

CHAPTER -VIII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 Summary

First of all, Chapter I introduces the problem under study. Then it contains the objective of the study, research questions, research hypotheses, conceptual framework, justification of the study, research methodology and plan of the study. At last, it covers the limitations of the study.

Chapter II describes the reviews of relevant literature on the research topic. Four categories of topical research works have been reviewed. Firstly, studies which have dealt with theoretical issues of migration. Secondly, research works which have been conducted at empirical level. These have been divided into two parts: those which are mainly based on secondary data and those, which are largely based on field survey data. Thirdly, we have reviewed those works which deal with the problem of rural-urban migration in other countries than India and the case of international migration. Then, we have reviewed the review articles on internal rural-urban migration. Finally, we have identified the research gap in this chapter.

Chapter III interprets the rural-urban migration scenario in India and in West Bengal by utilizing secondary data mainly on Census 2001 and 1991 and NSSO Reports of various rounds. We have included here some relevant data of 2011 Census to obtain more consistency with field survey data as we done field survey in the year 2013. In this chapter, we have at first introduced the rural-urban migration scenario in India and in West Bengal. Then we have examined the various issues of migration like migration by place of birth and by place of last residence, migration rates, net migration rate of some major state in India etc. Here, inter-state migration of migrants, migration within the state of migrants by place of birth and by place of last residence of some major states in India through different streams of migration, migration rates of different categories of persons, what are net migration rates of some major states in India? are specially discussed. Next, the distribution of migrants though different streams of migration and trend and pattern of rural-urban migration in India are

elucidated. The various reasons for migration and their comparisons with the data of different census cited above are also expounded. At last, we have examined the trend and pattern of rural urban migration in West Bengal.

Chapter IV sets forth the demographic and socio-economic profile of the survey area. Here, in the beginning, we have discussed about the study district of Cooch Behar where the location and of its boundary, brief history of the district, demographic profile based on 2001 Census and 2011 Census Report, and a brief description of the economy are delineated. Then we have analysed the the demographic and socio-economic profiles of migrant workers based on the villages surveyed of the district. For the analysis, we have divided at first the demographic profile of migrant workers and then the socio-economic profile of migrant workers. Lastly, the demographic and socio-economic descriptions of the surveyed villages in Cooch Behar district have been summarized.

Now, the major findings of the demographic profile based on primary data are delineated in the following.

1. There is almost symmetrical distribution among population of the sample villages found with respect to its division among adult male, adult female, male child and female child.
2. The presence of a substantial proportion of relatively young migrant labour force (20-30 years of age) among the respondents was observed.
3. The small sized migrant families (about 11.33 percent) consisting of upto 3 members are usually nuclear that we found through our field investigation.
4. It was found that out of 100 percent migrant households of surveyed villages, 68 percent migrant households belong to Hinduism whereas 32 percent belong to Muslims. There is no even a single Christian migrant household from the sample villages of Cooch Behar district.
5. It was seen that about 51 percent migrant households belong to SC category and about 47 percent belong to others that is General category whereas only 1 percent of migrant households belong to ST category among all six surveyed villages. There is no even a single OBC category migrant household among the six surveyed villages.

6. It could be noticed that only 22 percent migrant households belong to APL category whereas 78 percent migrant households belong to BPL category among total six surveyed villages of the district. It revealed that most of the migrant households were under BPL category.

Also, the major findings of the socio-economic profile based on primary data are delineated as under.

7. As far as education levels of migrant households are concerned, the majority percentages of migrant household members in the district are illiterate. As many as 31 percent male members and almost 43 percent female members are illiterate. Among the literacy of male and female, the highest (35 percentage of male) and the highest (29 percent of female) belong to the below primary category, that is, who are just literate. There is no any member of migrant who takes either the degree of graduation or post-graduation or technical level of education.

8. It was noticed that out of total 150 migrants' households of sample villages, the major 93(62.00 percent) migrant households occupied cultivable land less than one bigha, that is, they might be define as landless or near landless families.

9. The data also revealed table that majority percentage of migrant households belonging to social status as well as poverty status possessed cultivable land only less than 1 bigha. The interesting result was found from the survey data that although 1.70 percentages of BPL migrant households occupied between 15.1-30.0 bighas of cultivable land, there was no any percentage of APL migrant households who possessed the same amount of cultivable land. Including both social and poverty status of migrant households, there was no any percentage of migrant household who possessed greater than 30.0 bighas of cultivable land.

10. Majority (about 89.47 percent) male migrants acted as principal earner of the family while about 10.53 percent female migrants performed as principal earner of the family. They, therefore, engaged with a number of principal activities in destination areas.

11. Regarding work status/ occupational engagement of members of migrant households in the district, the data expressed that the out of the total male and female members of surveyed households, the highest 25.07 percentage of male and female members engaged in other types of work like building construction labour, road construction

labour, loading and unloading types of labour, mason, shuttering labour etc. and the lowest 0.13 percentage of male and female members did not engage in work but for seeking or available to get work. So, it could be observed that most of the male and female members engaged as regular salaried or wage employee and other types of work like mason, shuttering labour, building construction labour etc. although there is a lack or crisis of work in the local area throughout the year.

12. The data brought out that out of the total 483 members of migrant surveyed households, only 44 members i.e., 9.11 percentage engaged with subsidiary occupation like agriculture and allied activities, agriculture labour, construction labour etc. It indicated that very few members engaged with subsidiary activity.

Chapter V analyses the trend, pattern and features of rural–urban migration in the study area. Here, the analyses of this chapter are divided into two parts-(i) the trend and pattern of rural-urban migration in the study area and (ii) Characteristics or features of rural-urban migration in the study area.

