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## INTRODUCTION

In order to facilitate the preparation of area-specific programmes, with special emphasis on eight states that have been lagging behind in containing population growth(contributes $45 \%$ of the population of the country) to manageable limits, the Government of India has constituted an Empowered Action Group in the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare w.e.f. $20^{\text {th }}$ March,2001. It will explore the possibility of expanding the scope of social marketing of contraceptives in a manner that makes them easily accessible even while raising awareness levels and enhance performance particularly in states with below average socio-demographic indices that need focused attention. In preparation for the First Business Session of the EAG, the Department of Family Welfare has painstakingly prepared a comprehensive data set in respect of the 261 districts constituting these 8 states viz. Bihar, Jharkhand, Uttar Pradesh, Uttaranchal, Rajasthan, Orissa, Madhya Pradesh and Chhatisgarh. The trend of internal migration in those states is also important and its rank according to various development indicators. And as in India young people under age of 15-24 years constitute $35 \%$ of total population(2001 census ) so it is same in the EAG states and youth migration is an important indicator to understand the overall scenario of the states. Not only does this cohort represents India's future in the socio-economic and political realms but its experience will largely determine India's achievement of its goal of overall socio-economic development, population stabilization and harvesting its demographic dividend. According to many scholars migration in general and youth migration in particular has its immense importance as a development parameter since migration and development are inter-linked.

Migration is the geographic movement of people across a specified boundary for the purpose of establishing a new permanent or semi-permanent residence. Along with fertility and mortality, migration is a component of the population change. A migrant is classified both on the basis of place of birth as well as by place of last residence.

Usually place of last residence is more widely used to distinguish migrants from nonmigrants as it is a better indicator than place of birth. A person is considered as migrant by place of last residence, if the place in which he/she is enumerated during the census is other than his/her place of immediate last residence. By capturing the latest of the migrations in cases where persons have migrated more than once, this concept would give a better picture of current migration scenario (Census, 2001).

Migration is the barometer of changing socio-economic and political conditions at the regional, national and international levels. It is also a sign of wide disparities in economic and social conditions between the origin and destination places (UNFPA, 1993)

Migration is age and sex selective and labor migration is highly selective. Most of the workers are in young age group and in working age group. Migration is a selective process which involves some population sub-groups more than the other.

Ravensteins's laws were the early attempt to summarize some of the distinctive characteristics of the migrants focusing mainly on their demographic circumstances. Migrant's age schedule are often plotted to demonstrate the rate of increase in movement of the migrants in their whole life and it resulted into the increase in migration in specific young age group.

One important facet of population is the study of migration arising out of various social, economic and political reasons. For a large country like India, the study of movement of youth population under age group $15-24$ years in different parts of the country helps in understanding the dynamics of the society better. At this junction in the economic development of the country, especially when many states are undergoing faster economic development, particularly in areas, such as, manufacturing, information technology or service sectors, data on migration profile of population has become more important (Census 2001). With faster economic development, modernization, better transportation and shrinking of physical space,
population mobility is going to increase and becoming more complex in the years to come.

The history of migration is the history of people's struggle to survive and to prosper, to escape insecurity and poverty, and to move in response to opportunity. The economist J.K. Galbraith describes migration as "the oldest action against poverty". Worldwide 175 million people or just less than three percent of the total population live outside their country of birth.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Today throughout the world migration is contributing to economic and social development by enabling man to overcome the primary policy objective of regional science. The role played by migration in socio-economic development requires one to view it historically, since its form and role have changed somewhat over time. Migration is an equilibrating process serving to improve relations between man's numbers and his physical environment or to reduce disparity between communities or regions in different stages of development or to give rise to an increase in the overall productivity of the factorial equipment of a region or country (Spengler and Myers, 1977).

A study by Voices of Youth (UNICEF, 1995) shows that youth migration is driven by bad socio-economic conditions such as low wages, high rates of unemployment, underemployment in rural areas and poverty. Various other factors can also promote migration. "The main causes for youth migration are obviously the economic conditions and the prospects for the youth in a particular region" ( Kartik Madhira, 1995).

A study done by Scarlett Epstein (2007) on rural-urban youth migration in South India found increasing village population in a setting of limited land availability as well as the scarcity of water and a virtual absence of off-farm income-earning opportunities in rural areas. It was coupled with the well-documented urban bias in development illustrated by the rural-urban differential in the availability of schools, hospitals etc which jointly constitute the causes of the ever-increasing rate of rural-
urban migration. It is the "push" rather than the "pull" factor that induces villagers to migrate to cities."

According to a study by Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO, UN, 2001) migration to urban areas seems attractive to rural youth who are taught urban values through the education systems and see the limited employment opportunities in the rural areas. The massive migration from villages to towns, from towns to cities, and overseas to look for employment, has resulted in problems of urban congestion in cities such as Nairobi, Harare and Addis Ababa, though as yet, not on the scale of the huge urban centres of Asia and Latin America such as Calcutta, Manila, Bangkok, Santiago and Mexico City. Pressure on services in the cities of Africa however, is also increasing and plans and policies for youth in general and rural youth in particular are urgently needed since they are the main contributors to urban migration.

The study conducted by Ministry of Human Resource and Development, 2004 (NSSO $55^{\text {th }}$ round, 2000) reported that the Asian demographic trends tend to parallel those in South Asia with high growth rates, strong rural to urban migration and a very youthful population with almost $60 \%$ under 24 years of age. Approximately 20 per cent of the population falls between the ages of 15 and 24 . Farm incomes continue to be low for small-scale producers and family members often look for off-farm employment opportunities. Rural education is, in many cases, failing to address the needs of rural youth who need to learn about becoming self-reliant in their small communities. Increasing numbers of young people are feeling the effects of rural poverty and they are migrating to urban centres or to work in neighbouring countries in the region in the hope that their lives and those of their children will be improved. Of particular concern is the lack of appropriate educational and employment opportunities for rural young women. The situation and needs of rural youth in the countries in the near East region vary widely and this strongly supports the $F A O$ approach of defining the needs in each country before attempting to assist with strengthening programmes for rural youth and young farmers. The study further shows that more women are entering the workforce, but they have higher unemployment and are disproportionately represented in the lowest educational and job categories.

The studies done by National Labor Institute (2005) report that more than $80 \%$ of migrants have no formal education or dropped out before secondary school. In each report of Delhi and Mumbai, net migration is 500,000 in 2004. About $89 \%$ of the migrants are from rural areas and over $50 \%$ of migrants, both male and female, are between 15-25 years old.

According to another study (Mathur, 2008) youth forms 14-20\% of Asia's total population. As urbanization gains momentum in Asian countries - the United Nations predicts that the level of urbanization will rise from the current level of $39.9 \%$ to $54.5 \%$ by 2030 (UN, 2003). The numbers of youth will increase to about 460 million by the year 2030. Given the levels of education among youth and the activity rates in the age group of 15-24 years, the youth have a potentially large impact on the growth, poverty, education and MDG goals and objectives in Asian countries. Indian census data during 1991-2001 suggests that $29.9 \%$ of the total rural-urban migrants are in the 15-24 age-group. Migration of youth is an important factor in shaping cities and towns. Youth play an important part in urban economic growth.

According to Long (1988), young adult were much more mobile than people of other ages although the data is for United States but it holds the pattern mostly round the world.

According to Lee(1966), migration is selective in terms of age and sex i.e. not everyone migrates, only a selected proportion of population in selective age groups migrate. The heightened propensity to migrates at certain stages of the life cycle is important in selection of migration.
Table 1: Size and growth rates of migrants by type of migration, India, 1971-2001

| Type of migration | Size <br> 2001 <br> (in <br> million) | Percentage <br> distribution <br> $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | Growth rate in percent |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 24.9 | 8.3 | 37 |
| Intra-district | 74.6 | 23.7 | 44.3 | 13.7 | 26.3 |
| Inter-District | 41.1 | 13.1 | 28.1 | 11.7 | 53.6 |
| Inter state | 5.1 | 1.6 | -9.1 | -6.1 | -13.4 |
| International Migration | 314.3 | 100 | 27 | 9.8 | 34.7 |
| All Migrants |  |  |  |  |  |

Sources: Geography and You, January-February, 2010, Population Studies India's Internal Migration - Dr. R.B. Bhagat.

As per 2001 census, the total internal migrants in India were 309 million based on the place of last residence. Although number of internal migration has doubled since 1971, the proportion has been around $30 \%$ except 1991 census when it declined to $27 \%$. It is generally accepted that migration has been slowed down during the decade 1981-91 as the result of increased unemployment and sluggish growth in Indian economy. However, the recent migration trend emerging from Census 2001 shows that migration has picked up during 1991-2001 after India's economic liberalization was initiated in 1991.

Table 2: Migration by the place of last residence, INDIA, 2001

| Migration by the place of last <br> residence | Population in <br> million | Population in <br> percentage (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Total migrants by last residence | 314.5 | 100 |
| Duration less than 1 year | 8.8 | 3 |
| Duration 1 to 4 years | 47.2 | 15 |
| Duration 5 to 9 years | 42.1 | 13 |
| Duration 10 to 19 years | 69.4 | 22 |
| Duration 20 years and above | 101 | 32 |
| Duration not stated | 45.6 | 14 |

Source: Census 2001, Data Highlights

A substantial proportion among the total migrants (101 million) had migrated at least 20 years back. About 98.3 million ( $31 \%$ ) reported as migrants, had migrated over the last decade (i.e., duration 0-9 years). About 8.8 million or three percent of the population migrated with the duration of less than one year.

