

# Internal Migration and Labour Circulation in India

Ram B. Bhagat<sup>1</sup> and Kunal Keshri<sup>2</sup>

## Abstract

Migration has been an important determinant of population change associated with urbanization and economic development. In developing countries, it is mostly governed by the level of economic development of a region. The people's inter-state movement is generally propelled in India by two factors: uneven economic development and variations in the demographic transition of states. The outbreak of pandemic COVID-19 and ensuing migration crisis has highlighted the poor understanding of government agencies, which till recently had no clue of the real number of migrants and migrant labour staying in different parts of country. Also, there is a misconception that migrants are a homogeneous group. Based on nature of migration and duration of residence at the destination, migrants could be classified into two main categories: temporary circulatory migrants, semi-permanent migrants/ permanent migrants. It is well established that with increasing duration of migration a person's economic status not only becomes better but also absorbed in urban areas as a permanent migrant. The data from the Census of India (1991, 2001, and 2011) and the NSSO 55<sup>th</sup> (1999-2000), 64<sup>th</sup> (2007-08) and 70<sup>th</sup> rounds (2013) are used in this study. The work/employment related migration data from the census is used to study the long-term migration of permanent and semi-permanent nature, whereas data from NSSO is used to estimate short-term circulatory labour migration at the household level. This study aims to examine these two categories of labor migration linking them with pattern of regional disparities in India and highlights associated challenges.

## 1. Background

Migration has been an important determinant of population change associated with demographic transition, urbanization and economic development. It has a unique ability to transform the size, distribution and composition of national populations. Zelinsky (1971) has successfully linked the different stages of demographic transition with the level and direction

---

<sup>1</sup> R.B.Bhagat (PhD), Professor and Head, Department of Migration and Urban Studies, International Institute for Population Sciences, Mumbai-400088, INDIA (e-mail: rbbhagat@iips.net)

<sup>2</sup> Kunal Keshri (PhD), Assistant Professor, G B Pant Social Science Institute (University of Allahabad), Prayagraj (e-mail: kunalkeshri.lrd@gmail.com)

of migration known as mobility transition. Recent studies also established that when increasing number of developing countries will reach in the advance stages of demographic transition there will be concomitant increase in the impact of migration on the settlement systems of those countries (Charles-Edwards et al 2020; King, 2012).

In developing countries, migration is mostly governed by the level of economic development of a region. In some of the countries like India, internal migration is predominantly seen in the form of inter-state movement which is generally propelled by two factors: uneven economic development and variations in the demographic transition of states (Srivastava et al 2020). In reality however, intra-state migration is several times larger than inter-state migration (Bhagat and Keshri 2020). It is important, however, to emphasize that irrespective of migration being intra-state or inter-state it is inevitably a significant livelihood strategy adopted by a major section of Indian population. While studying migration and linking it with development, researchers generally do not make distinction between long-term migration which could take the form of permanent or semi-permanent migration and short-term migration of temporary and circulatory nature. We have been arguing that this distinction is important to understand the livelihood strategy of rural masses (Bhagat and Keshri 2020: Keshri and Bhagat 2013; Kumar and Bhagat 2017). It is likely that with increasing duration of migration a person's economic status not only becomes better but they are also absorbed in urban areas as a permanent migrant, whereas temporary circulatory migrants keep on shuttling between place of origin and place of destination.

The outbreak of the pandemic COVID-19 and ensuing migration crisis has highlighted the poor understanding of government agencies, which till recently had no clue of the real number of migrants and migrant labour staying in different parts of the country (Bhagat et al 2020). There is a need to provide researchers and policy makers some recent evidences of migration and its associated factors. This study aims to examine the nature of migration in general and temporary and circulatory migration in particular linking them with pattern of regional disparities in India and highlights associated challenges utilizing data from recent rounds of data from the Census of India and the National Sample Survey Office.

## 2. Data and Methods

Present study has utilized data from the Census of India and the National Sample Survey office (NSSO) which are the two foremost sources of migration information in India. Census data has been used for the years 1991, 2001 and 2011 while the NSSO data has been used for the years 1999-2000, 2007-2008 and 2013. The migration data from the census has been used to study the trends and patterns of long-term migration of permanent and semi-permanent nature, whereas work/employment related data from the NSSO has been utilized to understand the trends, patterns and determinants of short-term temporary circulatory labour migration in India. We have used the *place of last residence* data of census for analysing the long-term migration that includes not only work/employment as a reason of migration but various other reasons. Census of India had begun to collect information on reasons for migration since 1981. In the 1991 census there were seven reasons for migration: 1. Work/Employment, 2. Business, 3. Education, 4. Family moved 5. Marriage, 6. Natural calamities, and 7. Others. In censuses of 2001 and 2011 all the questions were kept as such, except the migration due to *Natural calamities* was dropped and a question on moved after birth was added. In addition to these changes the reason for family moved was renamed as moved with household.

