classes) and economically poor and vulnerable sections of the population, including STs. As per the study, 30.0% of the sample migrant households belonged to OBCs, 29.4% to SCs, and 4.3% to STs. Among inter-state migrants, 30.9% of the sample households belonged to OBCs, 33.1% to SCs, and 5.5% to STs. It has been shown that out of 303 migrant households in Haryana, 97.7% of migrants' heads of households are in the age group of 15–64 years, and 2.3% are 65 years and above. However, among inter-state migrants, 99.2% of the head of households are in the age group 15–64 years, implying that young people are more likely to migrate.

Education affects the occupation, which is the main determinant of wages/income. Table 10 shows that the majority, i.e., 38.6% of the migrant's heads of households, are illiterate compared to 12.1% among non-migrants, and 28.4% are literate up to the middle level among migrants compared to 20.4% among non-migrants. Most non-migrant heads of households (40.3%) are literate up to secondary and higher secondary level, as against 18.2% among non-migrants. On the other hand, 24.3% are graduates and above among non-migrant heads of households, compared to 13.2% among migrants. However, among inter-state migrants heads of households, 45.3% are illiterates, 33.1% are literate up to the middle level, and merely 5.5% are graduates and above. The education level of migrants significantly impacts their migration. Based on the skill or education level of the migrants, the reasons for migration may differ. When a respondent is well educated or economically sound, they will migrate because of the pull factors such as better employment opportunities, higher wages, better infrastructural facilities like schools and hospitals, better transportation systems, etc. Table 10 shows that 95.4%

Table 11. Employment Status of Head of Household of those Employed among Sample Households for Migrants and Non-Migrants in Haryana

	Sample Migrant Households			Sample Non-Migrant Households	Total Sample Households
	Inter-state	Intra-state	Total		
Regular Wage/Salaried	31.1	52.5	35.6	31.7	34.1
Daily Wage Casual Labourers	59.7	21.3	51.6	11.7	36.3
Self-Employed	9.2	26.2	12.8	56.7	29.6
Total Employed (in No.)%	228	61	289	180	469
	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)

Source : Derived using Primary Survey.

Figure 1. Precarious Living Conditions of Unskilled Inter-State Migrant Households



Source : Field Survey, 2021.

and 87.4% of migrant and non-migrant heads of households are employed, respectively. People largely move out of their homes in search of better employment opportunities. In the age group 15–64 years of the total migrant heads of households, 96.6% are employed. While in the age group 65 years and above, 42.9% are working. On the other hand, in the age group 15–64 years of the total non-migrant heads of households, 94.1% are employed, while in the age group 65 years and above, only 21.1% are working.

Of the total employed migrants' heads of households, 51.6% are daily wage casual laborers, whereas 35.6% and 12.8% are regular wage/salaried employees and self-employed, respectively (Table 11). On the other hand, 56.7% of the total sample non-migrant heads of households are self-employed, whereas 31.7% and 11.7% are regular wage/salaried employees and daily wage casual laborers, respectively. Nearly 60.0% of inter-state migrant heads of households are daily wage casual laborers. The inter-state migrants' heads of households employed as daily wage casual laborers are either agricultural laborers, construction workers, factory workers, or brick kiln workers, working in the informal sector and living in precarious conditions. Nearly 55.5% of inter-state migrant households stay in rented accommodations within a single room, and 34.3% stay as temporary settlers (on-site and squatting settlers). Figure 1 shows the precarious living conditions of unskilled inter-state migrants.

The average monthly income of regular wage/salaried heads of household is ₹ 22,028, ₹ 61,031, and ₹ 39,623, respectively, for the inter-state, intra-state and non-migrant. Their income level increases with an increase in education level. The average monthly income of those self-employed for the inter-state, intra-state and non-migrant heads of household is ₹ 12,857, ₹ 72,844, and ₹ 33,299, respectively. Among daily wage casual laborers, the average monthly income of the inter-state, intra-state and non-migrant heads of household is ₹ 9,879, ₹ 14,000, and ₹ 8,833, respectively (Table 12). Migrant workers in the informal sector generally suffer from low earnings, lack of stability, and durability of employment.