Now, at first, the core results of trend and pattern of migrants of the surveyed households in the study area are outlined in the following.

1. Based on nature of migration, the data revealed that the incidence of migration with full family was lower i.e. 44 percent compared to the incidence of migration with partial family i.e. about 71 percent in the surveyed households of Cooch Behar district. It could, therefore, be observed that the majority percentage of the surveyed households migrated outside with few family members.
2. It could be found that nearly 81 percent migrant members are male and about 19 percent are female and also a huge inter-village variations among female migrants compared to male migrants was observed. This means that the migrant families were in a vulnerable condition. This is because except in cases of dire need generally female members would like to stay at home to look after the children and elderly
3. As far as children migrants are concerned, out of 220 children of surveyed villages, only 29 children migrated with their parents or with their family members that constituted only about 13 percent i.e., 0.13 in portion of the total children of the migrant households in the district. It is, therefore, cleared that few percentages of

children from the total children migrated outside the district/ state with their parents or with their family members.

4. The data highlighted that the highest percentage (about 58 percent) of migrants lie in the age group of 15-30, followed by the age-group of 31-45 (about 22 percent), the age-group of upto 14 (about 13 percent) and the age-group of above 45 (nearly 6 percent). Thus, the majority percentages of migrants who migrate outside the district belong to the age group of 15-30.
5. It could be found from the surveyed households of the district that nearly 86 percent migrant migrated outside the state followed by about 11 percent migrated to another district of West Bengal, and about 2 percent migrated either in another place of the same district or in another country. Thus the majority percentages of migrants have migrated outside the state for either in search of employment or in search of better employment opportunity in the destination areas.
6. Data revealed that nearly 97 percent migrants have undertaken rural to urban migration (industry and service taken together) and only about 3 percent have undertaken rural to rural migration. Most of the migration has taken place through rural to urban stream in industrial sector.

And, then the core results of characteristics/features of migrants of the surveyed households in the study area are delineated as under.

7. It could be noticed that about 17 percent migrants did not engage in any work as they were unemployed while about 82 percent migrants engaged in works as wage employment labour and self employment. So the distribution of migrants was more distinguishable between the two categories.
8. Out of total 150 households, an overwhelming number of migrants i.e. 139 (about 93 percent), from the district remain engaged in wage employment. However, in the district about 7 percent household migrants remain engaged in self-employment at destination. So, most of the migrant households engaged in destination as wage employment to earn their livelihood.
9. Majority (about 77 percent) of the migrant workers remain employed as regular/daily wage labour The second way in which labourers got employment was as weekly wage

- labour. Interestingly, there was no even a single migrant labour of the surveyed households employed in destination either weekly basis or unorganized sector labour.
10. Regarding the nature of employment, it could be seen that about 28 percent cases in the district, migrant labourers remain engaged in destination as long term employee without a written contract. Migrant labourers engaged as casual day labourer were about 15 percent. As contract labourer and self-employed taken together constituted only about 5 percent engagement of labour at destinations. About 52 percent migrant i.e. the highest percentage engaged as other type of employment mostly on regular wage basis at destinations. There was no even a single migrant engaged as long term employee with a written contract.
 11. As far as the rates of wages received at destination are concerned, the highest workers (about 35 percent) from the district received a wage in the range of Rs. 81-100 per day. The second major numbers of workers received wage in the range of Rs. 101 to 120 (about 28 percent). The third major category of workers in the district received wages in the range of Rs. 121 to 150 (about 20 percent) at destination. Only about 11 percent received wages as per day basis in the range of 151 and above. So, most of the migrant workers of the surveyed households received wages at destination in the range of Rs 81-100 per day.
 12. Data revealed that about 93 percent of the migrants of the surveyed households engaged in the range of 7-8 hours per day with their assigned works. The percentage of migrant workers who engaged with their activities by the working hours above 8 hours per day was only 5 percent and only the 1.44 percentage of migrant workers being engaging with their activities upto 6 hours per day were found to be insignificant. Therefore, most of the migrant workers engaged with their activities at destinations in the range of 7-8 working hours per day.
 13. Regarding duration of stay of migrants at destination, it could be found that the highest percentage of migrants from the surveyed households (about 55 percent) stayed at destination for a period of above 24 months. The second most duration of stay category of migrants remained for the period of 19 to 24 months in which nearly 21 percent workers migrated. The third most duration of stay category of migrants remained for the period of 7 to 12 months in which about 16 percent migrant workers migrated. So, majority of migrant workers migrated for the duration of stay at

destination of above 24 months where the migrants remain engaged with their assigned activities being employed in different sectors.

14. The highest about 46 percent migrant workers visited their native village twice in a year and the second most percentage i.e., about 35 percent migrant workers visited their native village once in a year. The frequencies thrice and above thrice in a year constituted only 15 percent migrant to visit their home. Only about 4 percent migrant workers did not visit their native village throughout the year as they used to stay at destination. Thus, majority of the migrant workers of the surveyed households visited their native villages twice in a year.
15. About 13 percent of the migrant workers stayed at home for a period between 1 to 15 days during home visit. Then, about 73 percent of the migrant workers stayed at home for a period between 16 to 30 days on their home visit. Next, about 13 percent of the migrant workers spent more than 30 days during their home visit. Only about 2 percent migrant workers would not visit their home. Thus, majority of the migrant workers from the surveyed households stayed at home for a period between 16 to 30 days while their home visits.
16. It could be noticed that about 28 percent migrants of surveyed households stayed with their family members at destination and only about 10 percent migrant workers stayed with other workers at destination. Then, about 33 percent migrants from the surveyed households stayed with their friends. The percentages of migrant workers stayed with their relatives at destination were about 18 percent and about 12 percent migrant workers could not have such mentioned ways of staying arrangement as they stayed with alone. Thus, it was revealed that a large number of migrants migrated with family members.
17. Regarding the condition of housing at destination, it could be seen that in the district about 58 percent migrants lived in pucca houses in destination, nearly 30 percent lived in makeshift tarpaulin houses and 8 percent lived in houses made of tiles. It may be noted that pucca house actually means godown, veranda or similar type of places of the employer where the migrant workers were provided rent-free accommodation. Other types of housing like houses made of leaves or wood formed very insignificant proportion for migrants of the district. So, the majority migrant workers lived in pucca houses provided by the company or organization at destination. After all, the