We have utilized the unit level data of 55<sup>th</sup> (1999-2000), 64<sup>th</sup> (2007-2008) and 70<sup>th</sup> (2013) rounds of the National Sample Survey to understand the temporary circulatory labour migration in India. In the 55<sup>th</sup> round, the information on short-term migration was collected through the “employment and unemployment” schedule (schedule 10.0). We considered the definition of a short-term migrant as “a household member who stayed in the sample village/town for at least six months and who during the 365 preceding the date of survey stayed away from the village or town (usual place of residence) for 60 days for either employment or in search of employment” synonym to short-term temporary circulatory labour migration. We assume that the short-term migrant has been going to the same destination for short duration repeatedly. In the 64<sup>th</sup> round, the migration information was collected through “employment & unemployment and migration particular” schedule (schedule 10.2), and almost similar definition has been followed for the data collection but the minimum duration of stay out of the village or town was kept 30 days. In the 70<sup>th</sup> round, the migration information was collected using the “land and livestock holdings” schedule (schedule 18.1), the minimum duration of staying out of the village or town was kept 15 days.

It is important to note here that in the 70<sup>th</sup> round of the survey only rural sample was considered for the survey (NSSO, 2001; NSSO, 2010; NSSO, 2013). We have provided a state-wise comparison of the estimates of households with short-term temporary and circulatory labour migrants for the three time periods at household level. Comparison has also been done using socioeconomic variables.

### **3. Trends and Patterns of Internal Migration:**

The internal migration, which is defined as change in usual place of residence either permanent or semi-permanent basis, is a population movement on a long-term basis. It adds population to the destination and reduces it at the place of origin. As counting is done on de-facto basis it is the permanent transfer of population or labour until the next census enumeration. Compared with this there is no permanent transfer of population or labour in the short-term temporary and circulatory migration. Such migrants belong to the place of origin, and not to the place of destination. In migration literature scholars use the term migration in the former sense of permanent movement of population and labour transfer. Based on this perspective of migration there have been arguments that Indian population is less mobile compared to other countries (Davis, 1951). Recent studies also supported this contention as Aggregate Crude Migration Intensity (ACMI) of India is the lowest (5.2 per cent) among Asian countries (Charle-Edwards et.al. 2019) which is the highest (52.8) in South Korea. Bhagat and Keshri (2020) have found a slight ascent to 6.6 per cent in ACMI using Census 2011 data. There has been a twofold increase in the volume of long-term internal migration during the last three censuses, i.e. 1991-2011 while the proportion of migrants has increased from 27 percent to 37 percent in this duration according to the place of last residence (Table 1). However, it is to be noted that the census data is deficient in capturing short-term temporary and circulatory labour migration which consists of a larger proportion of labour migrants in India. For instance, a study based on National Sample Survey data found that annual temporary labour migration is seven times larger than permanent labour migration (Keshri and Bhagat 2013). Therefore, arguments of lower mobility in India are deceptive.

[Table 1 about here]

Table 2 presents the internal migration in India by place of residence and sex for the year 2011. It is evident that the percentage of migrants in urban areas (46 %) is almost 1.5 times higher than that of rural areas (33 %). Also, overall percentage of female migrants is more

than twice of the males. Higher prevalence of women's migration is mainly due to the fact that marriage has been a dominant reason for migration among women. It has been found in earlier studies also (Rao & Finnoffe, 2015; Srivastava & Sasikumar, 2003). In rural areas prevalence of male migration is 15 percent while it is 52 percent for females. However, in urban areas differentials are not so large. Though majority of women migrate for marriage as a primary reason, their migration is confined to the rural areas only.