The income per capita is a key determinant of well-being and a dimension of regional development that migration can influence. The average monthly per capita income (PCY) of the migrant households is ₹ 10,810, while that of the non-migrant households is ₹ 11,902. Among migrants, inter-state migrant households have an average monthly PCY of ₹ 7,933 (Table 13). The average per capita household income of the migrants was less than that of the non-migrants. Since the migrants' head of household is younger than the non-migrants, it probably would require more time to get settled and earn a similar income level to that of non-migrants.

In national income accounting and aggregate demand, consumption is the most crucial element determining an economy's welfare. It makes up a significant portion of households' disposable income on a microeconomic level and is vital for social and economic development. The importance of household consumption cannot be overstated. The average monthly per capita consumption expenditure (MPCE) of the migrant and non-migrant households is ₹ 4,797 and ₹ 6,393, respectively. If we look at the inter-state migrant households, the average MPCE is much lower at ₹ 3,585.

Thus, the average monthly total household income and MPCE of the inter-state migrant household are lower than that of the non-migrants. The average monthly total household income of the inter-state migrant households

Table 12. Average Monthly Income of Head of Household of Those Employed among Sample Households for Migrants and Non-Migrants in Haryana (in ₹)

Qualification	Regular Wage/Salaried				Daily Wage Casual Labourers				Self-Employed				Total	
	Inter-state		Non-		Inter-state		Non-		Inter-state		Non-		Inter-state	
	Migrants	Intra-state	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Intra-state	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Intra-state	Migrants	Non-Migrants	Migrants	Non-Migrants
Illiterate	9,893	8,000	9,667	10,5	9,076	10,200	10,667	6,389	10,000	12,500	8,951	9,857	10,853	
(% Share in Total)	19.7	3.1	10.5	10.5	58.1	38.5	28.6	42.9	6.3	4.9	44.7	11.5	9.4	
Literate up to the middle	13,788	11,000	13,000	13,000	11,250	19,600	8,346	9,389	30,000	14,647	11,890	19,857	12,071	
(% Share in Total)	36.6	3.1	8.8	8.8	30.9	38.5	61.9	42.9	6.3	16.7	33.8	11.5	19.4	
Secondary & Higher Secondary	22,000	36,722	37,194	37,194	10,267	11,000	6,500	60,000	93,643	33,602	19,222	53,632	33,743	
(% Share in Total)	26.8	28.1	31.6	31.6	11.0	23.1	9.5	9.5	43.8	52.9	15.8	31.1	41.1	
Diploma/Certificate Course	20,000	35,000	39,000	39,000	.	.	.	.	32,500	18,750	20,000	33,333	25,500	
(% Share in Total)	2.8	3.1	3.5	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	3.9	0.9	4.9	3.3	
Graduate & above	60,900	78,425	53,385	53,385	.	.	.	8,000	81,000	54,341	56,091	78,940	53,823	
(% Share in Total)	14.1	62.5	45.6	45.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	31.3	21.6	4.8	41.0	26.7	
Total	22,028	61,031	39,623	39,623	9,879	14,000	8,833	12,857	72,844	33,299	13,936	54,107	32,447	
Total No. HoHs of Those Employed	71	32	57	57	136	13	21	21	16	102	228	61	180	

Source : Derived using Primary Survey.

Table 13. Average Monthly Household Income, Per Capita Income, Consumption Expenditure, and Remittances Sent among Migrant and Non-Migrant Households

	Sample Migrant Households			Sample Non-Migrant Households
	Inter-state	Intra-state	Total	
Average Monthly Total Household Income	22,104	81,535	35,246	51,699
Average Monthly Per-capita Household Income	7,933	20,944	10,810	11,902
Average Monthly Consumption Expenditure (incl. rent paid) of Household	11,133	33,388	16,054	27,210
Average Monthly Per-capita Consumption Expenditure	3,585	9,067	4,797	6,393
Average Monthly Remittances Sent Back Home	2,241	1,449	2,066	–
Total No. of Sample Households	236	67	303	206

Source : Derived using Primary Survey.