## NEED OF THE STUDY

Youth migration primarily occurs due to the lack of employment and other facilities at the place of origin. Less development and regional disparities are also the main cause
of youth migration in India. In EAG states the youth Migration plays a very important role to show the socio-economic scenario of the state. So by analyzing the picture of these states in particular , policy implication can be done according to the earnest need for the development of these states. The factors which attract the youth migration are the employment opportunity, better living standard and higher level of educational facilities at the destination place for financially supporting the family members of the migrants in his/her originating place. The lack of employment opportunities in the rural areas and better employment prospects and infrastructure facilities in the urban areas motivate people to migrate to urban areas in EAG states. Underdevelopment, unavailability of resources, poverty and low wages in rural areas push the people to migrate developed areas. In India there is lack of data on migration in general and youth migration in EAG states in particular. The available literature on migration of youth is also scanty. Census is the primary source of information about migrants in India. It is only in every ten years that we get an opportunity to know about the overall migration scenario in India by studying the census data. The 2001 census data on migration has been published. It is important to know what has happened to the migration pattern during the last decade especially after the era of liberalization, privatization and globalization started in 1991. It was expected that this shift in economic policy would bring about a change in the pattern of migration in India in general and youth in particular. Hence, it was felt that there is a need to analyze the recent census data on migration of youth which might throw some light on the pattern of inter-state migration in the context of development and regional disparity focusing mainly on the eight EAG states. The present study is a humble attempt in that direction.

## OBJECTIVES

This study has the following three major objectives.

1. To study spatial patterns of youth migration in EAG states along with other states in India.
2. To understand characteristics of youth migration
3. To establish possible linkages between youth migration and development in EAG states in India.

## DATA AND METHODS

This study is based on 2001 census data. Migrants by place of last residence are analyzed. The development variables are collected from various sources like report of Planning Commission, Census of India, Central Statistical Organization and CMIE reports.

In this analysis, two rates namely in-migration rate and out-migration rate have been computed. These have been computed separately for both males and females in two age groups i.e. 15-24 years or youth and for all ages according to 2001 census.

In-migration rate may be defined as the number of migrants enumerated in the state, who have come from other states of the same country, per hundred enumerated population of the state of destination.

## Volume of in-migration to the state <br> In-migration rate $=$ <br> Total enumerated mid-year population of the state

Out-migration rate may be defined as the number of persons who have migrated out of the state to other states of the country, per hundred enumerated population of the origin state.

Out-migration rate $=\frac{\text { Volume of out migration from the state }}{\text { Total enumerated mid-year population of the state }} * 100$

Sex Ratio $=$ Female per 1000 Males.
In the present paper simple percentage distribution, rates and ratios have been used to describe the inter-state migration pattern. Maps have been used to portray the spatial pattern of migration flow. Statistical method of correlation and linear regression has been used to find the linkage between development, underdevelopment and youth migration in India.

Migration variables: a) Volume of migration, b) Rate of migration, c) Share of the state's total migration to country's total migration.

Development variables: 1) Percent below poverty line, 2) Per-capita income, 3) Percent urban population, 4) Female literacy rate, 5) Per capita bank deposit, 6) Public
\& private investment, 7) Per capita net state domestic product at current prices, 8)Per capita bank credit to industry, 9)Percent in service sector to the total main workers, 10) Percent in manufacturing sector to the total main workers, 11)Percent of agricultural laborer. The four dependent variables are 1)Volume of In-migration, 2)Volume of out-migration, 3) Rate of In-migration and 4)Rate of Out-migration and the rest 11 development variables are taken as independent variables.

Cartographic techniques have been used to study the flow of the migration streams

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

## PATTERNS OF MIGRATION

In this study of youth migration through the migration matrix we get the volume of migration from 2001 census for the particular age group 15-24 years. In table no. 3,4, 5,6 and 7 the total migration by sex are shown. The table shows the volume of total, male and female in-migrants from other states and total out migrants to these states. The rate and share of sex-wise in-migration and out-migration are also shown. The intra-state migration with respect to age and sex with percentages or share of total intra-state migrants are shown to enrich the study by knowing the flow of the youth migrants in India and focusing mainly the eight EAG states, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Uttaranchal, Jharkhand, Orissa, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh and Chattisgarh.. The sex ratio of both in-migration and out-migration are also shown for the youth age groups i.e. 15-24 years.

In-Migration: The table no.3, 4 and 5 shows the volume of in-migrant and out migrants from other state, the rates and the share of total in-migrants and out-migrants for total as well as by sex. From the table it is clearly seen that volume of in-migration and rate of in-migration according to the total population is high in Maharashtra, Delhi, Haryana, Gujarat, Punjab, Karnataka, West Bengal,. The total in-migrants to other states is highest in Maharashtra i.e. 1000802 persons ( 648127 male migrants and 352075 females migrants). The rate of total migration is directly proportional to the population size of the states and Union territories of India. The states and UTs having higher rate of migration are Daman \& Diu (45.89\%), Nagar Haveli (35.06\%), Chandigarh ( $36.31 \%$ ) and Delhi ( $22.66 \%$ ). Among states the rate of in-migration is high in Haryana (8.93\%), Arunachal Pradesh (8.68), Sikkim (6.09\%), Uttaranchal
$(5.60 \%)$ and Maharashtra (5.43\%). Whereas the total lowest in-migration is in Manipur i.e. total 688 in-migrants ( 449 males and 239 females) followed by Mizoram, Tripura and Meghalaya. The lowest rate of in-migration is found in Manipur, Tamil Nadu, Assam, Andhra Pradesh and Jammu and Kashmir and mainly in the EAG states. In Haryana, the female ( $12.05 \%$ ) in-migration is higher than males $(6.44 \%)$. Other states following the same trend are Uttaranchal, Uttar Pradesh, etc. Overall rate of in-migration is more among males than among female population in India.

Thus, the note worthy feature is that migration occurs as a response to human developments in levels of socio-economic development over the national space In general, movements are mostly from economically less developed regions focussing EAG states and Union territories to relatively more developed regions.

Share of total in migration: The major urban, administrative and business centers of developed states attract the migrants from the rural agricultural areas of backward states namely Chhattisgarh, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan etc. So, the shares of total inmigrants are high in Maharashtra (19.88\%), Delhi (12.85\%), Haryana (7.47\%), Uttar Pradesh (7.10\%), Gujarat (6.79\%), Karnataka (5.41\%) and Punjab (4.83\%). The male share of in-migration is higher than the females. The lowest share of in-migration is found in Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Orissa, Manipur, Sikkim, Mizoram and in Andaman and Nicobar Island according to 2001 census.

Out-migration: The table no. 3, 4 and 5 show the trends and patterns of in-migration as has been discussed earlier. Same way, it shows the states and union territories where the volume of outmigration and rate of out migration is highest according to the total population of the states. The volume of out-migration is high in Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh and Orissa i.e. mainly the EAG States and few union territories. The volume of out migration is low in Lakshadweep, Andaman Nicobar Island, Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Daman and Diu, Sikkim and Meghalaya.

The rate of out-migration is high in Chandigarh, Uttaranchal, Bihar, Jharkhand, Mizoram and Uttar Pradesh. The rate of outmigration is low in Tripura, Gujarat, Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh. The lowest rate is in Tripura (1.01\%). The volume and rate of male outmigration is more than female out-migration.

This pattern of out-migration is directly linked with the rate development in those states. In EAG states the rate and volume of out-migration is high due to sick
industries, underdeveloped agriculture, transport and communication facilities. The reason for low rate of out-migration is mainly better economy of the state. But in states like Tripura the main cause of low out migration is undeveloped transport connectivity.

Share of total out migrant: The share of out migration is high in the EAG (Empowered Action Group) States (Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh) and main reason behind this is poverty, stagnant economy, and low human development. The share of low migration is found in Lakshawadeep, Arunachal Pradesh, Pondicherry, Sikkim and other union territories.

Intra-state flow of migration stream: The intra state migrations are high in the states of Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, West Bengal, Gujarat and Madhya Pradesh. The highest intra- state migration is found in Maharashtra (15.69\%) for all ages and for the youth migration the intra-state migration is high in Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Bihar. The share of total intrastate migration is highest in Uttar Pradesh (14.92\%). The female migration is comparatively higher than males mostly in all states except in Chandigarh in 1524 years of age group.

The intra-state migration is low in Delhi, Chandigarh, Arunachal Pradesh, Sikkim, Andaman and Nicobar Island etc and is negligible in Chandigarh in both age groups.

Sex ratio of migrants: Over all sex ratio of in-migration are very much female dominated for all ages and youth migrants. It is high in Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Jharkhand Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Pondicherry, Andhra Pradesh, Orissa and Chhattisgarh. Among the youth migrants and all ages the out- migration is high among males. It may be due to single male migration for employment, education etc. And for females, marriages are the main reason of in-migration. The table 7 shows the sex ratio of all the states and union territories of India under 15-24 years of age group.

## CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH MIGRATION:

The characteristics of youth migration are shown on table 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12. And table D-4, D-5, D-6, D-7 and D-10 are taken from Census 2001 to understand the characteristics of youth migration in India.