[Table 2 about here]

Table 3 provides the trend and pattern of migration by streams for the censuses 1991 to 2011. Overall rural to rural migration stream has been most dominant throughout the last three decades. Nonetheless, proportion of rural to rural migration seems to have declined gradually during the period as it was 64 percent in 1991, 63 percent in 2001 and 54 percent in 2011. Sex-wise differentials are worth mentioning as this stream has the highest percentage among female migrants. There has been a declining trend of rural to rural streams from 1991 (72 %) to 2011 (63%) as far as women migrants are concerned. Among males, the trend is somehow similar to female migrants. Rural to urban migration stream is the second most important stream which is known for the dominance of labour migrants. Overall, it has shown a gradual increase in its share from 18 percent in 1991 to 20 percent in 2011. The percentage share of rural to urban migrants is higher among males as compared to females. Among males we find a mixed trend as its share increases from 30 percent in 1991 to 34 percent in 2001 and then it came down to 30 percent in 2011. However, among females share of rural to urban migration has shown a placid increase from 13.2 percent in 1991 to 13.5 percent in 2001 and a significant rise to 15.3 percent in 2011. Although urban to rural stream is miniscule among both male and female migrants and its decadal trend is also mixed. On the other hand, it is remarkable to see urban to urban migration is emerging as an important stream as its share has been increasing significantly irrespective of sex throughout the decade.

[Table 3 about here]

Table 4 shows the trend of migration by reasons during the last three decades. It is noteworthy that marriage is reported as the most important reason of migration by the majority of migrants. However, results suggest a declining trend during the reference period. Overall, it declined from 57.3 percent in 1991 to 50.3 percent in 2001 and further to 46.6 percent in 2011. Moved with family/household is the second most important reason in terms

of percent share which also showed a declining share irrespective of the sex. Other most important reason of migration is related to employment. We observe that share of this reason for migration has increased from 8.8 percent in 1991 to 9.5 percent in 2001 and then declined slightly to 9.1 percent in 2011. It is noteworthy that share of this reason among males has been gradually declining from 27.8 percent in 1991 to 28.5 percent in 2001 and then 24.1 percent in 2011. Contrastingly, share of migrants who migrated due to employment related reasons has decreased slightly among females from 1.8 percent in 1991 to 1.7 percent in 2001 but increased to 2.1 percent in 2011. Apart from this, the share of other reasons of migration, which incorporates all the other reasons, has been increasing among male as well as female migrants throughout the analysis period. It is as high as one-third among males and one-sixth among females in 2011. This shows that there are many reasons of migration which are clubbed in other category, need to be included in future censuses. The NSSO also provided data on reasons of migration, but the latest data available pertains to 64<sup>th</sup> Round for the year 2007-08 which is dated and cannot be compared to Census 2011.

[Table 4 about here]

#### **4. Inter-State Migration:**

Inter-state migrants constitute 12.1 per cent of total migrants in 2011 Census comprising of 54.2 million migrants compared to 26.6 million in 1991 and 41.1 million in 2001 Census. In terms of proportion, however, it remained to the level of 1991 (11.8 per cent) with slight increase in 2001 census (13.3 per cent). Table 5 presents regional patterns of inter-state migration. It is apparent that a large volume of migrants originates from Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu while Maharashtra, Delhi and Gujarat are the major destinations during the last three decades. Uttar Pradesh has been the largest origin state of inter-state migrants with increasing volume of inter-state out-migrants from 3.8 million in 1991 to 6.4 million in 2001 and then to 8.2 million in 2011. Bihar is not far behind with a volume of inter-state out-migrants 1.9 million in 1991 which increased to 3.6 million in 2001 and to 6.3 million in 2011. It is interesting to observe that some of the states which initially were the net gainers of migrants eventually became net losers during the later decades. For instance, Madhya Pradesh was a net gainer in 1991 and 2001, it became net loser in 2011, and similarly, West Bengal was net receiver of migrants in 1991 and 2001 while it became net sender of migrants again in 2011. Tamil Nadu, though has become a net loser throughout the

reference period but it shows a chequered trend of sending 0.5 million migrants to other states in 1991, then it has sent 0.9 million in 2001, while in the latest census 2011 it has sent only 0.3 million migrants to other states. On the other hand, some of the states were initially net losers but they have become net gainers in the recent decades, namely, Punjab, Sikkim and Tripura. In 2011 the top most receiving state of migrants is Maharashtra (6.0 million), followed by Delhi (4.7 million), Gujarat (2.3 million), Haryana (1.3 million), Punjab (0.7 million) and Karnataka (0.7 million). It is important to note that three newly created states after the completion of Census 1991 have been net gaining states in the following decades. However, this result can be interpreted with caution as many intra-state migrants turned out to be inter-state migrants due to reorganisation of inter-state boundaries.