Table 14. Sample Migrant Households Sending Remittances Back Home

	Sample Migrant Households		
	Inter-state	Intra-state	Total
1. No. of Households Sending Remittances Monthly	159	19	178
(% of Total No. of Sample Households)	(67.4)	(28.4)	(58.8)
(% of Total Migrant Sample Households Sending Remittances)	(97.0)	(90.5)	(96.2)
Average Monthly Remittances Sent Back Home	3280	4912	3454
Average Monthly Remittances Sent as a % of Total Household Income	22.3	15.5	21.6
2. No. of Households Sending Remittances Occasionally	5	2	7
(% of Total No. of Sample Households)	(2.1)	(3.0)	(2.3)
(% of Total Migrant Sample Households Sending Remittances)	(3.0)	(9.5)	(3.8)
Average Monthly Remittances Sent Back Home	1500	1875	1607
Average Monthly Remittances Sent as a % of Total Household Income	4.1	4.1	4.1
Total No. of Migrant Sample Households Sending Remittances (1+2)	164	21	185
(% of Total Sample Households)	(69.5)	(31.3)	(61.1)
Average Monthly Remittances Sent Back Home	3226	4623	3384
Average Monthly Remittances Sent as a % of Total Household Income	21.8	14.4	20.9
3. No. of Households Not Sending Remittances	72	46	118
(% of Total Sample Households)	(30.5)	(68.7)	(38.9)
Total No. of Sample Households (1+2+3)	236	67	303
Average Monthly Remittances Sent Back Home	2241	1449	2066
Average Monthly Remittances Sent as a % of Total Household Income	15.1	4.5	12.8

is only 42.7% of the non-migrant households, and that of the intra-state migrant households is as high as 157.7%. While the MPCE of inter-state migrant households is only 56.1% of the non-migrant households, and that of the intra-state migrant households is as high as 141.8%. The reason for meagre per capita household consumption in the case of inter-state migrant households is their low household income level.

Moreover, around 10% of their income is remitted back home (Table 13). The share is much higher when those

Table 15. Percentage Remittances of Total Household Income Sent by Sample Migrant Households Monthly

Monthly Remittances Sent as a Percentage of Total Household Income (%)	% of Sample Migrant Households Sending Remittances Monthly		
	Inter-state	Intra-state	Total
1–10	19.5	42.1	21.9
11–20	22.6	26.3	23.0
21–30	13.8	15.8	14.0
31–50	25.2	15.8	24.2
51 & above	18.9	–	16.9
Total Sample Migrant Households Sending Remittances Monthly	100.0	100.0	100.0
(No.)	(159)	(19)	(178)

Table 16. Use of Remittances Sent Back Home in the Last 365 Days

Use of Remittances Sent in the Last 365 days	Sample Migrant Households		
	Inter-state	Intra-state	Total
Everyday consumption (food/clothing, etc.)	48.8	71.4	51.4
Everyday Consumption & Children's Education	22.0	4.8	20.0
Everyday Consumption & Pay off Debts	9.1	4.8	8.6
Everyday Consumption & Health/Medical	3.7	9.5	4.3
Everyday Consumption & House Durables	2.4	0.0	2.2
Everyday Consumption & Pay off Debts & Household Durables	3.0	4.8	3.2
Everyday Consumption & Children's Education & Pay-off Debts	1.2	4.8	1.6
Everyday Consumption & Children's Education & Household Durables	3.0	0.0	2.7
Everyday Consumption & Children's Education & Marriage & Other Ceremonies	2.4	0.0	2.2
Others	4.3	0.0	3.8
Total No. of Migrant Sample Households Sending Remittances	164	21	185

households who remit to their point of origin monthly are considered. It is estimated at 22.3% of such household income (Table 14). Also, remittances form an important part of household livelihood strategies. Remittances contribute directly to raising household incomes while broadening earning opportunities. They also allow households to increase their consumption of local goods and services (Ranjan, 2015).