Educational attainment of migrants: According to the table no. 8, the educational attainment of migrants of all ages and 15-24 years (youth migrants) are analysed. Out
of 314541350 populations of all ages $48.25 \%$ are illiterate among which male is $25.76 \%$ and female is $57.75 \%$. Among the youth total population 54787460 population $32.15 \%$ total population are illiterate among which male is $12.06 \%$ and female is $41.09 \%$. The percentage of literate is $67.85 \%$ for the youth migrants but male literacy is dominated over female literacy. Out of total population $58.03 \%$ of female are literate below matric or secondary examination where as in all ages $65.90 \%$ of female are on the same category. This table analyse that the literacy rate of youth migrants are high all over but have its deficit in technical degree or post graduate as mostly don't fulfil the age criteria of post-graduation and are not taken under consideration to count as the youth age is fixed. The male is more literate than female on every group of educational level. It may be because the female migrants are coming from the interior part of India and are prone to early marriages which squeezed the educational level of women.

Reasons for Migration: According to the table no.9, the main reasons for migration are work/ employment, business, education, marriage, moved after birth, moved with house hold. For work and employment $10.25 \%$ of youth population migrate where as $9 \%$ population migrate for employment. Among youth migrants, male population is in more percentage i.e. $34.29 \%$ rather than female as this scenario is in every reason, Education ( $14.90 \%$ male), Business ( $0.23 \%$ ), moved after birth ( $24.74 \%$ ), moved with household ( $50.21 \%$ ) and for other reasons ( $67.68 \%$ ) except marriage as the reason of migration as $97.73 \%$ of female. The scenario is same under the migrants of all ages.

Types of Economic Activity: The economic activity of migrants is mainly categorized under three types, Main Workers, Marginal worker and Non- Workers. Among this the last two types of workers are sub-divided into two parts, total and seeking /available for job. As our main focus is on youth migration so according to the table no. 10 , out of total migrants $42.71 \%$ are main worker who get employment throughout the year among which $85.93 \%$ are male and $28.26 \%$ are female. The percentage of total marginal worker is $23.9 \%$ and under the category of seeking or availability is $7.97 \%$. Among the non worker the total percentage is $92.81 \%$ and under seeking and available category it is $17.59 \%$. In the marginal and non-worker category the share of female is high and probable reason are illiteracy, low educational attainment, unskilled and gender disparity. Overall, the percentages of marginal and
non worker are high due to the above probable reasons and also due to the lack of opportunity and high unemployment.

Educational Attainment of Migrants reporting Employment as the Reason for Migration: Table no. 11 shows educational attainment of migrants reporting employment as the reason for migration. Here only those migrants are taken who migrated seeking employment. So according to the table, $27.79 \%$ of the total employed youth population is illiterate (among males it is 20.3\% and among females it is $50 \%$ ). The total literacy among those youths who moved for employment is $72.21 \%$ and male's literacy is always higher than females.

Marital Status of Migrants: The table no. 12 shows the marital status of migrants. The marital status are categorizes under four main groups. They are never married, currently married, widowed, divorced and separated. Under the never married category the percentage of male is more ( $69.8 \%$ ) than female ( $10.28 \%$ ) among youth migrants. In India the youth migration is dominated by single male migration that mostly migrates for employment. Other than this category in other three categories, it is dominated by females mostly for social reasons like marriage

## LINKAGES BETWEEN YOUTH MIGRATION AND

## DEVELOPMENT IN INDIA (Focusing on the EAG states):

Table 13, 15 and 17 provides the basic information on the socio-economic background of major states of India mainly focusing on the EAG states according to total, male and female migration.
(1) Population living below poverty line is an important indicator of development in India. There is great variation among states in percent of BPL i.e. Punjab (6), Haryana (7) and HP (8) have very low level of BPL. On the other hand, mainly EAG states states like Orissa (48), Bihar (44) have higher per cent under BPL. This describes the wide regional disparities in development within the country.
(2) Per capita income is another important indicator which reflects the level of development condition. Here, it can be observed that per capita incomes in EAG states Bihar $(6,015)$ and UP $(9,895)$ are very much low compared to other states like Punjab $(25,652)$ and Haryana $(26,632)$.
(3) The level of urbanization is also an important indicator of level of development. Within India, there is great variation in level of urbanization, i.e. particularly in EAG states like Bihar: 11\%, Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Assam: $13 \%$ and HP: $10 \%$. Level of urbanization is low. On the other hand, Maharashtra: $42 \%$ and Tamil Nadu: $44 \%$ indicate great variation among states.
(4) Female literacy is also very good indicator to shows socio-economic development. Here, we also see that, Bihar (34\%), UP (43\%) and other EAG states indicate very low level of female literacy. On the other hand, we see states like Kerala ( $88 \%$ ), Maharashtra (68\%) and HP (68\%) which indicate higher female literacy.
(5) Percent of agricultural laborer also indicate the level of development. Here, the relationship between agricultural laborers and development is negative. The table shows that Bihar and MP and other EAG states have much higher percentage of labors engaged in agricultural sector. During the same time Kerala and Punjab have been showing very less percent of labors engaged in agriculture.
(6) Per capita bank deposit of Bihar $(3,548)$, Orissa $(5,292)$ and Rajasthan $(5,863)$ reveals that it is very low in comparison with Maharashtra $(25,166)$ and Punjab $(22,587)$.
(7) Public and Private Investment create more industries as well as job opportunities. Table 14 shows that Gujarat $(171,399)$, Maharashtra $(169,855)$ and AP $(162,416)$ have very high amount of public and private investment. On the other hand, Bihar $(23,634)$ and Rajasthan $(38,194)$ show low amount of investment.
(8) Per capita net state domestic product in Bihar $(5,445)$ and UP $(9,749)$ shows very low compared to others. On the other hand Maharashtra and Punjab have high per capita net state domestic product.
(9) Data shows that in states like Assam, Bihar and Haryana, percentage share of persons engaged in manufacturing is very low (from 7 percent to 15 percent), while in Maharashtra and Gujarat, it is very high.
(10) Per capita bank credit to industry indicates great variation among the states in India. Bihar (304), Assam (386) and Orissa (373) have low bank credit. On the other hand, Maharashtra $(5,708)$ and Tamil Nadu $(3,375)$ have very high amount of bank credit to industry.

According to table no. $14,16 \& 18$ the 11, possible developmental indicators are taken as mentioned earlier. The Pearson's Correlation Matrix of youth migration relates volume and rate of youth migration with socio-economic indicators of sixteen major states of India separately for total, male and female migration.

Volume of in-migration: The volume of in-migration shows that the percentage urban (.538* \%) and per capita bank deposit ( $0.498^{*} \%$ ) is highly positively correlated on the basis of 0.01 level at significance. Per capita bank credit to industry ( $0.742^{* *} \%$ ) is highly positively correlated with volume of migration on the basis of 0.05 level of significance. Same significance is shown in case of males but in case of females none of the socio-economic factors are significant to relate volume of in-migration. Thus we can relate that when in a state or union territory urban population is high or per capita bank deposit is high or per capita bank credit to industry is high, then in that state volume of in-migration is also very high due to the growth of economy and higher opportunities to lead a good life is also high.

Volume of out-migration: The volume of out migration is negatively correlated with per capita income $\left(-0.557^{*}\right)$, female literacy rate $\left(-0.612^{*}\right)$ and per capita NSDP ($.0 .575^{*}$ ) at 0.05 level of significance. Thus we can relate that when a state has low per capita income, low female literacy rate and low per capita net state domestic product( at current price NSDP), then the volume of out-migration will be high. In case of males same are significant but in case of females only female literacy is negatively significant and correlated to volume of out-migration. Thus it means that mainly in the EAG states the development indicators and that is why the volume of youth out-migration will be high in those states.

Rate of in-migration: The rate of in-migration is negatively correlated with percentage of people below poverty line (BPL) $\left(-0.520^{*}\right)$ and positively correlated with per capita income $\left(0.678^{* *}\right)$, per capita bank deposit ( $0.510^{*}$ ) and per capita net state domestic product at current price ( $0.650^{* *}$ ). Thus we can interpret that poverty is negatively related with in-migration implying that the states having high poverty level do not experience high rate of in-migration. The other three factors are positively correlated at (**) 0.01 level of significance and at (*) 0.05 level of significance. This implies that the states which have high level of per capita income, per capita bank deposit and per capita NSDP have witnessed high rate of in-migration
due to the higher growth and development in those states. It is same in case of male and female youth migration indicators.

Rate of out-migration: The rate of out-migration negatively correlates with percentage urban, female literacy and public \& private investment. Thus we can infer from the table that EAG states has low level of urbanization, low female literacy rate as well as low public and private investment, then it means that the state is backward and under developed due to which the rate of out-migration is high. It is same in case of males but in case of females, public and private Investment is negatively correlated and highly significant.

## SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

1) Areas with urban centers, major metropolitan cities, administrative head quarters, and business sectors attract the migrants from EAG states where employment opportunities are very less. Maharashtra and Delhi witnessed largest in-migration of population during the last ten years from different states. Maharashtra received 20 percent and Delhi received 13percent share of total in-migration from the various states of India.
2) On the other hand, EAG states like U.P and Bihar are the two most important states where share of the total out-migration is highest, U.P. - 23 percentage and Bihar 13 percentage of share in total out-migration of the country.
3) In some of the states like Haryana, Gujarat, Maharashtra, Punjab, Delhi, etc there is significant in-migration as well as out-migration. Development may be responsible for both in and out migration.
4). In 2001 census gives an opposite picture of sex ratio of the migrants in some states. EAG states like U.P and Bihar show very peculiar picture. Sex ratio of inmigration is very much female dominated on the other hand out-migration is very much male dominated. It can be clarified as female migration is mainly intra district dominated of a particular state where as out-migration is mainly interstate dominated I male.
4) There is a negative relationship between rate of in-migration and poverty. That means if the level of poverty is high, there will be less in-migration to these states, when level of poverty declines and per capita bank deposit, per capita bank credit to
industries increase, there will be more in migration. It means increasing economic development will ultimately attract more migrants.
5) The volume of in-migration is positively correlated with percentage of urban, per capita bank deposit and per capita bank credit to industry. It indicates that those states which have high percentage of urban population, high capita bank deposit and high bank credit to industry will have high volume of in-migration.
6) Regional disparity in development influences flow of inter-state migration streams. The Youths mostly migrate from socio-economically backward states (EAG states) like Uttar Pradesh and Bihar to more prosperous states like Maharashtra, Delhi etc.

India is a very old country with a young very population. Migration is essential for development. Youths constitute a very significant proportion of the total population. Among the total migrant population, the youths constitute the most important component as it is the young and energetic who venture out to newer destination in search of employment and livelihood. Most of them are absorbed in low quality unskilled and semi-skilled jobs. There is high regional disparity in the spatial pattern of flow of migration. Youths from EAG states like Uttar Pradesh and Bihar migrate to more prosperous states like Maharashtra and Delhi. Therefore, there is need for more balanced regional development. There should be more focus on development in EAG states which experience high distress out-migration. Also there should be more focus on development in those states which experience high distress out-migration. Also there should be policy to increase the educational level and skill of the migrants so that migrants can be absorbed in high paid skilled jobs resulting in vertical mobility of the youth rather than the present horizontal mobility in EAG sates. Thus the development of the country will be equal and regional disparity will be less..
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Table 3: Rate and share of youth in-migration and out - migration (Total)-EAG India, 2001(0-9 years)

| States | Total mid year population | Total in migrants from other states | Total out migrants to other states | Rate of in <br> Migration | Rate of out Migration | Share of Total in Migrants(\%) | Share of Total out Migrants(\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | 2037050 | 17047 | 27641 | 0.84 | 1.36 | 0.34 | 0.55 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 1209653 | 52827 | 40044 | 4.37 | 3.31 | 1.05 | 0.80 |
| Punjab | 4895084 | 242979 | 126103 | 4.96 | 2.58 | 4.83 | 2.51 |
| Chandigarh | 196809 | 71,460 | 23279 | 36.31 | 11.83 | 1.42 | 0.46 |
| Uttaranchal | 1672399 | 93737 | 97572 | 5.60 | 5.83 | 1.86 | 1.94 |
| Haryana | 4213862 | 376151 | 189791 | 8.93 | 4.50 | 7.47 | 3.77 |
| Delhi | 2854839 | 646963 | 110936 | 22.66 | 3.89 | 12.85 | 2.20 |
| Rajasthan | 10239580 | 253192 | 333354 | 2.47 | 3.26 | 5.03 | 6.62 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 29356815 | 357419 | 1199759 | 1.22 | 4.09 | 7.10 | 23.83 |
| Bihar | 13513381 | 111632 | 749722 | 0.83 | 5.55 | 2.22 | 14.89 |
| Sikkim | 118615 | 7226 | 1922 | 6.09 | 1.62 | 0.14 | 0.04 |
| Arunachal Pradesh | 196594 | 17061 | 3456 | 8.68 | 1.76 | 0.34 | 0.07 |
| Nagaland | 476034 | 8946 | 16286 | 1.88 | 3.42 | 0.18 | 0.32 |
| Manipur | 460460 | 688 | 10961 | 0.15 | 2.38 | 0.01 | 0.22 |
| Mizoram | 192318 | 7023 | 7976 | 3.65 | 4.15 | 0.14 | 0.16 |
| Tripura | 613526 | 9228 | 6191 | 1.50 | 1.01 | 0.18 | 0.12 |
| Meghalaya | 444967 | 9836 | 5325 | 2.21 | 1.20 | 0.20 | 0.11 |
| Assam | 4925931 | 29220 | 78942 | 0.59 | 1.60 | 0.58 | 1.57 |
| West Bengal | 14700051 | 198301 | 241859 | 1.35 | 1.65 | 3.94 | 4.80 |
| Jharkhand | 4649357 | 152160 | 198112 | 3.27 | 4.26 | 3.02 | 3.94 |
| Orissa | 6721577 | 65239 | 150045 | 0.97 | 2.23 | 1.30 | 2.98 |
| Chhattisgarh | 3603212 | 87088 | 112170 | 2.42 | 3.11 | 1.73 | 2.23 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 10858633 | 261304 | 271847 | 2.41 | 2.50 | 5.19 | 5.40 |
| Gujarat | 10023019 | 341557 | 117021 | 3.41 | 1.17 | 6.79 | 2.32 |
| Daman \& Diu | 42513 | 19509 | 1597 | 45.89 | 3.76 | 0.39 | 0.03 |
| Dadra \& Nagar Haveli | 46999 | 16479 | 1123 | 35.06 | 2.39 | 0.33 | 0.02 |
| Maharashtra | 18427308 | 1000802 | 222152 | 5.43 | 1.21 | 19.88 | 4.41 |
| Andhra Pradesh | 14516861 | 119996 | 184587 | 0.83 | 1.27 | 2.38 | 3.67 |
| Karnataka | 10267897 | 272401 | 204415 | 2.65 | 1.99 | 5.41 | 4.06 |
| Goa | 267047 | 29390 | 6473 | 11.01 | 2.42 | 0.58 | 0.13 |
| Lakshadweep | 11864 | 934 | 406 | 7.87 | 3.42 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| Kerala | 5968496 | 53856 | 110711 | 0.90 | 1.85 | 1.07 | 2.20 |
| Tamil Nadu | 11985151 | 68306 | 173369 | 0.57 | 1.45 | 1.36 | 3.44 |
| Pondicherry | 195382 | 25828 | 7166 | 13.22 | 3.67 | 0.51 | 0.14 |
| A \& N Islands | 76738 | 8142 | 1614 | 10.61 | 2.10 | 0.16 | 0.03 |
| Total | 189980022 | 5033927 | 5033927 | 260.81 | 103.78 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

Source: Census 2001, D series, n.b. : Foccusing Eag states

Table 4:Youth - Rate and share of in-migration and out - migration (Male) - EAG states, India, 2001

| States | Total Male population | Total in migrants from other states | Total out migrants to other states | Rate of in <br> Migration | Rate of out Migration | Share of Total in Migrants | Share of Total out Migrants |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | 1068801 | 9265 | 18523 | 0.87 | 1.73 | 0.36 | 0.72 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 620021 | 30692 | 18316 | 4.95 | 2.95 | 1.19 | 0.71 |
| Punjab | 2649447 | 140240 | 40456 | 5.29 | 1.53 | 5.45 | 1.57 |
| Chandigarh | 115456 | 42,608 | 10794 | 36.90 | 9.35 | 1.66 | 0.42 |
| Uttaranchal | 857618 | 41162 | 48834 | 4.80 | 5.69 | 1.60 | 1.90 |
| Haryana | 2346757 | 151079 | 43991 | 6.44 | 1.87 | 5.87 | 1.71 |
| Delhi | 1631103 | 385544 | 39193 | 23.64 | 2.40 | 14.98 | 1.52 |
| Rajasthan | 5458547 | 73018 | 137531 | 1.34 | 2.52 | 2.84 | 5.34 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 15951061 | 89427 | 732319 | 0.56 | 4.59 | 3.47 | 28.45 |
| Bihar | 7208706 | 163065 | 490498 | 2.26 | 6.80 | 6.34 | 19.06 |
| Sikkim | 62206 | 4177 | 975 | 6.71 | 1.57 | 0.16 | 0.04 |
| Arunachal Pradesh | 102070 | 9481 | 1982 | 9.29 | 1.94 | 0.37 | 0.08 |
| Nagaland | 250144 | 5608 | 14570 | 2.24 | 5.82 | 0.22 | 0.57 |
| Manipur | 228928 | 449 | 6050 | 0.20 | 2.64 | 0.02 | 0.24 |
| Mizoram | 98094 | 4809 | 4085 | 4.90 | 4.16 | 0.19 | 0.16 |
| Tripura | 309372 | 4075 | 3221 | 1.32 | 1.04 | 0.16 | 0.13 |
| Meghalaya | 221303 | 5151 | 2201 | 2.33 | 0.99 | 0.20 | 0.09 |
| Assam | 2526233 | 13751 | 45343 | 0.54 | 1.79 | 0.53 | 1.76 |
| West Bengal | 7640105 | 83317 | 145364 | 1.09 | 1.90 | 3.24 | 5.65 |
| Jharkhand | 2438264 | 40446 | 120898 | 1.66 | 4.96 | 1.57 | 4.70 |
| Orissa | 3361184 | 22305 | 95928 | 0.66 | 2.85 | 0.87 | 3.73 |
| Chhattisgarh | 1836217 | 31221 | 51640 | 1.70 | 2.81 | 1.21 | 2.01 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 5849413 | 69386 | 81877 | 1.19 | 1.40 | 2.70 | 3.18 |
| Gujarat | 5295022 | 225881 | 53528 | 4.27 | 1.01 | 8.78 | 2.08 |
| Daman \& Diu | 28727 | 16025 | 889 | 55.78 | 3.09 | 0.62 | 0.03 |
| Dadra \& Nagar Haveli | 28075 | 11900 | 344 | 42.39 | 1.23 | 0.46 | 0.01 |
| Maharashtra | 10044253 | 648727 | 78811 | 6.46 | 0.78 | 25.21 | 3.06 |
| Andhra Pradesh | 7432412 | 35650 | 71849 | 0.48 | 0.97 | 1.39 | 2.79 |
| Karnataka | 5382263 | 126510 | 75425 | 2.35 | 1.40 | 4.92 | 2.93 |
| Goa | 140622 | 17190 | 2928 | 12.22 | 2.08 | 0.67 | 0.11 |
| Lakshadweep | 5972 | 711 | 287 | 11.91 | 4.81 | 0.03 | 0.01 |
| Kerala | 2925053 | 28834 | 52993 | 0.99 | 1.81 | 1.12 | 2.06 |
| Tamil Nadu | 6008509 | 28205 | 79477 | 0.47 | 1.32 | 1.10 | 3.09 |
| Pondicherry | 97426 | 8960 | 1877 | 9.20 | 1.93 | 0.35 | 0.07 |
| A \& N Islands | 41757 | 4844 | 716 | 11.60 | 1.71 | 0.19 | 0.03 |
| Total | 100261141 | 2573713 | 2573713 | 278.99 | 95.50 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