migrants did not enjoy a very improved housing condition either at origin or at destination.

Chapter VI describes the causes of migration with push and pull factors. The analyses of this chapter are classified into four parts - (i) Prerequisites conditions of migrants for migration (ii) Factors of migration analysis (iii) Implementation of MGNREGA and out-migration and (iv) The comparative analyses between migrant and non-migrant households regarding their nature and significance.

Now, at first, the major findings of prerequisites conditions of migrants for migration of surveyed households in the study area are outlined in the following.

1. Data revealed that about 87 percent cases, the decision to migrate was made by the migrant himself/herself. Only about 13 percent cases the decision to migrate was taken by the parents of the migrants. There was no such type of migrant household among six villages surveyed whose family member was migrated by the decision of their spouses.
2. Among the facilitators of surveyed households, relatives, friends already living at destination acted as the most important facilitators (46 per cent cases); followed by labour recruiters/contractors from destination (about 25 per cent cases); relatives, friends living in village/neighborhood (about 13 per cent cases). Only 1.33 percent marked by others (himself/herself) as facilitator.
3. It could be seen that out of total surveyed households in the district, 66 percent households' workers were partially employed before out-migration and only 1.33 percent household workers were fully employed before out-migration. On the other hand, about 33 percent households' workers of the surveyed households had totally remain unemployed before out-migration.
4. Data stated that about 63 percent of the migrant households of the surveyed villages were engaged in agriculture and its allied activities before out-migration and 8 percent engaged in manufacturing sector. Only 0.67 percent of the migrant households were engaged in service sector. It was also revealed in the table that about 29 percent migrant workers before out-migration were engaged neither agricultural related activities nor manufacturing related activities nor service related activities as they were not got employment in local areas. So most of the migrant households' workers

were engaged in agricultural related activities compared to other sectors of employment before out-migration.

Next, the core results of factors of migration analysis in the study area are delineated as under.

5. Data revealed that 98 percent households lived in kutchha houses and only little over 1 percent households lived in semi-pucca houses and less than one per cent households lived in pucca houses in the district of Cooch Behar. As far as the land category wise distribution of households was concerned, it could be viewed that almost all the surveyed households possessing land less than one bigha (i.e., households which were landless or near landless), were having kutchha houses. The same was true for different other categories of households having land between 1 bigha to 30 bighas. However, there was no even any single migrant household who had land greater than 30 bighas. Thus, land being the main asset in rural areas that depicted a very pitiable economic condition of the households under survey.
6. It was exposed that in Cooch Behar district, about 53 per cent migrant households had their own toilet facility and about 47 percent had no such type of facility. As far as categories of toilets were concerned in the district, about 37 percent of toilets were kutchha, 14 percent were pucca, only 2 percent were semi-pucca and about 47 percent migrant households had no any toilet facility as they normally used open space for their toilet. So most of the migrant households surveyed had no toilet facility and semi-pucca as being one of the types of toilet facility was found to be insignificant.
7. Data revealed that about 67 percent of surveyed households of Cooch Behar district use tube wells as own source of drinking water, 30 percent households use tube well or well on shared basis as source of their drinking water and only about 3 percent households use well as own source of drinking water. There is no any other source of drinking water in surveyed households. As shared sources of water requires lots of time to be devoted to collect water due to travel requirement to the source of water as well as spending time in standing on the queue, therefore 30 percent surveyed households in Cooch Behar district are normally done this type of troublesome activities to cover drinking water.
8. It could be found that only about 9 percent surveyed houses were electrified whereas about 91 percent surveyed houses had not gained electricity connection. There is no

doubt that poverty was the main cause for which they couldn't afford to have electric connection.

9. In respect of almost zero waiting period, it could be found that in 99.33 percent cases the migrant workers did not have to wait in the destination to obtain a job and only 0.67 percent cases the migrant workers had to wait to get job. Thus, waiting to get job for the migrants in the destination was insignificant here. The matter of the fact is that almost there was no waiting by the migrants for jobs but there were jobs waiting to be manned by the migrants at the destination in our study.
10. Data revealed that about 32 per cent migrant workers of surveyed households helped others to migrate and about 68 percent migrant workers did not help others for migration. So, there was a quite portion of migrant workers who motivated others to migrate. The reason for motivation might be that since migration from the district was overwhelmingly rural to urban areas and at distant places, therefore, workers who already migrated worked as a role model or motivator to many prospective migrant workers.
11. About 21 percent households reported that their working members would have remained unemployed, 30 percent reported to get employment for upto 120 days, 48 percent would get employment between 121 to 200 days and less than one percent i.e., 0.67 percent households reported to have been employed for more than 200 days in a year if they remained in origin instead of migrating. So most of the working members of the surveyed households got employment between 121 to 200 days in a year. Employments consisting of more than 200 days by the working members of the households were found to be insignificant.
12. The data expressed that migrant labourers of the surveyed households would have received wage rates of upto 40 rupees in the case of labourers of about 2 percent households in the district. This indicates that these types of labourers from the surveyed households were faced distressed situation. Then labourers from nearly 62 per households would receive Rs. 41 to Rs. 60. This also indicates a distressed situation of surveyed households as it carried comparatively low wage rate. On the other hand, the labours of about 28 percent households would get Rs. 61 to 80, relatively higher rate of wages and only near about 1 percent household workers would have received wages above Rs. 80.