The survey results show that among the sample inter-state migrant households, 69.5% send remittances back home, while only 31.3% of the sample intra-state migrant households send remittances (Table 14). Out of the total inter-state sample migrant households sending remittances back home, 97.0% send remittances monthly. Among sample migrant households sending remittances regularly/monthly, one-fourth of the households remit nearly 31–50% of the total household income back home (Table 15). However, the capability of each migrant varies along with the differences in each migrant household's characteristics, such as education, skill, socioeconomic background, and place of origin (rural/urban).

Migrants often send money back home to their families and communities for various reasons. One of the main reasons is to provide financial support to their families and help meet their basic needs, such as food, clothing, etc. Remittances are important for impoverished families or those with limited access to resources. Migrants send

money back home to support their children's education, cover medical expenses or emergencies, or pay off debts. Remittances are also used to invest in businesses, agriculture, or other income-generating activities, contributing to their home communities' economic development.

Out of the sample migrant households who send remittances every month, almost half meet their everyday consumption needs, highlighting the importance of remittances in supporting the daily lives of family members left behind in their place of origin (Table 16). It also indicates that migrant workers continue to work hard to support their families despite low wages and precarious living conditions.

Details of Members of Sample Households

Among the 509 households surveyed, the total number of members residing at the place of enumeration amounted to 2,093. Of the 2,093 members, 841 are members of inter-state migrant households, and 272 and 980 are members of intra-state migrant and non-migrant households, respectively. Table 17 shows 56.3% and 59.7% are

Table 17. Share (%) of Members of Sample Households among Migrants and Non-Migrants

	Share (%) of Members of				
	Inter-state Migrant Households	Intra-state Migrant Households	Total Migrant Households	Non-Migrant Households	Total Households
Sex					
Male	59.7	56.3	58.9	51.6	55.5
Female	40.3	43.8	41.2	48.4	44.5
Sex Ratio (Female/Male) *1000	675	778	699	937	803
Age Group					
0–14	27.0	22.4	25.9	20.0	23.1
15–64	72.1	72.8	72.2	72.9	72.5
65 & above	1.0	4.8	1.9	7.1	4.4
Marital Status					
Never Married	47.9	38.6	45.6	37.8	42.0
Married	49.5	58.5	51.7	56.7	54.0
Widowed/Divorced/Separated	2.6	2.9	2.7	5.5	4.0
Education Level					
Illiterate	33.4	9.2	19.8	9.2	19.8
Literate up to the middle	37.7	29.4	31.8	29.4	31.8
Secondary and Higher Secondary	15.5	33.3	24.9	33.3	24.9
Diploma and Certificate Course	0.2	2.7	1.6	2.7	1.6
Graduate and above	4.8	20.0	15.1	20.0	15.1
Vocational Training	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Below five years enrolled in Educational Institute	0.6	1.4	1.2	1.4	1.2
Below five years not enrolled in Educational Institute	7.6	3.9	5.5	3.9	5.5
Occupational Status					
Student	19.1	23.5	20.2	26.4	23.1
Employed	52.9	40.8	50.0	34.3	42.6

Unemployed	0.6	2.2	1.0	1.3	1.2
Dependent	14.4	9.9	13.3	12.0	12.7
Retired/Pensioner	0.5	1.5	0.7	1.6	1.2
Out of Labour Force	1.6	0.7	1.4	2.1	1.7
Attended household duties only	10.3	21.3	13.0	22.1	17.3
Informal Training	0.6	.	0.5	0.0	0.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(No. of Members)	(841)	(272)	(1,113)	(980)	(2,093)

Source : Derived using Primary Survey.