Source: Census 2001, D series n.b. : Foccusing Eag states

Table 5: Youth - Rate and share of in-migration and out - migration (Female) - EAG states,India, 2001

| States | Total Female population | Total in migrants from other states | Total out migrants to other states | Rate of in Migration | Rate of out Migration | Share of Total in Migrants | Share of <br> Total out Migrants |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | 968249 | 7782 | 12613 | 0.80 | 1.30 | 0.30 | 0.49 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 589632 | 22135 | 21876 | 3.75 | 3.71 | 0.86 | 0.85 |
| Punjab | 2245637 | 102739 | 87628 | 4.58 | 3.90 | 3.99 | 3.41 |
| Chandigarh | 81353 | 28,852 | 12613 | 35.47 | 15.50 | 1.12 | 0.49 |
| Uttaranchal | 814781 | 52575 | 53288 | 6.45 | 6.54 | 2.04 | 2.07 |
| Haryana | 1867105 | 225072 | 147509 | 12.05 | 7.90 | 8.75 | 5.74 |
| Delhi | 1223736 | 261419 | 73747 | 21.36 | 6.03 | 10.16 | 2.87 |
| Rajasthan | 4781033 | 180174 | 196839 | 3.77 | 4.12 | 7.00 | 7.66 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 13405754 | 267992 | 495642 | 2.00 | 3.70 | 10.42 | 19.29 |
| Bihar | 6304675 | 61419 | 259163 | 0.97 | 4.11 | 2.39 | 10.09 |
| Sikkim | 56409 | 3049 | 997 | 5.41 | 1.77 | 0.12 | 0.04 |
| Arunachal Pradesh | 94524 | 7580 | 1668 | 8.02 | 1.76 | 0.29 | 0.06 |
| Nagaland | 225890 | 3338 | 8500 | 1.48 | 3.76 | 0.13 | 0.33 |
| Manipur | 231532 | 239 | 4970 | 0.10 | 2.15 | 0.01 | 0.19 |
| Mizoram | 94224 | 2214 | 3947 | 2.35 | 4.19 | 0.09 | 0.15 |
| Tripura | 304154 | 5153 | 3008 | 1.69 | 0.99 | 0.20 | 0.12 |
| Meghalaya | 223664 | 4685 | 3155 | 2.09 | 1.41 | 0.18 | 0.12 |
| Assam | 2399698 | 15469 | 43389 | 0.64 | 1.81 | 0.60 | 1.69 |
| West Bengal | 7059946 | 114984 | 104926 | 1.63 | 1.49 | 4.47 | 4.08 |
| Jharkhand | 2211093 | 111714 | 101344 | 5.05 | 4.58 | 4.34 | 3.94 |
| Orissa | 3360393 | 42934 | 57044 | 1.28 | 1.70 | 1.67 | 2.22 |
| Chhattisgarh | 1766995 | 55867 | 66282 | 3.16 | 3.75 | 2.17 | 2.58 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 5009220 | 191918 | 190453 | 3.83 | 3.80 | 7.46 | 7.41 |
| Gujarat | 4727997 | 115676 | 67477 | 2.45 | 1.43 | 4.50 | 2.63 |
| Daman \& Diu | 13786 | 3484 | 796 | 25.27 | 5.77 | 0.14 | 0.03 |
| Dadra \& Nagar Haveli | 18924 | 4579 | 788 | 24.20 | 4.16 | 0.18 | 0.03 |
| Maharashtra | 8383055 | 352075 | 146234 | 4.20 | 1.74 | 13.68 | 5.69 |
| Andhra Pradesh | 7084449 | 84346 | 113314 | 1.19 | 1.60 | 3.28 | 4.41 |
| Karnataka | 4885634 | 145891 | 129655 | 2.99 | 2.65 | 5.67 | 5.05 |
| Goa | 126425 | 12200 | 3539 | 9.65 | 2.80 | 0.47 | 0.14 |
| Lakshadweep | 5892 | 223 | 126 | 3.78 | 2.14 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| Kerala | 3043443 | 25022 | 57877 | 0.82 | 1.90 | 0.97 | 2.25 |
| Tamil Nadu | 5976642 | 40101 | 93146 | 0.67 | 1.56 | 1.56 | 3.62 |
| Pondicherry | 97956 | 16868 | 5300 | 17.22 | 5.41 | 0.66 | 0.21 |
| A \& N Islands | 34981 | 3298 | 915 | 9.43 | 2.62 | 0.13 | 0.04 |
| Total | 89718881 | 2573066 | 2569768 | 229.82 | 123.76 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

Source: Census 2001, D series n.b. : Foccusing EAG states

Table 6: Intra-State Migration in India according to age \& sex with all duration (2001).

| States \& UT | 15-24 years |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Persons | Males | Females | \% of total in-migrants (15-24 yrs) | \% of male in-migrants (15-24 yrs) | \% of female in-migrants (15-24 yrs) |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | 103,839 | 26,259 | 77,580 | 0.36 | 0.64 | 0.31 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 196,521 | 35,736 | 160,785 | 0.67 | 0.87 | 0.64 |
| Punjab | 517,390 | 59,874 | 457,516 | 1.77 | 1.46 | 1.83 |
| Chandigarh | 571 | 329 | 242 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| Uttaranchal | 239,945 | 45,751 | 194,194 | 0.82 | 1.11 | 0.78 |
| Haryana | 649,897 | 72,981 | 576,916 | 2.23 | 1.78 | 2.30 |
| Delhi | 27,928 | 11,439 | 16,489 | 0.10 | 0.28 | 0.07 |
| Rajasthan | 2,166,294 | 219,258 | 1,947,036 | 7.43 | 5.34 | 7.78 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 4,348,107 | 272,801 | 4,075,306 | 14.92 | 6.64 | 16.27 |
| Bihar | 2,597,160 | 108,046 | 2,489,114 | 8.91 | 2.63 | 9.94 |
| Sikkim | 14,254 | 4,919 | 9,335 | 0.05 | 0.12 | 0.04 |
| Arunachal Pradesh | 28,540 | 12,830 | 15,710 | 0.10 | 0.31 | 0.06 |
| Nagaland | 12,663 | 6,369 | 6,294 | 0.04 | 0.16 | 0.03 |
| Manipur | 14,653 | 3,681 | 10,972 | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.04 |
| Mizoram | 23,214 | 10,810 | 12,404 | 0.08 | 0.26 | 0.05 |
| Meghalaya | 10,120 | 4,569 | 5,551 | 0.03 | 0.11 | 0.02 |
| Assam | 478,598 | 88,101 | 390,497 | 1.64 | 2.14 | 1.56 |
| West Bengal | 2,460,230 | 221,042 | 2,239,188 | 8.44 | 5.38 | 8.94 |
| Jharkhand | 801,159 | 58,243 | 742,916 | 2.75 | 1.42 | 2.97 |
| Orissa | 1,016,535 | 162,865 | 853,670 | 3.49 | 3.96 | 3.41 |
| Chhattisgarh | 746,361 | 109,882 | 636,479 | 2.56 | 2.67 | 2.54 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 2,289,187 | 289,435 | 1,999,752 | 7.85 | 7.04 | 7.99 |
| Gujarat | 1,733,439 | 358,927 | 1,374,512 | 5.95 | 8.74 | 5.49 |
| Daman \& Diu | 640 | 313 | 327 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| Dadra \& Nagar Haveli | 1,292 | 575 | 717 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| Maharashtra | 3,309,047 | 831,118 | 2,477,929 | 11.35 | 20.23 | 9.90 |
| Andhra Pradesh | 2,439,302 | 423,441 | 2,015,861 | 8.37 | 10.31 | 8.05 |
| Karnataka | 1,386,031 | 305,639 | 1,080,392 | 4.75 | 7.44 | 4.31 |
| Goa | 21,135 | 8,072 | 13,063 | 0.07 | 0.20 | 0.05 |
| Lakshadweep | 1,796 | 902 | 894 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.00 |
| Kerala | 585,533 | 113,180 | 472,353 | 2.01 | 2.75 | 1.89 |
| Tamil Nadu | 905,613 | 232,148 | 673,465 | 3.11 | 5.65 | 2.69 |
| Pondicherry | 12,458 | 4,647 | 7,811 | 0.04 | 0.11 | 0.03 |
| A \& N Islands | 10,844 | 4,516 | 6,328 | 0.04 | 0.11 | 0.03 |
| Total | 29,150,296 | 4,108,698 | 25,041,598 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

Source: Census 2001. D-series.