13. Regarding the reasons for migration, it could be found that in the surveyed households of the district the reasons for migration in order of importance were: 'in search of better employment' (nearly 57 percent), 'in search of employment (nearly 28 percent), 'migration of the parent/earning member of the family' (about 14 percent). 'Other reasons' for migration were found to be very insignificant. Although, there were huge inter-village variations of the causes of migration. But overall, it could be found that the dominant of migration for villages of the district is that people migrated largely to get better employment, though in villages 3 'in search of employment' was the dominant cause of migration than 'in search of better employment'. That is, in this village people were more unemployed compared to other villages where majority of the migrants migrated in search of better employment. Migration due to the 'migration of parent/earning member of the family' constituted 14 percent of migrants of the district. It may be noted that a good number of migrants in this category belonged to minors, that is, children up to the age of 14 years.

After that, the major findings of the implementation of MGNREGA and out-migration of surveyed households in the study area are outlined in the following.

14. Data revealed that 88 percent households of Cooch Behar district held job cards under the scheme and only 12 percent households did not get job card under the scheme. A higher percentage of job card holders of surveyed households indicate that the depth of poverty was higher among them as a higher number of them were job hungry.
15. About 59 percent of the surveyed households of Cooch Behar district received some days of employment and about 41 percent households did not receive even a single day of employment under MGNREGS. So, a large part of households' member did not receive any employment. It was found that there were much inter-village variations regarding employment received and did not receive under the mentioned scheme. The paradoxical result between villages 5 and 6 found in the table was that in village 5, 84 percent households received some days of employment and remaining 16 percent did not receive even a single day of employment whereas in village 6 only 16

percent households got some days of employment and a large amount of households i.e., 84 percent households did not get any employment.

16. Nearly 33 percent households received employment between 6 to 10 days, 12 percent households received 17 days and 8 percent received employment 1 to 5 days only and 42 percent did not receive any employment at all in the district. Therefore, the employment arrangements through MGNREGA brought out a very poor state of implementation of MGNREGS among the investigated villages.

Finally, the core results of the comparative analyses between migrant and non-migrant households regarding their nature and significance are summarised in the following.

17. The data indicated that in case of migrant households, out of total 150 migrant households 62 percent households possessed first category of agricultural land that is less than 1 bigha whereas from a total of 150 non-migrant households about 35 percent households possessed the same type of agricultural land. But from the second category that is 1.0 – 3.0 to 15.1-30.0, the agricultural lands possessed by the non-migrant households were consecutively greater than those types of land possession of migrant households. There was no any agricultural land of both migrant and non-migrant households that lies greater than 30 bighas. Regarding the type of 7.6 – 15.0 agricultural land, only 4 percent migrant households possessed this type of land. On the other hand, about 15 percent non-migrant households possessed the same type of agricultural land which was obviously much higher than the migrant households.
18. About 63 percent of the migrant households engaged in agriculture and allied activities whereas about 75 percent of the non-migrant households engaged in agriculture and allied activities. So, non-migrant households engaged more than migrant households in that type of activities. For migrant households, only about 9 percent associated with both industrial and service related activities. On the other hand, about 25 percent non-migrant households associated with both industrial and service related activities. Therefore, non-migrant households associated more with those types of activities than migrant households. In case of migrant households, about 29 percent of the households did not get employment opportunity in local areas before out-migration.

19. It could be found that the percentage of holding job card of migrant households under MGNREGA of the surveyed households was 88 whereas about 79 percent non-migrant households did hold job card. Only 12 percent of the migrant households did not hold job card. On the other hand, about 22 percent non-migrant households did not hold job card. So, migrant households did hold more job card than non-migrant households under MGNREGA. There were almost inter-village variations noticed in the above table regarding job card holding among migrant and non-migrant households. Only interesting result shows in village 4 that percentage of holding job card and not holding job card among migrant and non-migrant households were same that is, 76 percent for holding job card and 24 percent for not holding job card respectively.
20. About 59 percent migrant households received employment under MGNREGA in the last one year whereas 54 percent non-migrant households received employment under MGNREGA in the last one year. In case of migrant households about 42 percent did not receive employment and on the other hand 46 percent non-migrant households did not receive the same. So, employment received by the migrant households was more than employment received by the non-migrant households. One absurd result noticed among migrant and non-migrant households in case of villages 3 and 6 is that received of employment under MGNREGA in the last one year is quite less than not received of employment of both migrant and non-migrant households. Here, only 4 percent and 16 percent migrant households of villages 3 and 6 received employment whereas 96 percent and 84 percent migrant households of those same villages did not receive employment. Further, 32 percent and 40 percent non-migrant households of villages 3 and 6 received employment whereas 68 percent and 60 percent non-migrant households of those same villages did not receive employment.
21. Regarding the days of employment received under MGNREGA in the last one year among migrant and non-migrant respondents, it could be observed that about 33 percent which is the highest percentage of migrant households received 6 to 10 days of employment under MGNREGA whereas the highest about 23 percent of non-migrant households received 16 and above days of employment under MGNREGA in the last one year and only about 5 percent which was the lowest percentage of migrant households received 11 to 15 days of employment whereas only about 1 percent

which was the lowest percentage of non-migrant households received 1 to 5 days of employment under MGNREGA. So, most of the migrant households received 6 to 10 days of employment and non-migrant households received 16 and above days of employment under MGNREGA in the last one year. In case of migrant household, received of employment between 11 to 15 days was found to be insignificant whereas in case non-migrant migrant households, 42 percent households did not receive any number of days of employment and 46 percent for non-migrant households did not receive any number of days of employment as they did not get job card under MGNREGA.