Table 18. Employment Status of those Employed among Members of Sample Households for Migrants and Non-Migrants in Haryana

Type of Job	Share (%) of Members of				
	Inter-state Migrant Households	Intra-state Migrant Households	Total Migrant Households	Non-Migrant Households	Total Households
Regular Wage/Salaried	34.4	53.2	38.1	41.1	39.2
Daily Wage Casual Labourers	56.4	22.5	49.6	11.0	35.1
Self-Employed	9.2	24.3	12.2	47.9	25.7
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
No. of Those Employed	(445)	(111)	(556)	(336)	(892)

Source : Derived using Primary Survey.

males among intra-state and inter-state migrant households, respectively, whereas 51.6% are males among non-migrant households.

The sex ratio of non-migrant households (937) is much higher compared to inter-state (675) migrant households depicting that it is largely the male member among inter-state migrant household moving for better economic prospects. We found that 25.9% of total members of migrant families are in the age group 0–14 years, 72.2% are in the age group 15–64 years, and merely 1.9% are above 65 years of age. On the other hand, among members of inter-state migrant households, 27.0%, 72.1%, and 1.0% are in the age group 0–14, 15–64, and 65 and above, respectively. Therefore, most of the migrant members are young.

Regarding educational qualification, 33.4% of the members of inter-state migrant households are illiterate, 37.7% are literate up to the middle level, and 15.5% are literate up to secondary and higher secondary levels. Merely 4.8% are graduates and above among the members of inter-state migrant households compared to 20.0% among members of non-migrant families (Table 17). However, among members of intra-state migrant households, 9.2% are illiterates, 29.4% are literate up to the middle level, 33.3% are literate up to secondary and higher secondary levels, and 20.0% are graduates and above. Of the total members of migrant households, 50.0% are employed, 20.2% are students, 13.3% are dependents, and 13.0% attend household duties. Among the members of inter-state migrant households, 52.9% are employed compared to 34.3% among members of non-migrant families.

Of the total employed members of migrant households, 49.6% are daily wage casual laborers, whereas 38.1% and 12.2% are regular wage/salaried employees and self-employed, respectively. On the other hand, 47.9% of the total sample non-migrant heads of households are self-employed, whereas 41.1% and 11.0% are regular

Table 19. Average Monthly Income of Earning Members among Sample Households for Migrants and Non-Migrants in Haryana (in ₹)

Qualification	Regular Wage/Salaried			Daily Wage Casual Labourers			Self-Employed			Total		
	Inter-state Migrants Households	Intra-state Migrants Households	Non-Migrants Households	Inter-state Migrants Households	Intra-state Migrants Households	Non-Migrants Households	Inter-state Migrants Households	Intra-state Migrants Households	Non-Migrants Households	Inter-state Migrants Households	Intra-state Migrants Households	Non-Migrants Households
Illiterate	8,003	8,000	8,318	7,711	8,786	8,091	6,150	10,000	9,813	7,691	8,813	8,633
(% Share in Total)	26.1	1.7	8.0	56.6	56.0	29.7	24.4	3.7	5	43.1	14.4	8.9
Literate up to the middle	10,475	11,125	11,227	9,135	17,286	7,474	10,132	30,000	16,043	976	16,292	11,844
(% Share in Total)	39.2	6.8	15.9	31.1	28.0	51.4	46.3	3.7	14.3	35.3	10.8	19
Secondary and Higher Secondary	16,514	32,633	27,469	9,161	10,750	5,286	24,778	88,188	29,494	14,467	45,852	27,574
(% Share in Total)	22.9	25.4	23.2	12.4	16.0	18.9	22	29.6	51.6	16.9	24.3	36.3
Diploma/Certificate Course	20,000	67,500	22,750	.	.	.	.	32,500	20,500	20,000	50,000	21,786
(% Share in Total)	1.3	3.4	5.8	.	.	.	.	7.4	3.7	0.4	3.6	4.2
Graduate and above	48,438	64,230	45,231	.	.	.	29,333	62,333	47,613	45,421	63,683	46,138
(% Share in Total)	10.5	62.7	47.1	.	.	.	7.3	55.6	24.8	4.3	46.8	31.3555
Vocational Training	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	25000	.	.	25,000
(% Share in Total)	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	0.6	.	.	0.3
Total	15,305	51,754	31,446	8,333	11,480	7,243	13,780	64,648	30,733	11,232	45,820	28,439
Total No. of Those Employed	153	59	138	251	25	37	41	27	161	445	111	336

Source : (Bedi and Khurana, 2023).

wage/salaried employees and daily wage casual laborers, respectively. Nearly 56.4% of inter-state migrant heads of household are daily wage casual laborers (Table 18).