Table 7: Sex ratio of in-migration and out migration India, 2001

| States | 15-24 yrs of age group |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sex Ratio of In-migration | Sex Ratio of Out-migration |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | 840 | 681 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 721 | 1,194 |
| Punjab | 733 | 2,166 |
| Chandigarh | 677 | 1,169 |
| Uttaranchal | 1277 | 1,091 |
| Haryana | 1490 | 3,353 |
| Delhi | 678 | 1,882 |
| Rajasthan | 2468 | 1,431 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 2997 | 677 |
| Bihar | 377 | 528 |
| Sikkim | 730 | 1,023 |
| Arunachal Pradesh | 799 | 842 |
| Nagaland | 595 | 583 |
| Manipur | 532 | 821 |
| Mizoram | 460 | 966 |
| Tripura | 1265 | 934 |
| Meghalaya | 910 | 1,433 |
| Assam | 1125 | 957 |
| West Bengal | 1380 | 722 |
| Jharkhand | 2762 | 838 |
| Orissa | 1925 | 595 |
| Chhattisgarh | 1789 | 1,284 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 2766 | 2,326 |
| Gujarat | 512 | 1,261 |
| Daman \& Diu | 217 | 895 |
| Dadra \& Nagar Haveli | 385 | 2,291 |
| Maharashtra | 543 | 1,856 |
| Andhra Pradesh | 2366 | 1,577 |
| Karnataka | 1153 | 1,719 |
| Goa | 710 | 1,209 |
| Lakshadweep | 314 | 439 |
| Kerala | 868 | 1,092 |
| Tamil Nadu | 1422 | 1,172 |
| Pondicherry | 1883 | 2,824 |
| A \& N Islands | 681 | 1,278 |

Source: Census data D-series.

## CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH MIGRANTS

Table 8: Educational attainment of Migrants of all duration of residence, INDIA,2001

| Educational level of Migrants | Age groups |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 15-24 yrs |  |  |
|  | Persons | Male | Female |
| Iliterate | 32.15 | 12.06 | 41.09 |
| Literate | 67.85 | 87.94 | 58.91 |
| Literate but below Matric/Secondary | 53.19 | 45.90 | 58.03 |
| Matric/Secondary but below graduate | 36.74 | 42.84 | 32.69 |
| Technical diploma or certificate not equal to degree | 1.02 | 1.90 | 0.44 |
| Graduate and above other than technical degree | 5.11 | 5.74 | 4.69 |
| Technical degree or diploma equal to degree or post degree | 1.05 | 1.67 | 0.63 |

Source: Census 2001, D series, D-4. Migrants by place of residence, Age, Sex, ,Educational Level and Duration of Residence.
Table 9: Reasons for Migration, by place of residence and all duration of residence

| \multirow{2}{*}{ Total migrants } |  | Age groups |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 15-24 yrs |  |  |  |
|  | Persons | Male | Female |  |
| Work/Employment | 6 | 17.50 | 1.50 |  |
| Business | 0.47 | 1.19 | 0.16 |  |
| Education | 3.35 | 7.60 | 1.46 |  |
| Marriage | 46.23 | 0.95 | 66.40 |  |
| Moved after birth | 6.34 | 12.62 | 3.55 |  |
| Moved with household | 15.35 | 25.62 | 10.78 |  |
| Others | 21.82 | 34.53 | 16.16 |  |

Source: Census 2001, D series. D5: Migrants by place of last residence, Age, Sex, Reason For Migration and duration of residence, INDIA,2001

Table 10: Migrants By Place Of Last Residence, Economic Activity, Age, Sex And Duration of Residence, INDIA,2001

| Total migrants |  | Age groups |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 15-24 yrs |  |  |  |
|  | Persons | Male | Female |  |
| Main workers | 42.71 | 85.93 | 28.26 |  |
| Marginal workers | 23.90 | 3.88 | 79.90 |  |
| Total | 7.97 | 8.21 | 5.23 |  |
| Seeking/Available for work | 92.81 | 94.58 | 92.22 |  |
| Non-workers |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 17.59 | 29.02 | 13.76 |  |
| Seeking/Available for work |  |  |  |  |

Source: Census 2001, D-series, D-8: Migrants place of last residence, Economic Activity, Age, Sex and Duration of residence, INDIA, 2001

Table 11: Migrants By Place Of Last Residence, Age, Sex, Marital Status And Duration Of Residence 0-9 Years, INDIA, 2001

| \multirow{2}{*}{ Total migrants } |  | Age groups |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 10-29yrs |  |  |  |
|  | Persons | Male | Female |  |
| Never married | 23.72 | 69.80 | 10.08 |  |
| Currently married | 75.60 | 29.94 | 89.12 |  |
| Widowed | 0.46 | 0.13 | 0.56 |  |
| Divorced and separated | 0.22 | 0.12 | 0.24 |  |
| Unspecified | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |

Source: Census 2001, Dseries, D-10, Migration by place of last residence, Age, Sex, Marital Status and Duration of Residence 0-9 years, INDIA,2001
N.B: As the Age Group is not in 5yrs of Interval and to show the Marital Status of Migrants in young age group the two 10 years interval age-group is taken.

Table 12: Educational attainment of migrants reporting Employment/ Work as the reason for Migration (by place of last residence with duration of 0-9 years), INDIA,2001

| Population with work/employment as the reason for <br> migrationAge groups   <br>  Persons Male Female |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 27.79 | 20.3 | 49.99 |
| Literate | 72.21 | 79.7 | 50.01 |
| Literate but below Matric/Secondary | 39.12 | 42.57 | 28.92 |
| Matric/Secondary but below graduate | 25.00 | 28.68 | 14.11 |
| Technical diploma or certificate not equal to degree | 2.22 | 2.40 | 1.68 |
| Graduate and above other than technical degree | 3.39 | 3.67 | 2.57 |
| Technical degree or diploma equal to degree or post degree | 0.76 | 0.75 | 0.79 |

[^0]Table 13. Socio-economic \& Migration Variables for EAG states of India, 2001

| State | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{\%} \\ \text { of } \\ \text { BPL } \end{gathered}$ | Per Capita income (20012002) | $\%$ of Urban 2001 | Female <br> Literacy <br> 2001 | Per Capita Bank deposit 2003 | Pub. \& Pvt Investment 2003 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per } \\ \text { Capita } \\ \text { NSDP } \\ \mathbf{( 2 0 0 1 -} \\ \mathbf{2 0 0 2}) \end{gathered}$ | Per Capita Bank Credit to Indus 2001 | \% in Service Sector 2001 | \% in Manuf. Sect 2001 | $\%$ in <br> Agri. <br> Labor <br> 2001 | Volume of Inmigration | Volume of Outmigration | Rate of Inmigration | Rate of Outmigration |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Andhra Pradesh | 10.5 | 17642 | 27.1 | 51.17 | 9470 | 162416 | 17642 | 1401 | 23.47 | 29.36 | 62.3 | 399764 | 588347 | 0.53 | 0.78 |
| Assam | 40.2 | 10951 | 12.7 | 56.03 | 4693 | 112303 | 10951 | 386 | 29.04 | 11.51 | 50.7 | 86296 | 163591 | 0.32 | 0.61 |
| Bihar | 44 | 6015 | 10.5 | 33.57 | 3548 | 23634 | 5445 | 304 | 21.94 | 15.94 | 77.4 | 259751 | 1380125 | 0.31 | 1.67 |
| Gujarat | 12.4 | 21276 | 37.4 | 58.6 | 13572 | 171399 | 21276 | 2921 | 15.99 | 33.24 | 52 | 1080024 | 405190 | 2.13 | 0.8 |
| Haryana | 7.4 | 26632 | 29 | 56.31 | 12316 | 19399 | 24820 | 2144 | 25.07 | 6.54 | 51.6 | 997130 | 360986 | 4.73 | 1.71 |
| H.P | 7.5 | 22576 | 9.8 | 68.08 | 15833 | 31664 | 21543 | 822 | 48.21 | 14.04 | 68.7 | 142453 | 105036 | 2.34 | 1.73 |
| Karnataka | 16.9 | 18324 | 34 | 57.45 | 13841 | 130651 | 18324 | 2009 | 20.3 | 27.93 | 55.9 | 842640 | 693423 | 1.6 | 1.31 |
| Kerala | 9.4 | 21310 | 26 | 87.86 | 18362 | 38955 | 21310 | 1195 | 19.33 | 19.97 | 23.3 | 219359 | 370248 | 0.69 | 1.16 |
| M.P | 37.2 | 11438 | 26.7 | 50.28 | 5993 | 44001 | 12027 | 769 | 26.7 | 26.85 | 71.6 | 689891 | 691070 | 1.14 | 1.14 |
| Maharashtra | 23.3 | 24736 | 42.4 | 67.51 | 25166 | 169855 | 24736 | 5708 | 22.08 | 29.96 | 55.4 | 2970512 | 780894 | 3.07 | 0.81 |
| Orissa | 47.8 | 10103 | 15 | 50.97 | 5292 | 93694 | 10234 | 373 | 25.84 | 23.83 | 64.7 | 148401 | 316646 | 0.4 | 0.86 |
| Punjab | 6 | 25652 | 34 | 63.55 | 22587 | 30818 | 25652 | 2493 | 23.62 | 27.29 | 39.4 | 689558 | 363584 | 2.84 | 1.5 |
| Rajasthan | 13.4 | 13066 | 23.4 | 44.34 | 5863 | 38194 | 13825 | 717 | 20.54 | 24.98 | 66 | 674623 | 875960 | 1.19 | 1.55 |
| Tamil Nadu | 20.1 | 21738 | 43.9 | 64.55 | 13523 | 163303 | 21239 | 3375 | 20.77 | 33.65 | 45.6 | 231939 | 551095 | 0.37 | 0.89 |
| U.P | 31 | 9895 | 20.8 | 42.98 | 6249 | 54859 | 9749 | 501 | 21.81 | 36.45 | 66 | 669627 | 2512018 | 0.4 | 1.51 |
| W.B | 31.7 | 17769 | 28 | 60.22 | 10449 | 57058 | 17769 | 1625 | 20.77 | 31.11 | 43.9 | 531838 | 475593 | 0.66 | 0.59 |
| Sources | - Pla | ming Com <br> - Cen <br> - Econ <br> - CMI <br> - Dire <br> - Stati | ission of In us of Indi omic Sur E report torate of tical outli | dia, 2001-2002 <br> a 2001 <br> vey 2003-20 <br> 001 <br> economics <br> ne India 20 | $02, \text { HDI } n$ <br> 0 <br> and statistic <br> 4-2005 | port <br> s of respectiv | state Go | $\text { tt } 2004$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 14: PEARSON CORRELATION
TABLE 14: PEARSON CORRELATION MATRIX (TOTAL), EAG STATES, INDIA, 2001