[Table 5 about here]

### **5. Regional Pattern of Circulatory Labour Migration:**

Table 6 presents regional picture of temporary and circulatory labour migration in India by showing the percentage and estimated number of households having at least one temporary labour migrant (migrant households) across the states for all the three time periods i.e. 55<sup>th</sup> round (1999-2000), 64<sup>th</sup> round (2007-2008) and 70<sup>th</sup> round (2013) by place of residence. Results show that the number of migrant households has increased from 5.43 million in 55<sup>th</sup> round to 10.0 million in 64<sup>th</sup> round. If we see the results from rural areas, then it increased from 4.3 million in 55<sup>th</sup> round to 9.2 million in 64<sup>th</sup> round and then 10.0 million in the 70<sup>th</sup> round. In the last two rounds, northern states Bihar and Uttar Pradesh have the largest number of households which have at least one temporary labour migrant as far as rural areas are concerned. Interestingly, in Bihar the estimated number of such household decreased slightly from 1.8 million (2007-2008) to 1.7 million (2013) while in Uttar Pradesh this estimate has increased from 1.5 million (2007-2008) to 1.7 million (2013) in rural areas. In the east West Bengal and Jharkhand have observed increase in the number of migrant households from 1.1 million (64<sup>th</sup> round) to 1.3 million (70<sup>th</sup> round) in the former while from 0.4 million to 0.6 million in the later. In central India Madhya Pradesh remained a significant state for this kind of migration where we find increase in the number of migrant households from 0.5 in 64<sup>th</sup> and 0.8 in 70<sup>th</sup> round. A significant increase in the migrant households has also been observed in Maharashtra in the last two rounds. While looking at the percentage of migrant households we find that Jharkhand (16 %), Bihar (12 %), Madhya Pradesh (10 %), West Bengal (09 %),

Rajasthan (10 %) and Uttar Pradesh (07 %) are the leading states in this regard as per the latest round in rural areas. In the southern and north-eastern states intensity of this kind of migration is comparatively lesser.

[Table 6 about here]

## **6. Characteristics of Circulatory Labour Migration**

To understand the characteristics of migrant households an analysis has been done for the prominent household level socioeconomic variables like monthly household consumer expenditure (MPCE) quintiles (which is a proxy for the income) and caste. The percentage of migrant households according to the MPCE and place of residence has been shown in Table 7 for the reference years 1999-2000 and 2007-2008. Unfortunately, this information is not available for the year 2013. In both the rounds a negative association of temporary and circulatory labour migration with MPCE has been observed, that means with the increasing level of MPCE from lowest to highest temporary and circulatory migration rate decreases. As compared to urban areas households of rural areas observe sharp differentials according to MPCE.

In Table 8 percentage of migrant households according to social groups and place of residence has been shown for the reference years 1999-2000, 2007-2008 and 2013. In all the three rounds, scheduled tribe households have been found to be most prone to temporary labour migration followed by scheduled castes, other backward classes and others. These differentials are more visible in rural areas, particularly for the year 2013. It indicates that the temporary and circulatory labour migration is a livelihood strategy for millions of poor and socially marginalised households in India. Compared to this form of migration, long-term migration of permanent and semi-permanent nature is mainly resorted by relatively better off and more educated households (Bhagat 2010; Keshri & Bhagat 2013).

[Table 7 about here]

[Table 8 about here]



## 7. Conclusions:

This paper analysed the internal migration in general and temporary and circularity labour migration in particular. A distinction has been made between two forms of migration namely long-term migration of permanent and semi-permanent nature defined based on change in the usual place of residence, and short-term temporary and circulatory migration which generally occurred as a livelihood strategy among the poor sections of rural society who also happened to belong to the STs, SCs and minority communities. During the time of COVID-19 and lockdown period, the temporary and circulatory migrants were badly affected due to their precarious job. Any policy to protect migrant rights should look at migration not as a single form but must include various migration forms. The vulnerability of migrant families also increases as they move across administrative boundaries. Particularly those temporary and circulatory migrants who moved across states may be more vulnerable as they lose many entitlements and provisions of social security programmes related to food, nutrition, housing, health and education. There is a growing demand to make the social security programmes portable in the light of COVID-19 sufferings inflicted on the migrant workers. It is also important to emphasize that there is a huge apathy to collect and publish data by the national statistical agencies like Census of India and National Sample Survey Office. It is also not adequately included in the nation-wide survey like NFHS (National Family Health Survey). It is worthwhile to emphasise that statistical inclusion of migrants and migration will not only make them visible but also help policy makers in devising suitable policies for their inclusion, empowerment and protection of their citizenship rights.