22. In respect of comparison of reasons for migration of migrants and reasons for non-migration of non-migrants, the data revealed that in Cooch Behar district, about 57 percent i.e., the highest percentage of migrants migrated out-side the district or state for in search of better employment followed by in search of employment (about 28 percent), migration of the parent/earning member of the family (about 14 percent), transfer of services/contract (about 1 percent) and business (less than 1 percent). On the other hand, about 53 percent i.e., the highest percentage of non-migrant had small or medium size of agricultural land followed by self-employment in business as well as services (about 13 percent), hampering family members' education (12 percent), marginal family and children due to low age (about 11percent), others like govt. service, major illness like malaria, typhoid, tuberculosis, construction worker (mason) etc. (9 percent) and social/ political problems in outside (riots, terrorism, bad law and order etc. (4 percent). Business and transfer of services or contract being the reasons for migration were found to be insignificant and social/ political problems in outside (riots, terrorism, bad law and order etc) being the reason for non-migration was found to be insignificant.

Chapters VII discusses the consequences of migration with costs and benefits. The analyses of this chapter are classified into two parts - (i) Analyses of socio-economic consequences of migration (ii Comparative analyses between migrant and non-migrant households regarding socio-economic consequences.

Here, the major findings of socio-economic consequences of migration in the study area are delineated in the following.

1. Data presented that about 26 percent of the migrants acquired some skill while working at destination whereas about 74 percent of the migrants did not acquire any skill and were engaged as an unskilled regular or casual daily labour. Since acquiring skill while working rendered the workers more efficient and skilled and it helped them to earn more in subsequent periods. However, there was a lot of inter-village variations among migrants based on skilled acquired at destinations.
2. The majority of the migrants (about 79 percent) in the district earned income in the range of Rs. 2001 to Rs. 5000 per month. The second income category in which the next higher number of workers falls was Rs. 1001-2000 (about 12 percent). The third income category where the next higher number of migrants belonged was Rs. 5001 to 10,000 (about 7 percent). Migrants' earning income up to 1000 and above Rs. 10,000 per month constituted only about 2 percent that were found to be insignificant. However, there were huge inter-village variations among migrant workers regarding the earnings of income. Thus, most of the migrant workers earning income remained in between Rs. 2001 to 5000.
3. It could be indicated that the majority percentage of respondents' monthly households' consumption expenditure (68 percent) were lie upto Rs. 2000. Then, about 27 percent of respondents' monthly households' consumption expenditure remained in between Rs. 2001-3000. The household consumption expenditure levels of respodents between Rs.3000-4000 and above Rs.4000 together constituted only about 5 percent which were found to be insignificant. Thus, most of the respondents' monthly households' consumption expenditure remained in upto Rs.2000.
4. The highest numbers of migrants (about 63 percent) fell into the consumption category of Rs. 1001 to Rs. 2000 per month. The second higher numbers of migrants (about 34 percent) belonged to the category of upto Rs. 1000. Migrants falling in income category of Rs. 2001 to 3000 and of Rs. 3001 and above formed an insignificant proportion of migrants in the district. However, there were a huge inter-village variations revealed in the table regarding the respondents' monthly consumption expenditure levels at destinsations. Thus, most of the migrants monthly consumption expenditure remained the consumption category of Rs. 1001 to Rs. 2000.
5. Data stated that the highest percentage (about 48 percent) of migrants from the district made a monthly saving of Rs. 1001-2000 followed by Rs. 2001-3000 (about 25

percent), Rs. upto 1000 (about 20 percent) and Rs. 3001 and above (nearly 7 percent). However, there were a lot of inter-village variations revealed in the table among migrants regarding the different categories of monthly savings. So, majority of migrants saved from their parts of income that ranges from Rs. 1000 to 2000.

6. About 75 percent of the migrants from the surveyed households sent money to their family members at origin and about 25 percent did not send the same. However, there were a much inter-village variations among migrants regarding the remittances sent and not sent. Interestingly, we noticed that in village 5, there was no even a single migrant who did not send money to his family member at origin and a very few percent (about 6 percent) migrants of village 6 did not sent money to their family members at origin.
7. The highest about 66 percent migrant of the surveyed households of Cooch Behar district sent remittances two times at origin, followed by three times (about 16 percent), one time (nearly 12 percent) and more than three times and above (about 6 percent). However, there were a lot of inter-village variations observed among the migrants regarding the times of remittances sent at their origin from their destinations. Thus, it is cleared that the major percentage of migrants sent remittances two times at their origins.
8. It could be found that the highest number of the district migrants (about 53 percent) made remittances in the range of Rs. 5001 to Rs. 10000. The next higher number of migrants, i.e., about 20 percent made remittances in the range of upto Rs. 5000. As far as third and fourth higher number of migrants making remittances are concerned it was interestingly found the same percentage i.e., 13.48 percentage in the categories of Rs. 10001 to 15000 and Rs. 15001 and above respectively in the district. However, there were huge inter-village variations revealed among the migrants regarding the amount of remittances sent at their origin from their working places. So, the majority of the migrants sent their money to their family members in the range of Rs. 5001 to Rs. 10000.
9. In district total for APL migrant families, the highest 20.67 percent families used remittances sent by the migrant workers on food items and the lowest 2 percent migrant families used remittances on both for education of their household members as well as other items on household consumer expenditure. On the other hand, for