| Indicator | \% of BPL | Per capita income | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% urban } \\ & \text { pop } \end{aligned}$ | Female literacy rate | Per capita bank deposit | Public \& pvt. invest | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per } \\ & \text { capita } \\ & \text { NSDP } \end{aligned}$ | Per capita bank credit to industry | $\%$ in Service Sector | $\begin{aligned} & \% \text { in } \\ & \text { Man } \\ & \text { fact } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \%of } \\ \text { agri. } \\ \text { laborer } \end{gathered}$ | Vol. of in migr | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rate of } \\ \text { in } \\ \text { Migrati } \\ \text { on } \end{gathered}$ | Rate of out migr | Vol. of out-migr |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% of BPL | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| per capita income | -.806** | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% urban pop | -0.429 | .633*** | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female literacy rate | -.516* | .717** | 0.375 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Per capita bank deposit | -.638** | .867** | .617* | .756** | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public \& pvt invest | -0.016 | 0.173 | .553* | 0.131 | 0.206 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Per capita NSDP | -.809** | .996** | . $6666^{* *}$ | .732** | .884** | 0.2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Per capita bank credit to industry | -0.369 | . 711 ** | . 852 ** | 0.43 | .779** | .575* | . 727 ** | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Services | -0.054 | 0.062 | -.563* | 0.107 | 0.004 | -0.311 | 0.028 | -0.291 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manufacturing | 0.011 | -0.017 | .572* | -0.039 | 0.148 | 0.497 | 0.037 | 0.352 | -.506* | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% of agricultural laborer | 0.43 | -.597* | -0.472 | -.803** | -.580* | -0.097 | -.616* | -0.358 | 0.335 | -0.053 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Vol. of in migration | -. 114 | 0.346 | 0. $538 *$ | 0.042 | . 498 * | 0.283 | 0.362 | . 742 ** | -0.258 | 0.279 | 0.046 | 1 |  |  |  |
| Vol. of out- migration | . 369 | -.557* | -. 238 | -.612* | -. 415 | -. 262 | $.575 *$ | -. 289 | -. 230 | . 274 | . 439 | . 140 | 1 |  |  |
| Rate of in migration | -.520- | . $678 * *$ | . 280 | . 175 | . 510 * | -. 203 | . 650 * | . 454 | . 199 | -. 350 | -. 509 | .546* | -. 236 | 1 |  |
| Rate of out migration | . 140 | -. 332 | -.537* | -.545* | -. 348 | -.743** | -. 389 | -. 465 | . 208 | -. 461 | . 492 | -. 106 | .603* |  | 1 |
| **. Correlation is significa <br> *. Correlation is significan | nt at the 0.01 $t$ at the 0.05 | level (1-tail evel (2-tailed) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 15. Socio-economic \& Migration Variables for EAG states, INDIA, (MALE), 2001

| State | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \text { BPL } \\ (2001- \\ 2002) \end{gathered}$ | Per Capita Income (2001- 2002) | $\begin{gathered} \text { oof } \\ \text { Urban } \\ 2001 \end{gathered}$ | Female Literacy 2001 | Per Capita Bank Deposit 2003 | Pub. \& Pvt. <br> Invest <br> 2003 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Par } \\ \text { Capita } \\ \text { NSDP } \\ (2001- \\ 2002) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\%$ in Service Sector 2001 | \% in Manuf. Sect 2001 | \% in Agri. Labour 2001 | Volume of $\operatorname{In}$ migr. 2001 | Volume of OutMigr. 2001 | Rate of In- migr. 2001 | Rate of out migr. 2001 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Andhra <br> Pradesh | 10.5 | 17642 | 27.1 | 51.17 | 9470 | 162416 | 17642 | 1401 | 23.47 | 29.36 | 62.3 | 35650 | 71849 | 0.48 | 0.97 |
| Assam | 40.2 | 10951 | 12.7 | 56.03 | 4693 | 112303 | 10951 | 386 | 29.04 | 11.51 | 50.7 | 13751 | 45343 | 0.54 | 1.79 |
| Bihar | 44 | 6015 | 10.5 | 33.57 | 3548 | 23634 | 5445 | 304 | 21.94 | 15.94 | 77.4 | 163065 | 490498 | 2.26 | 6.80 |
| Gujarat | 12.4 | 21276 | 37.4 | 58.6 | 13572 | 171399 | 21276 | 2921 | 15.99 | 33.24 | 52 | 225881 | 53528 | 4.27 | 1.01 |
| Haryana | 7.4 | 26632 | 29 | 56.31 | 12316 | 19399 | 24820 | 2144 | 25.07 | 6.54 | 51.6 | 151079 | 43991 | 6.44 | 1.87 |
| H.P | 7.5 | 22576 | 9.8 | 68.08 | 15833 | 31664 | 21543 | 822 | 48.21 | 14.04 | 68.7 | 30692 | 18316 | 4.95 | 2.95 |
| Karnataka | 16.9 | 18324 | 34 | 57.45 | 13841 | 130651 | 18324 | 2009 | 20.3 | 27.93 | 55.9 | 126510 | 75425 | 2.35 | 1.40 |
| Kerala | 9.4 | 21310 | 26 | 87.86 | 18362 | 38955 | 21310 | 1195 | 19.33 | 19.97 | 23.3 | 28834 | 52993 | 0.99 | 1.81 |
| M.P | 37.2 | 11438 | 26.7 | 50.28 | 5993 | 44001 | 12027 | 769 | 26.7 | 26.85 | 71.6 | 69386 | 81877 | 1.19 | 1.40 |
| Maharashtra | 23.3 | 24736 | 42.4 | 67.51 | 25166 | 169855 | 24736 | 5708 | 22.08 | 29.96 | 55.4 | 648727 | 78811 | 6.46 | 0.78 |
| Orissa | 47.8 | 10103 | 15 | 50.97 | 5292 | 93694 | 10234 | 373 | 25.84 | 23.83 | 64.7 | 22305 | 95928 | 0.66 | 2.85 |
| Punjab | 6 | 25652 | 34 | 63.55 | 22587 | 30818 | 25652 | 2493 | 23.62 | 27.29 | 39.4 | 140240 | 40456 | 5.29 | 1.53 |
| Rajasthan | 13.4 | 13066 | 23.4 | 44.34 | 5863 | 38194 | 13825 | 717 | 20.54 | 24.98 | 66 | 73018 | 137531 | 1.34 | 2.52 |
| Tamil Nadu | 20.1 | 21738 | 43.9 | 64.55 | 13523 | 163303 | 21239 | 3375 | 20.77 | 33.65 | 45.6 | 28205 | 79477 | 0.47 | 1.32 |
| $\boldsymbol{U} . P$ | 31 | 9895 | 20.8 | 42.98 | 6249 | 54859 | 9749 | 501 | 21.81 | 36.45 | 66 | 89427 | 732319 | 0.56 | 4.59 |
| $\boldsymbol{W} . \boldsymbol{B}$ | 31.7 | 17769 | 28 | 60.22 | 10449 | 57058 | 17769 | 1625 | 20.77 | 31.11 | 43.9 | 83317 | 145364 | 1.09 | 1.90 |