## References:

- Bhagat, R.B. (2010) "Internal Migration in India: Are the Underprivileged Migrating More", *Asia Pacific Population Journal*, 25 (1): 31-49.
- Bhagat, R. B. and Keshri, K. (2020). "Internal Migration in India", In Martin Bell, Aude Bernard, Charles-Edward, and Yu Zhu (Eds.) *Internal Migration in the Countries of Asia: A cross-national comparison*. Springer International Publishing: Basel.
- Bhagat, R. B., R.S., R., Sahoo, H., Roy, A. K., & Govil, D. (2020). The COVID-19, Migration and Livelihood in India: Challenges and Policy Issues: Challenges and Policy Issues. *Migration Letters*, 17(5), 705-718.

- Charles-Edwards, E., Bell, M., Bernard, A. and Zhu, Y. (2020). "IMAGE-Asia: An Introduction", In Martin Bell, Aude Bernard, Charles-Edward, and Yu Zhu (Eds.) *Internal Migration in the Countries of Asia: A cross-national comparison*. Springer International Publishing: Basel. Pp. 3-14.
- Keshri, Kunal and R.B. Bhagat (2012) "Temporary and Seasonal Migration: Regional Pattern, Characteristics and Associated Factors", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vo. 47, No. 4 (January 28), pp. 74-81.
- Keshri, Kunal and R.B. Bhagat (2013) "Socio-economic Determinants of Temporary Labour Migration in India: A Regional Analysis", *Asian Population Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 2, 2013, pp. 175-195.
- Kumar, Nandan and Bhagat, R.B. (2017) "Interaction between Migration and Development: A Study of Income and Workforce Diversification in Rural Bihar" *Environment and Urbanization ASIA* Vo. 8, No. 1, 2017, pp. 20-136.
- National Sample Survey Organisation (2001): "Migration in India", Report No. 470 (55/10/8), 1999-2000, National Sample Survey Organisation. (New Delhi: Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation Government of India).
- (2010): "Migration in India". Report No. 533 (64/10.2/2), 2007-2008. National Sample Survey Organisation. (New Delhi: Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India).
- (2013): "Key Indicators of Land and Livestock Holdings in India". Report No. (70/18.1), 2013. National Sample Survey Organisation. (New Delhi: Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India).
- Rao, S. & Finnoff, K. 2015. "Marriage Migration and Inequality in India, 1983–2008," *Population and Development Review*, The Population Council, 41(3), pages 485-505.
- Srivastava, R and S K Sasikumar (2003): "An Overview of Migration in India, its Impacts and Key Issues". Paper presented at Regional Conference on Migration, Development and Pro-Poor Policy Choices in Asia, at Dhaka.
- Srivastava, R., Keshri, K., Gaur, K. Padhi, B. and Jha, A. (2020). *Internal migration in India and the Impact of Uneven Regional Development and Demographic Transition across States: A Study for Evidence-Based Policy Recommendations*. A Study Report prepared for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA). Delhi: Institute of Human Development.
- Zelinsky, W (1971): "The Hypothesis of the Mobility Transition", *Geographical Review*, 61(2): 219-249.



## Tables and Figures

**Table 1: Internal Migration in India, 1991-2011.**

Year	Population (in millions)	Internal Migrants (in millions)	Percentage of Migrants
1991	838.5	225.8	26.9
2001	1018.5(1028.6)	307.6(309.4)	30.2(30.1)
2011	1198.3(1210.8)	447.1(449.9)	37.3(37.2)

Source: Authors' calculation using D-Series Census tables for the years 1991, 2001 and 2011.

Note: Figures in the parentheses are numbers and percentage including Jammu and Kashmir (J & K) for 2001 and 2011. There was no census in J&K during 1991 Census.

**Table 2: Internal Migration by Sex and Place of Residence in India, 2011.**

	Population (in Millions)			Internal Migrants (in Millions)			Percentage of Migrants		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Internal Migrants									
Rural	427.8	406.0	833.7	63.6	211.9	275.5	14.9	52.2	33.0
Urban	195.5	181.6	377.1	79.9	94.6	174.5	40.9	52.1	46.3
Total	623.3	587.6	1210.9	143.5	306.5	449.9	23.0	52.2	37.2

Source: Authors' calculation using D-Series Census tables for the years 1991, 2001 and 2011.