Most members of inter-state migrant households have low qualifications and largely work as daily-wage casual workers (Table 19). ANOVA gives an F -value of 175.459, and the corresponding p -value is $0.000 < 0.05$, depicting that education level differs significantly among the working members of migrant and non-migrant households. Also, the members of inter-state migrant families are relatively more involved in unskilled work and, even for the same kind of work, are paid less than members of intra-state migrant/non-migrant households. The possible reason could be that the productivity of local workers may be more compared to migrants, or it may be because of the better bargaining power of locals or their unwillingness to work below a certain wage level. Thus, the findings highlight that inter-state migration plays an important role in developing the state's economy by providing cheap and flexible labor ready to take up any work.

Conclusion

To sum up, migration in Haryana is primarily driven by economic factors, particularly for males. Social and cultural factors, predominantly marriage, are the main cause of migration for females. There is a limitation of detailed analysis based on secondary data, as some people say those initially migrated for cultural/social reasons later engaged in economic activities at their point of destination areas. Thus, the status of migrant household members based on the head of households is analyzed from the primary survey undertaken for 509 households covering migrant and non-migrant families from four districts spread across the state. A detailed questionnaire was used to collect information about the socioeconomic conditions of the migrants and non-migrants.

The survey results show that most migrant households from rural areas are SCs and OBCs and economically poor and vulnerable sections of the population, including STs. Most migrant heads of households are male and migrate for work/employment, followed by better living conditions, but there are wide variations among inter-state and intra-state migrants. The level of education varied widely among inter-state migrants and non-migrants. Most inter-state migrants' heads of households, being illiterate or literate up to the middle level, are employed as daily wage casual laborers either as agricultural laborers, construction workers, factory workers, or brick kiln workers working in the informal sector and living in precarious conditions. Workers in the informal sector generally suffer from low earnings, lack of stability, and durability of employment. The average monthly household income and per capita consumption expenditure of the inter-state migrant households are lower than that of the non-migrants. The reason for low per capita household consumption in the case of inter-state migrant households is their low household income level. Moreover, a fraction of their income is remitted back home.

Thus, the study shows that inter-state migration in Haryana is predominantly driven by work and employment opportunities, with significant variations in reasons for migration and socioeconomic status among migrants. The study also highlights the challenges faced by inter-state migrants, including poor living, and working conditions, low earnings, and low consumption expenditure.

Policy Implications

The study findings suggest that the unskilled migrants in India require a multi-faceted approach that includes recognizing migrants as a separate group with specific needs, improving their access to healthcare, education, employment, social integration, justice, housing, setting up facilitation centers for migrants, and creating awareness about the programs already in place for their benefit like "One Nation One Ration Card." By addressing these policy implications, the government can improve the lives of migrants and help them achieve their full potential.

Limitations of the Study and Scope for Future Research

- ✎ The survey was conducted during the COVID-19 period, because of which there was a shortage of migrant workers.
- ✎ The analysis in this study is confined to the overall economy. However, a sector-wise analysis can be undertaken to broaden the scope of future research.
- ✎ This study has been undertaken for a developed state like Haryana. However, a similar analysis can also be undertaken for other developed states to compare the similarities and differences among states and the reasons for the same.

Authors' Contribution

Ms. Manvi Khurana perceived the idea and developed the research design for the study under the supervision of Dr. Jatinder S. Bedi. She conducted a rigorous literature review and undertook a detailed primary survey. Ms. Manvi Khurana also analyzed the data collected from the field survey and prepared the draft for this study. Dr. Jatinder S. Bedi mainly provided the methodological framework for survey design and data analysis and supervised and finalized the manuscript.