TABLE 16: PEARSON CORRELATION MATRIX (MALE), EAG STATES, INDIA, 2001

| Indicator | \% of BPL | Per capita income | \% urban | Female literacy rate | Per capita bank deposit | Public \& pvt. invest | Per capita NSDP | Per capita bank credit to industry | $\%$ in <br> Service <br> Sector | \% in <br> Man <br> fact | \%of agri. labore r | Vol. of in migr | Vol. of out migr | Rate of in Migration | Rate of out migr |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% of BPL | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| per capita income | -.806** | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% urban pop | -. 429 | . $633 * *$ | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female literacy rate | -. $516^{*}$ | .717** | . 375 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Per capita bank deposit | -.638** | .867** | .617* | .756** | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public \& pvt invest | -. 016 | . 173 | .553* | . 131 | . 206 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Per capita NSDP | -.809** | .996** | .666** | .732** | .884** | . 200 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Per capita bank credit to industry | -. 369 | .711** | .852** | . 430 | .779** | .575* | .727** | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Services | -. 054 | . 062 | -. $563{ }^{*}$ | . 107 | . 004 | -. 311 | . 028 | -. 291 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manufacturing | . 011 | -. 017 | . $572{ }^{*}$ | -. 039 | . 148 | . 497 | . 037 | . 352 | -.506** | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\%$ of agricultural laborer | . 430 | -.597* | -. 472 | -.803** | -.580* | -. 097 | -.616* | -. 358 | . 335 | -. 053 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Vol. of in migration | -. 114 | . 346 | .538* | . 042 | .498* | . 283 | . 362 | .742** | -. 258 | . 279 | . 046 | 1 |  |  |  |
| Vol. of Out migration | . 369 | -.557* | -. 238 | -.612* | -. 415 | -. 262 | -. 575 * | -. 289 | -. 230 | . 274 | . 439 | . 140 | 1 |  |  |
| Rate of in migration | -. 520 * | .678** | . 280 | . 175 | .510* | -. 203 | .650** | . 454 | . 199 | -. 350 | -. 059 | .546* | -. 236 | 1 |  |
| Rate of out migration (person) | . 140 | -. 332 | -.537* | -.545* | -. 378 | -.743** | -. 389 | -. 465 | . 208 | -. 461 | . 492 | -. 106 | .603* | . 233 | 1 |
| **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed). <br> *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 17. Socio-economic \& Migration Variables for EAG states, INDIA, (FEMALE), 2001

| State | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ B P L \\ (2001- \\ 2002) \end{gathered}$ | Per Capita Income(2001- $2002)$ | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \text { Urban } \\ 2001 \end{gathered}$ | Female <br> Literacy <br> 2001 | Per Capita Bank Deposit 2003 | Pub. \& Pvt. Invest 2003 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per Capita } \\ \text { NSDP(2001- } \\ 2002) \end{gathered}$ | Per Capita Bank Credit to Indus 2001 | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { in } \\ \text { Service } \\ \text { Sector } \\ 2001 \end{gathered}$ | $\%$ in Manuf. 2001 Sect 2001 | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% in } \\ \text { Agri. } \\ \text { Labour } \\ 2001 \end{gathered}$ | Volume of Inmigr. 2001 | Volume of OutMigr. 2001 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rate } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { In- } \\ \text { migr. } \\ \text { 2001 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rate } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { out } \\ \text { migr. } \\ \text { 2001 } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Andhra Pradesh | 10.5 | 17642 | 27.1 | 51.17 | 9470 | 162416 | 17642 | 1401 | 23.47 | 29.36 | 62.3 | 84346 | 113314 | 0.48 | 0.97 |
| Assam | 40.2 | 10951 | 12.7 | 56.03 | 4693 | 112303 | 10951 | 386 | 29.04 | 11.51 | 50.7 | 15469 | 43389 | 0.59 | 1.60 |
| Bihar | 44 | 6015 | 10.5 | 33.57 | 3548 | 23634 | 5445 | 304 | 21.94 | 15.94 | 77.4 | 61419 | 259163 | 0.83 | 5.55 |
| Gujarat | 12.4 | 21276 | 37.4 | 58.6 | 13572 | 171399 | 21276 | 2921 | 15.99 | 33.24 | 52 | 115676 | 67477 | 3.41 | 1.17 |
| Haryana | 7.4 | 26632 | 29 | 56.31 | 12316 | 19399 | 24820 | 2144 | 25.07 | 6.54 | 51.6 | 225072 | 147509 | 8.93 | 4.50 |
| H.P | 7.5 | 22576 | 9.8 | 68.08 | 15833 | 31664 | 21543 | 822 | 48.21 | 14.04 | 68.7 | 22135 | 21876 | 4.37 | 3.31 |
| Karnataka | 16.9 | 18324 | 34 | 57.45 | 13841 | 130651 | 18324 | 2009 | 20.3 | 27.93 | 55.9 | 145891 | 129655 | 2.65 | 1.99 |
| Kerala | 9.4 | 21310 | 26 | 87.86 | 18362 | 38955 | 21310 | 1195 | 19.33 | 19.97 | 23.3 | 25022 | 57877 | 0.90 | 1.85 |
| M.P | 37.2 | 11438 | 26.7 | 50.28 | 5993 | 44001 | 12027 | 769 | 26.7 | 26.85 | 71.6 | 191918 | 190453 | 2.41 | 2.50 |
| Maharashtra | 23.3 | 24736 | 42.4 | 67.51 | 25166 | 169855 | 24736 | 5708 | 22.08 | 29.96 | 55.4 | 352075 | 146234 | 5.43 | 1.21 |
| Orissa | 47.8 | 10103 | 15 | 50.97 | 5292 | 93694 | 10234 | 373 | 25.84 | 23.83 | 64.7 | 42934 | 57044 | 0.97 | 2.23 |
| Punjab | 6 | 25652 | 34 | 63.55 | 22587 | 30818 | 25652 | 2493 | 23.62 | 27.29 | 39.4 | 102739 | 87628 | 4.96 | 2.58 |
| Rajasthan | 13.4 | 13066 | 23.4 | 44.34 | 5863 | 38194 | 13825 | 717 | 20.54 | 24.98 | 66 | 180174 | 196839 | 2.47 | 3.26 |
| Tamil Nadu | 20.1 | 21738 | 43.9 | 64.55 | 13523 | 163303 | 21239 | 3375 | 20.77 | 33.65 | 45.6 | 40101 | 93146 | 0.57 | 1.45 |
| U.P | 31 | 9895 | 20.8 | 42.98 | 6249 | 54859 | 9749 | 501 | 21.81 | 36.45 | 66 | 267992 | 495642 | 1.22 | 4.09 |
| $\boldsymbol{W} . \boldsymbol{B}$ | 31.7 | 17769 | 28 | 60.22 | 10449 | 57058 | 17769 | 1625 | 20.77 | 31.11 | 43.9 | 114984 | 104926 | 1.35 | 1.65 |

TABLE 18 : PEARSON CORRELATION MATRIX ( FEMALE), IN EAG STATES, INDIA, 2001

| Indicator | \% of BPL | Per capita income | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { urban } \\ \text { pop } \end{gathered}$ | Female literacy rate | Per capita bank deposit | Public \& put. invest | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per } \\ \text { capita } \\ \text { NSDP } \end{gathered}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Per capita } \\ \text { bank } \\ \text { credit to } \\ \text { industry } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\%$ in Service Sector | $\%$ in Man fact |  | Vol. of in migr | Vol.of out-mig | Rate of in Migration | Rate of out migr |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% of BPL | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| per capita income | -.806** | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% urban pop | -0.429 | . $633^{* *}$ | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female literacy rate | -.516* | . 717 ** | 0.375 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Per capita bank deposit | -.638** | .867** | .617* | .756** | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public \& pvt invest | -0.016 | 0.173 | .553* | 0.131 | 0.206 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Per capita NSDP | -.809** | .996** | . 666 ** | . 732 ** | .884** | 0.2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Per capita bank credit to industry | -0.369 | .711** | . 852 ** | 0.43 | .779** | .575* | . 727 ** | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Services | -0.054 | 0.062 | -.563* | 0.107 | 0.004 | -0.311 | 0.028 | -0.291 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manufacturing | 0.011 | -0.017 | . 572 * | -0.039 | 0.148 | 0.497 | 0.037 | 0.352 | -.506** | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% of agricultural laborer | 0.43 | -.597* | -0.472 | -.803** | -.580* | -0.097 | -.616* | -0.358 | 0.335 | -0.053 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Vol. of in migration | -0.058 | 0.149 | 0.418 | -0.195 | 0.22 | 0.061 | 0.16 | 0.473 | -0.278 | 0.298 | 0.202 | 1 |  |  |  |
| Vol. of Out-migration | 0.266 | -0.464 | -0.101 | -.601* | -0.358 | -0.247 | -0.474 | -0.197 | -0.268 | 0.31 | 0.437 | .579* | 1 |  |  |
| Rate of in migration | -.508* | . $672 \times *$ | 0.278 | 0.179 | .510* | -0.214 | . $644 * *$ | 0.453 | 0.198 | -0.352 | -0.064 | .503* | -0.095 | 1 |  |
| Rate of out migration | 0.151 | -0.327 | -.530* | -.528* | -0.367 | -.752** | -0.383 | -0.456 | 0.207 | -0.463 | 0.477 | 0.126 | .557* | 0.25 | 1 |

## INTER- STATE YOUTH MIGRATION (TOTAL) IN

 EAG STATES. INDIA. 2001

Map not according to scale




[^0]:    Source: Census 2001, D series, D7:Migrants By Place Of Last Residence With Duration 0-9 Years Reporting 'Work/Employment' As Reason For Migration By Age, Sex And Educational Level