**Table 3: Internal Migration by Streams, India, 1991-2011.**

Stream	1991			2001			2011		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Rural to Rural	43.6	72.3	64.5	36.4	72.3	62.9	31.3	63.3	53.8
Rural to Urban	30.0	13.2	17.8	34.2	13.5	18.9	30.1	15.3	19.7
Urban to Rural	7.5	5.4	6.0	6.3	4.2	4.8	8.6	6.0	6.8
Urban to Urban	18.9	9.0	11.7	23.0	10.0	13.4	29.9	15.4	19.7
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Authors' calculation using D-Series Census tables for the years 1991, 2001 and 2011.

**Table 4: Reasons of Internal Migration in India, 1991-2011.**

Reasons of migration	1991			2001			2011		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Employment related reasons	27.8	1.8	8.8	28.5	1.7	9.5	24.1	2.1	9.1
Business	7.1	0.5	2.3	2.6	0.2	0.9	1.8	0.3	0.8
Education	5.0	0.8	2.0	2.6	0.4	1.1	2.3	0.7	1.2
<i>Moved with Family/Household</i>	26.5	10.7	15.0	18.9	10.9	13.2	20.0	11.5	14.2
Moved after birth	NA	NA	NA	10.2	3.0	5.1	13.9	4.5	7.5
Marriage	4.1	77.0	57.3	2.3	70.1	50.3	3.7	66.7	46.6
Natural Calamity	1.1	0.3	0.4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Others	28.4	8.9	14.2	34.9	13.7	19.9	34.2	14.2	20.6
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Authors' calculation using D-Series Census tables for the years 1991, 2001 and 2011.

**Table 5: Inter-State In-migration, Out-migration and Net Migration  
India, 1991-2011**

States	1991			2001			2011		
	In-migrants	Out-migrants	Net migrants	In-migrants	Out-migrants	Net migrants	In-migrants	Out-migrants	Net migrants
Andhra Pradesh	994141	1221574	-227433	1032753	1564768	-532015	1591890	2030004	-438114
Arunachal Pradesh	98653	36856	61797	136050	22803	113247	136010	37368	98642
Assam	487761	353296	134465	407141	708374	-301233	495699	659694	-163995
						-			
						364162			
Bihar	1031566	3024822	-1993256	1619031	5260659	8	1111954	7453803	-6341849
Chhattisgarh	NA	NA	NA	936415	862447	73968	1267668	693632	574036
						439645			
Delhi	3268691	573674	2695017	5324052	927593	9	6330065	1556308	4773757
Goa	155576	94915	60661	228869	91323	137546	269689	106196	163493
Gujarat	1465214	934959	530255	2182741	1346817	835924	3916075	1571862	2344213
Haryana	1579052	1425947	153105	2675920	1738559	937361	3626318	2315915	1310403
Himachal Pradesh	236830	344109	-107279	350834	435883	-85049	395504	535823	-140319
Jharkhand	NA	NA	NA	1730938	1473434	257504	2195521	1704827	490694
Karnataka	1600231	1425965	174266	2074471	1862289	212182	3247660	2502956	744704
Kerala	437087	963838	-526751	454259	1053407	-599148	654423	1291325	-636902
Madhya Pradesh	2457392	1486213	971179	2169350	2011922	157428	2744332	2979492	-235160
						516727			
Maharashtra	4059626	1772089	2287537	7313139	2145868	1	9087380	3068231	6019149
Manipur	15034	36823	-21789	14783	51903	-37120	20100	75751	-55651
Meghalaya	70318	54840	15478	83082	50852	32230	107915	70268	37647
Mizoram	9882	28326	-18444	35293	37993	-2700	41380	30365	11015
Nagaland	44088	24201	19887	81577	159281	-77704	108020	45734	62286
Odisha	592596	621338	-28742	662800	937148	-274348	855096	1271121	-416025
Punjab	1120282	1376248	-255966	1749122	1632410	116712	2488299	1740877	747422
Rajasthan	1470102	1951521	-481419	1741411	2609555	-868144	2604298	3756716	-1152418
Sikkim	23319	36628	-13309	46033	14819	31214	61163	21459	39704
Tamil Nadu	842996	1404758	-561762	727172	1668200	-941028	1650771	1985157	-334386
Tripura	41335	79231	-37896	63778	65655	-1877	87378	85862	1516
						-			
						643051			
Uttar Pradesh	1873515	5753754	-3880239	2824746	9255257	1	4061933	12319592	-8257659
Uttarakhand	NA	NA	NA	859598	893572	-33974	1250575	993570	257005
West Bengal	2005331	1139631	865700	2457162	1687690	769472	2381045	2405522	-24477
Andman and Nicobar Islands	77923	17155	60768	84380	13838	70542	81267	20700	60567
Chandigarh	392748	136640	256108	554474	207573	346901	633966	265645	368321
Dadra and Nagar Haveli	25603	16724	8879	67328	7717	59611	135602	16635	118967
Daman and Diu	19107	15492	3615	61272	12682	48590	124522	18906	105616
Lakshadweep	4200	10387	-6187	5561	1925	3636	6077	15680	-9603
Puducherry	189396	104134	85262	252727	102599	150128	339967	288834	51133