BPL migrant families, the highest 72 percent families used remittances sent by the migrant workers on food items and the lowest 4.67 percent migrant families used remittances on education for their household members. Interestingly, it is seen in the table that in case of both APL and BPL families, there was no any use of remittances on marriage and other ceremonies. However, there were huge inter-village variations revealed among the APL and BPL migrant families regarding the use of remittances sent at their origin from their working places.

And the core results of comparative analyses between migrant and non-migrant households regarding socio-economic consequences are precisely outlined in the following.

10. Data revealed that in male and female migrants together, the highest about 36 percent migrants had no any education i.e., they are not literate, about 33 percent (the second most) migrants were literate with formal schooling including EGS that is they took education below primary level, about 13 percent (the third most) migrants took the education upto primary level and the education level literate without any schooling and diploma/ certificate course both possessed the lowest percentage i.e., only 0.13 for migrants. On the other hand, the highest 23 percent male and female non-migrants both were literate with formal schooling including EGS that is they took education below primary level, about 21 percent (the second most) non-migrants had no any education i.e., they were illiterate, about 19 percent (the third most) non-migrants took the education upto upper primary level and literate without formal schooling i.e. literate through NFEC/AIEP and others (community education, adult education initiated by village panchayat etc.) both possessed the lowest percentage i.e., only 0.14 for non-migrants. Although, there was a huge variations observed in the above table between male and female migrants and also between male and female non-migrants regarding various levels of education. Literate without any schooling, higher secondary education and diploma/ certificate course being the education level of migrants were found to be insignificant whereas literate without formal schooling, literate through TLC/AEC, diploma/ certificate course and post graduate and above being the education levels of non-migrants were found to be insignificant.

11. The highest percentage i.e., about 79 percent of migrants from the district earned a monthly income of Rs. 2001-5000 followed by Rs. 1001-2000 (about 13 percent), Rs.5001-10000 (about 7 percent), Upto Rs. 1000 (about 1 percent) and above 10000 (0.48 percent). On the other hand, the highest percentage i.e., about 70 percent of non-migrants from the district earned a monthly income of Rs. 2001-5000 followed by Rs. 1001-2000 (about 22 percent), Upto Rs. 1000 (about 13 percent), Rs. 5001-10000 (about 4 percent), and above 10000 (about 1 percent). However, there were a lot of inter-village variations noticed in the table among migrants and non-migrants regarding the different categories of monthly income. So, majority of migrants and non-migrants earned income that ranges from Rs. 2001 to 5000 through engaging various types of non-agricultural activities by migrants at destinations like labour in construction work, mason work, brick klin work, labour of rod binding work, etc, and through involving specially on agricultural activities by non-migrants at local areas.
12. About 63 percent migrant households' earners consumed monthly by spending the amount of Rs. 1000-2000 whereas about 51 percent non-migrant households' earners consumed monthly by spending that same amount. About 34 percent migrant households' earners depleted monthly by spending the amount of Rs. upto 1000 whereas about 45 percent non-migrant households' earners depleted monthly by spending that same amount and only 3 percent migrant households' earners swallowed monthly by spending the amount of Rs. 2001- 3000 whereas about only 4 percent non-migrant households' earners swallowed monthly by spending that same amount. So, the percentage of monthly consumption of migrant households' earners was higher than the percentage of monthly consumption of non-migrant households' earners in case of Rs. 1000-2000. On the other hand, for the case of consumption category of Rs. upto 1000, the percentage of monthly consumption of migrant households' earners was quite less than the percentage of monthly consumption of non-migrant households' earners and also for the case of consumption category of Rs. 2001-3000, the percentage of monthly consumption of migrant households' earners was little less than the percentage of monthly consumption of non-migrant households' earners.
13. About 48 percent migrant households' earners from the district saved monthly amount of Rs. 1001-2000 followed by Rs. 2001-3000 (about 25 percent), upto Rs.1000 (about

20 percent), and 3001 and above (about 7 percent) . On the other hand, about 52 percent of non-migrant households' earners from the district saved monthly amount of Rs. 1001-2000 followed by upto Rs. 1000, Rs. 2001-3000 (about 12 percent) and 3001 and above (about 7 percent). So, the majority of both migrant and non-migrant households earners saved monthly amount of Rs.1001-2000 and in comparison, the percentages of monthly saving amount of upto Rs.1000, Rs. 1001-2000 and 3001 and above of migrant households' earners were less than percentages of monthly saving of those same amounts of non-migrant households' earners. Only the percentage of monthly saving amount of Rs. 2001-3000 of migrant households' earners was greater than the percentage of monthly saving of that same amount of non-migrant households' earners.