Conflict of Interest

On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

Funding Acknowledgement

The authors declare that no funds, grants, or other support were received during the preparation of this manuscript.

References

- Agasty, M. P. (2016). Impact of rural-urban labour migration on education of left behind children: Evidence from rural India. *Arthshastra Indian Journal of Economics & Research*, 5(4), 48–56. <https://doi.org/10.17010/aijer/2016/v5i4/100780>
- Bhagat, R. B. (2018). Development impacts of migration and urbanisation. *Economic & Political Weekly*, 53(48), 15–19. <https://www.epw.in/journal/2018/48/commentary/development-impacts-migration-and.html>
- Bora, R.S. (2014) Migrant informal workers: A study of Delhi and satellite towns. *Modern Economy*, 5, 562 – 579. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/me.2014.55053>
- Census of India (2011). *PCA SD: Primary census abstract (PCA) data, India & States/UTs - State and district level – 2011*. Office of the Registrar General & Census Commissioner, India.
- Deswal, S. (2004). *Patterns of in-migration in Haryana* (Doctoral dissertation, Maharshi Dayanand University). <https://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/handle/10603/113882>

- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2016). *Migration, agriculture, and rural development. Addressing the root causes of migration and harnessing its potential for development*. <https://www.fao.org/3/i6064e/i6064e.pdf>
- Lee, E. S. (1966). A theory of migration. *Demography*, 3(1), 47–57. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2060063>
- Lei, L., & Desai, S. (2021). Male out-migration and the health of left-behind wives in India: The roles of remittances, household responsibilities, and autonomy. *Social Science & Medicine*, 280, Article 113982. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.113982>
- Malhotra, N., & Devi, P. (2018). Factors in internal migration in India: A case study of Ludhiana City. *Arthshastra Indian Journal of Economics & Research*, 7(3), 7–24. <https://doi.org/10.17010/aijer/2018/v7i3/130152>
- Mehra, S., & Singh, G. (2013). Determinants and factors related to migration of labourers to industries in Ludhiana, Punjab. *Arthshastra Indian Journal of Economics & Research*, 2(5), 35–42. <https://doi.org/10.17010/aijer/2013/v2i5/54529>
- Ranjan, R. (2015). *Remittance and development: A study of selected villages of Mithilanchal region of Bihar (GRFDT Research Monograph Series)*. https://grfdt.com/Upload/Publication/4038_GRFDT%20Research%20Paper%205.pdf
- Simpson, N. B. (2022). *Demographic and economic determinants of migration*. IZA World of Labor 2022. <https://wol.iza.org/uploads/articles/619/pdfs/demographic-and-economic-determinants-of-migration.pdf>
- Srivastava, R. (2012). Internal migration in India: An overview of its features, trends and policy challenges. In, *UNICEF National Workshop on Internal Migration and Human Development in India*. <https://ruralindiaonline.org/media/documents/16wkshpReportInternalMigrationHumanDevelopmentIndia2EN20111231.pdf#page=7>
- Srivastava, R., & Pandey, A. K. (2017). *Internal and international migration in South Asia: Drivers, interlinkage and policy issues* (Discussion Paper). United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). <https://www.shram.org/uploadFiles/20170627123111.pdf>
- Venkataramakrishnan, R. (2020, March 31). India's seasonal migrants have been invisible for too long. This crisis should be a wake-up call. *Scroll. in*. <https://scroll.in/article/957742/indias-seasonal-migrants-have-been-invisible-for-too-long>

About the Authors

Manvi Khurana is a Doctoral Scholar cum Research Assistant at the Institute for Development and Communication, Chandigarh. She did her post-graduation from Panjab University, Chandigarh, in economics. Her research areas include econometrics, development economics, and migration studies.

Dr. Jatinder S. Bedi is a Professor of Economics at the Institute for Development and Communication, Chandigarh. With 30-years of working experience in various research organizations, his areas of expertise include livelihood mission, EoDB, GST, land economics, sustainable development, and sectoral studies such as agro-based and textile industries.