Source: Authors' calculation using D-Series Census tables for the years 1991, 2001 and 2011.

**Table 6: Percentage and Estimated number of households with at least one Circular Migrant, India, National Sample Survey, 1999-2000, 2007-2008 and 2013**

States	1999-2000						2007-2008						2013	
	Rural		Urban		Total		Rural		Urban		Total		Rural	
	%	Estimates	%	Estimates	%	Estimates	%	Estimates	%	Estimates	%	Estimates	%	Estimates
Andhra Pradesh	2.00	250,841	2.41	119,311	2.11	370,152	3.25	483,863	0.51	27,764	2.51	511,627	1.81	156,949
Arunachal Pradesh	1.04	1,344	6.14	906	1.56	2,250	7.06	11,597	5.83	3,230	<b>6.75</b>	14,827	<b>13.03</b>	21,631
Assam	2.83	101,218	4.22	22,669	3.01	123,887	5.25	241,290	4.29	24,765	<b>5.14</b>	266,055	3.32	174,028
Bihar	3.51	514,378	1.77	40,560	3.28	554,938	13.39	<b>1,824,844</b>	3.16	47,218	<b>12.38</b>	1,872,062	<b>11.97</b>	<b>1,683,103</b>
Chhattisgarh	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4.3	169,319	0.95	7,824	3.71	177,143	6.17	231,306
Delhi	0.00	0	0.83	16,690	0.61	16,690	0.6	1,233	1.01	30,233	0.98	31,466	NA	NA
Goa	1.14	1,650	2.16	3,060	1.65	4,710	3.61	5,327	0.55	1,041	1.89	6,368	5.71	5,726
Gujarat	3.86	226,099	0.83	24,892	2.84	250,991	7.41	488,576	1.64	69,360	<b>5.15</b>	557,936	4.77	280,282
Haryana	3.27	80,488	6.11	66,671	4.14	147,159	1.49	45,458	0.56	7,254	1.21	52,712	1.29	33,465
Himachal Pradesh	2.70	27,916	1.80	2,647	2.59	30,563	2.05	27,866	0.36	598	1.87	28,464	3.34	44,265
Jammu & Kashmir	1.22	13,580	1.06	2,949	1.19	16,529	6.75	87,166	2.53	7,468	<b>5.97</b>	94,634	6.01	82,673
Jharkhand	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	10.35	<b>431,464</b>	0.33	3,223	<b>8.45</b>	434,687	<b>15.89</b>	<b>596,190</b>
Karnataka	2.60	179,563	1.83	54,191	2.37	233,754	3.15	240,163	1.52	61,536	2.59	301,699	2.87	222,558
Kerala	3.23	140,386	3.39	54,245	3.28	194,631	1.89	103,573	0.97	17,817	1.66	121,390	2.21	113,359
Madhya Pradesh	5.19	567,433	2.06	67,327	4.47	634,760	8.44	<b>781,168</b>	1.55	46,877	<b>6.75</b>	828,045	9.58	<b>811,011</b>
Maharashtra	2.83	324,225	2.10	158,130	2.54	482,355	2.94	368,580	0.58	53,223	1.95	421,803	4.69	<b>587,459</b>
Manipur	0.40	858	0.35	247	0.39	1,105	1.37	4,190	1.35	1,588	1.36	5,778	2.59	6,698
Meghalaya	1.10	3,162	0.67	480	1.02	3,642	5.32	21,233	1.21	1,093	4.56	22,326	3.06	14,432
Mizoram	0.60	345	0.20	83	0.43	428	1.74	1,678	2.57	2,008	2.11	3,686	3.12	2,923
Nagaland	3.43	3,256	2.22	1,029	3.04	4,285	12.89	19,295	17.54	9,225	<b>14.10</b>	28,520	5.15	21,253
Odisha	3.18	197,941	1.17	15,173	2.83	213,114	4.32	306,812	1.58	20,083	3.91	326,895	5.87	458,215
Punjab	3.74	102,493	3.07	48,853	3.49	151,346	1.27	42,864	0.73	14,178	1.07	57,042	2.44	67,098
Rajasthan	3.24	204,627	1.95	38,608	2.94	243,235	5.86	<b>510,210</b>	1.29	35,627	4.76	545,837	<b>9.95</b>	<b>822,956</b>
Sikkim	2.64	2,179	3.70	384	2.76	2,563	1.25	1,388	0	0	1.07	1,388	0.23	266
Tamil Nadu	1.89	173,194	1.83	92,655	1.87	265,849	3.34	319,797	2.1	155,040	2.80	474,837	4.4	411,802
Telangana	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3.16	155,990
Tripura	1.49	7,526	1.80	1,590	1.53	9,116	1.09	7,328	1.43	2,344	1.15	9,672	3.24	21,530
Uttar Pradesh	3.41	756,515	3.31	204,895	3.39	961,410	6.18	<b>1,531,311</b>	1.41	99,412	<b>5.12</b>	1,630,723	6.99	<b>1,686,959</b>
Uttarakhand	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1.8	24,638	0.62	3,003	1.49	27,641	5.6	92,454
West Bengal	3.91	436,606	1.88	69,708	3.40	506,314	8.54	1,147,199	1.87	89,801	<b>6.79</b>	1,237,000	8.96	<b>1,266,190</b>
India	3.20	4,319,779	2.22	1,116,690	2.93	5,436,469	5.81	9,254,795	1.33	844,557	4.54	10,099,352	6.46	10,080,130