14. 68 percent of respondents of migrant households' monthly household consumer expenditure were lie upto Rs.2000 whereas about only 11 percent of respondents of non-migrant households monthly household consumer expenditure remained in that same category. About 27 percent of respondents of migrant households monthly household consumer expenditure ranged from Rs 2001 to Rs.3000 whereas about 53 percent of respondents of non-migrant households monthly household consumer expenditure ranged from that same category. Only about 5 percent in total of respondents of migrant households remained for the monthly household consumer expenditure categories of Rs. 3001-4000 and above Rs. 4000 which were found to be insignificant. On the other hand, 36 percent in total of respondents of non-migrant households lied for the monthly household consumer expenditure categories of Rs. 3001-4000 and above Rs. 4000 which were quite higher than the respondents of migrant households lied in those same categories.
15. As far as asset holding of migrant and non-migrant households are concerned, the data exhibited that the telephone/mobile being an electric equipment occupied the highest number i.e., 154 whereas refrigerator possessed the lowest number for migrant households. On the other hand, for non-migrant households, also the telephone/mobile being an electric equipment occupied the highest number i.e., 116 whereas refrigerator possessed the lowest number. However, in comparison, the number of electric equipments of migrant households like refrigerator, B/W TV, transistor/radio, telephone/mobile, tubelights and other electric equipments such as iron, tape recorder, table fans, etc were higher than those types of electric equipments of non-migrant

households whereas the number of electric equipments such as colour TV, dish antenna and ceiling fans of migrant households were less than those categories of electric equipments of non-migrant households. Thus, due to more electrification of houses and purchasing capacity of non-migrant households, the number of electric equipments such as colour TV, dish antenna and ceiling fans were higher than migrant households. Refrigerator being electric equipment was found to be insignificant for both migrant and non-migrant households.

16. Considering the various furniture items for the surveyed households of Cooch Behar district, the total number of cots /beds of migrant households was 346 whereas the total number of that same furniture item of non-migrant households was 292. For the migrant households, the total number of chairs/benches was 265 whereas it was 288 for non-migrant households. Next, the total number of tables of migrant households was 163 whereas for non-migrant households it was 135. And, the total number of almirahs/cupboards of migrant households was 159 in which for the non-migrant households it was 196. There was no even a single sofa set of migrant households whereas only 1 sofa set was there for non-migrant households that was found to be insignificant. The total number of dressing tables and other furniture items like wooden tools, alnas etc. of migrant household was 90 whereas it was 54 for non-migrant households. Although, there were significant inter-village variations regarding the number of various furniture items among migrant and non-migrant households. Hence, on an average, the total number of furniture items of migrant households was higher than the total number of furniture items of non-migrant households.

On the whole, it was found that out-migration is a boon to the migrant workers and other members of their families.

8.2 Conclusions

According to 2001 Census, migration data by the place of last residence express that the maximum number of migrants migrated within the state for the duration of 20 years and above i.e., permanent migration. The migrants migrated within the state were minimum for the duration of less than one year i.e., temporary migration and also the same patterns found for migrants migrated from other states of India. The number of migrants from other states in the country has recorded highest growth (by 53.6%) among migration trends, which would indicate increasing mobility due to migration for work/employment and education in other states.

According to NSSO data of different rounds, it is viewed that low migration rate among rural males signified that males neither from rural areas nor from urban areas had the tendency to migrate to rural areas.

During the period of 1983 to 2000, it is observed that the percentage of male migrants to the total population remained almost constant i.e., about 7 per cent - for rural areas and showed little variation - between 24 to 27 per cent - in urban areas. A rising trend in the case of females, however, was noticeable in percentage of migrants to the total population over this period.

It is also observed that the net- migration rate per 1000 of people among the major states of India was the highest for Haryana (79) followed by Maharashtra (44), West Bengal (27) and Punjab (25) in 1999-2000.

As far as growths of migrants by migration streams in India during the decade of 1991-2001 are concerned, there are some negative percentages of growth of males and female migrants in rural to rural, rural to urban and urban to rural migration streams of intra-district and inter-district migration during the decade. On the other hand, there are all positive percentages of growth of intercensal migrants in interstate migration stream.

According to NSSO data of 1999-2000 on migration in the respect of trend and pattern of rural-urban migration in India, it is observed that the proportion of migration for males in each period of migration was greater than the proportion of migration for females in each period of migration and it also observed that the overall movement of males from rural to urban areas was more frequent than females.

According to 2001 census, with duration of residence 0-9 years by rural- urban status of place of last residence and the place of enumeration, it is explored that out of 97.5 million internal

migrants in the country, 53.3 million (54.7%) migrants moved within rural areas and about 20.6 million migrants (21.1% of the total migrants) migrated from rural areas to urban areas. Regarding reasons for migration, according to 1991 census data, out of total 82.1 million migrants (both male and female) by last residence about 36.1 million were female migrants who moved on account of marriage. The proportion of female migrants who had migrated due to marriage declined slightly to 64.9% in 2001 from 65.9% in 1991. Obviously, 'Work/Employment' and 'Family moved' continue to be important reasons among males migrants.

In respect of the nature of movement of migration according to 64th round NSSO Survey in West Bengal, it is viewed that both the cases of permanent and temporary migration with duration of stay more than 12 months, number of female migrants was noticeably higher than the number of male migrants due to marriage.

As far as the internal migrants by the types of migration streams for West Bengal are concerned, the most of migration for both male and female occurred through the streams of rural to rural and rural to urban migration.

Based on the above major findings we can draw the following conclusions from the study.

1. The rural out-migration that has been witnessed in our survey villages is a revelation of severe economic distress.
2. The decadal growth rate of population during 1991-2001 has been recorded as 7.86 percent in the district. It reveals an idea about the general relative distribution pattern of population in the state as well as also in the whole country from the demographic profile of sample villages.
3. The migrant families mainly dependent upon with male migrants to maintain their socio-economic status.
4. In overall out-migration pattern, the dominant has been rural to urban migration in the district of Cooch Behar.
5. Migration from Cooch Behar district has been mainly non-seasonal and longer duration.
6. Most of migrant workers have migrated within the country and very few migrated outside the country.

7. Most of the migration of Cooch Behar district has taken place through rural to urban stream in industrial sector.
8. Majority of the migrant of the surveyed households engaged other type of employment i.e. work as regular wage at destination and received wages in the range of Rs 81-100 per day.
9. Migration of children along with adult male or female members has resulted in the deprivation of these children of basic education. Households having children migrants are likely to face a bleak future as deficiency in schooling of the migrant children will prevent them from coming out of poverty trap.
10. Destination, type of employment and earning of the migrants are closely correlated to the level of literacy of the migrants. Broadly, migrants with above-primary level education prefer to migrate in semi-urban or urban areas to be employed in non-farm sector. Naturally, migrants with higher levels of literacy earn more than those with lower levels of literacy.
11. Migrants are conscious about their role and responsibility in the family. Most of them did not wait for the opinion of their parents or spouses to take decision to migrate. Majority took decision themselves to migrate to save the self and family from starvation and distressed condition.
12. Social network and kinship was the dominant facilitator of migration. Thus, social relations have a lot of meaning and significance in rural society till today.
13. Underemployment situation prevailing at origin was the very important cause (push factor) of migration. Migrants hardly found employment for 7 months in a year at the origin. But they need job throughout the year to overcome their hunger and the state of destitution.
14. Our study does not support Todaro's migration theory. No migrant worker remains unemployed at destination. Jobs are ready to absorb the migrants at destinations. So the migrants' 'actual earning' (in contrast to 'expected earning' in Todaro's model) is much higher at destinations due to full employment and higher wage rates there as compared to origin. Thus, full employment throughout the year and higher wages and higher income at destination were the strongest pull factors for migration.

15. Both push and pull factors are responsible for causing out-migration of the rural workers. However, push factors were stronger than the pull factors. Actually, in most cases migration was undertaken as a last resort of survival strategy.
16. It reveals from our study that workers who already migrated worked as a role model or motivator to many prospective migrant workers.
17. Introduction of National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) (since 2nd October 2009, it has been renamed as Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act – MGNREGA) has not been successful in checking rural out-migration from our study areas. The implementation of the scheme is being done half-heartedly.
18. There are both positive and negative socio-economic impacts of migration on the life, livelihood and living conditions of the migrant population and their family members at origin. Positive impacts were visible in the form of higher income earning, higher consumption level, saving some money out of higher income and to use the money remitted by the migrants for the purposes of buying food, health care services, improving housing condition, repaying debt etc. But the families of the migrants could not use the remitted money for the purpose of education of their children as they had to meet other pressing needs having higher priority in their lives. The negative impacts were found in the form of lack of attention to elderly and children who were left at origin, occasional accidents at work sites at destinations, occasional theft and looting of their cash and belongings while on journey by train or bus for home visit, and sporadic harassment by their employers in terms of provision of sub-human shelter, food and working condition at destinations.

Migration and movement of people from one area to another is a continuous and eternal churning process bringing both joys and sorrows to the migrants. Nevertheless, on the whole out-migration has proved to be a definite boon to the migrants and their family members in our survey areas.

8.3 Suggestions and Policy Recommendations

The study leads us to make certain suggestions from our findings and conclusions for the improvement of standard of living and quality of life of the migrants and their family members and their neighbours who are in a similar socio-economic condition. We would like to formulate the following few practical suggestions and policy recommendations.

1. The first and foremost measure to be taken at the government level is to implement its current wage-employment and self-employment programmes and other income-augmenting policies for the rural poor. Creation of employment opportunities at local level would help to check migration of women and children. Women and children need to remain at origin. Because in that case women would be able to look after their children and elderly members of the family and send their children to school. Children, by getting their basic education, and if condition becomes favorable, can take their secondary, higher secondary and still higher level of education. Being educated they can permanently improve their socio-economic condition.
2. It is crucially important that imbalances between economic opportunities in rural and urban sectors be minimized specifically since migrants are assumed to respond differentials in expected incomes, if we mark the urban 'expected' wage as the real wage.
3. More technical institution should be established by the Government so that people can take technical education easily for acquiring more skills that helps to have better company job through migration at destination.
4. Strengthening of self-help groups by effective management of micro-credit programme may help the rural poor to break the vicious cycle of poverty. Members of the groups should be provided with more training for production and marketing of their produce and services.
5. Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) will have be implemented widely in rural areas in West Bengal as well as overall in India by the Central Government through active initiation of Panchayat members to check out-migration, especially of female workers.

6. Existing programmes of agricultural and rural development are to be properly implemented with good governance. Measures are to be taken to increase agricultural productivity by expanding irrigation facilities and expanding the area under high yielding varieties. Public investment in irrigation is to be increased. Conditions should be created to facilitate private investment in agricultural development. More activities in the allied sector of agriculture like live-stock, animal husbandry, horticulture and floriculture are to be undertaken. Through more and more public and private investment it is possible to increase employment opportunities in these allied sectors of agriculture.
7. Finally, in spite of the above suggestions and recommendations to check rural out-migration, we recommend promotion of rural-urban migration of rural population to be absorbed in non-agricultural employment in urban areas in the short run for economic reasons. However, it is obvious that more educated manpower should undertake migration from rural areas, as that will bring more income and prosperity. To facilitate out-migration, more transport facilities are to be provided within rural areas, from rural areas to near and far destinations of migrants in terms of expansion of railway networks and bus routes; better telecommunication facilities are to be provided and more rural banking facilities are to be created.