Source: Unit level data of 55th (1999-2000), 64th (2007-2008) and 70th (2013) rounds of National Sample Survey.

Notes: 1. Total of migrants of all states may not equal to the all-India figure because it also includes the migrants from union territories.

2. In the 55th round "a household member who stayed in the sample village/town for at least six months and who during the 365 days preceding the date of survey stayed away from the village or town (usual place of residence) for 60 days for either employment or in search of employment then this person was termed a temporary labour migrant; in the 64th round minimum duration of stay out of the village or town was 30 days; in the 70th round the minimum duration of stay out of the village or town was 15 days from the village.

3. \* In the 70th round (2013) only rural sample has been surveyed therefore estimates and migration rates are for rural areas only.

**Table 7: Percentage of Households with at least one Circular Migrant in India according to MPCE Quintiles and place of residence, NSS, 1999-2000, 2007-2008, 2013**

MPCE Quintiles	1999-2000			2007-2008			2013		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Lowest	4.46	2.11	4.11	9.59	2.27	8.88	NA	NA	NA
Lower	3.40	1.84	3.20	7.31	1.58	5.96	NA	NA	NA
Medium	3.23	2.58	2.82	5.58	1.15	4.16	NA	NA	NA
Higher	2.70	1.98	2.45	4.11	1.18	2.43	NA	NA	NA
Highest	2.57	2.47	2.45	2.46	0.50	1.26	NA	NA	NA
Total	3.20	2.22	2.93	5.81	1.33	4.54	NA	NA	NA

Source: Unit level data of 55th (1999-2000), 64th (2007-2008) and 70th (2013) of National Sample Survey.

Note: \*In the 70th round (2013) only rural sample has been surveyed therefore migration rates are for rural areas only and MHCE related questions were not asked to the respondents.

**Table 8: Percentage of Households with at least one Circular Migrant in India according to caste and place of residence, NSS, 1999-2000, 2007-2008, 2013**

Caste	1999-2000			2007-2008			2013		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Scheduled Tribes	5.34	1.87	4.92	8.43	1.33	7.74	8.83	NA	NA
Scheduled Castes	3.47	2.21	3.23	6.31	1.56	5.31	6.64	NA	NA
Other Backward Classes	2.67	2.66	2.67	5.53	1.57	4.53	6.35	NA	NA
Others	2.86	1.99	2.52	4.63	1.07	3.11	5.29	NA	NA
Total	3.20	2.22	2.93	5.81	1.33	4.54	6.46	NA	NA

Source: Unit level data of 55th (1999-2000), 64th (2007-2008) and 70th (2013) of National Sample Survey.

Note: \*In the 70th round (2013) only rural sample has been surveyed therefore migration rates are for rural areas only.