

The Level and Pattern of Economic Activity by Migration Status in India

STUDIES of labour force participation generally assume a positive association between migration status and labour force status. It is presumed that most migration is motivated by economic reasons and that as a result, the labour force participation of migrants tends to exceed that of the non-migrants. Demographic studies in India proceed on the assumption that this generalisation is applicable also to the internal migration in the country. Some data available from the 1961 Census suggest the need for some qualifications to this general presumption

The primary objective here is to outline the differentials in the level of worker rates and the sectoral or industrial distribution of workers according to their migration status. The necessary data are available from the 1961 Census of India which gives the distribution of population according to the place of birth and work status (workers and non-workers) as well as the industrial category distribution¹ of workers. The special migration tables compiled from the 1961

*The author was Professor of Demography, Department of Economics, University of Bombay, (Kalina, Bombay 400038) when this paper was prepared in 1973.

1. The term 'industrial category' was used in the 1961 Census to approximate to a one/digit industrial classification of the population. In a sense, it was based on mixed criteria including industry or the activity of the establishment, as well as location or (he scale of activity (e.g. whether manufacturing was undertaken within the household or outside) and the land-ownership status of the agricultural workers (e.g. cultivators and agricultural labourers). However, The industrial category distribution of workers was provided for every village of India and has proved useful.

census data for Greater Bombay², together with the special tables on the working force of Maharashtra³, make it possible to study worker rates by sex, age and migration status, and for females, also by marital status. This analysis is supplemented by the data from a special sample survey of 1500 households in Greater Bombay, conducted during March-June 1971 to study the characteristics of migrants to Greater Bombay.⁴ These supplementary data are subject to sampling errors but a variety of possible cross-tabulations help to understand related factors like the level of unemployment and income situation of the migrants and nonmigrants.

The Distribution of Population by Migration Status, 1961

The 1961 census data on migration are based on the reported place of birth. Persons enumerated in a place different from their place of birth are considered migrants, or rather, lifetime migrants because the time of their move is not known. The information relating to the rural-urban character of the place of birth (or origin) and the place of enumeration (destination) makes it possible to distinguish between the intra-rural, urban-rural, rural-urban and inter-urban migrants. These distinctions can take into account the territorial boundaries crossed by the migrants. It is, therefore, possible to classify them as intradistrict, interdistrict as well as interstate migrants.

Table 1 shows the distribution of the male and female population of rural and urban India according to migration status, as reported by the 1961 Census. According to these data, 14 per cent of the rural males and 40 per cent of the urban males were lifetime migrants. The corresponding proportion for females was around 45 per cent, both in rural and urban areas. The higher percentage of migrants among the females is certainly due to the customary change in their place of residence following marriage. A certain proportion of

2. The special migration tables have been published in Census of India, 1961, Vol. X, Maharashtra, Part X (1-C) Greater Bombay : *Special Migration Tables*, 1966.

3. The tables on the working force of Maharashtra State were compiled under a collaborative project of the Office of the Registrar General and the University of Bombay. The results have been summarised in author's "The Level and Nature of Work Participation by Sex, Age and Marital Status in India, 1961", a paper presented at the Census Centenary Seminar held at New Delhi in October 1972.

4. The survey was conducted on behalf of the CIDCO (City and Industrial Development Corporation of Maharashtra Ltd. The field work for the survey was carried out by a staff appointed and supervised by the Tata Institute of Social Sciences. It was designed to collect data on the demographic particulars (from a sample of 3,000 households) as well as on migration, housing conditions and travel patterns (from a sample of 1500 households).

TABLE 1—THE PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION AND SEX RATIO OF THE TOTAL AND THE INDIA BORN POPULATION BY RURAL/URBAN RESIDENCE AND PLACE OF BIRTH OR MIGRATION STATUS, 1961 CENSUS DATA

Country of Birth/Migration Status/Place of Birth (Rural or Urban)	Place of Enumeration								
	All Areas			Rural Areas			Urban Areas		
	Males	Females	Sex Ratio	Males	Females	Sex Ratio	Males	Females	Sex Ratio
I. All Persons	100.00	100.00	1063	100.00	100.00	1038	100.00	100.00	1184
India Born	97.75	97.97	1061	98.61	98.71	1037	94.05	94.24	1181
Born Abroad	2.25	2.03	1167	1.39	1.29	1116	5.95	5.76	1224
II. Migration Status of the India-Born (India-born = 100.00)									
(a) Non-migrants	81.21	55.28	1559	85.92	54.87	1625	60.02	57.42	1235
Rural Born	70.30	45.90	1625	85.92	54.87	1625	—	—	—
Urban Born	10.91	9.38	1235	—	—	—	60.02	57.42	1235
(b) Intradistrict									
Migrants	10.23	32.99	329	9.75	35.98	281	12.38	17.72	826
Rural Born	9.24	31.43	312	9.22	35.00	273	9.32	13.20	835
Urban Born	0.99	1.56	675	0.53	0.98	561	3.06	4.52	801
(c) Intendistrict Intra-									
state Migrants	5.03	8.50	623	2.93	7.16	425	14.48	15.35	1115
Rural Born	3.77	6.97	574	2.59	6.65	404	9.09	8.63	1245
Urban Born	1.26	1.53	874	0.34	0.51	687	5.39	6.72	948
(d) Interstate									
Migrants	3.53	3.23	1161	1.40	1.99	725	13.12	9.51	1630
Rural Born	2.47	2.30	1141	1.22	1.80	701	8.09	4.82	1984
Urban Born	1.06	0.93	1210	0.18	0.19	945	5.03	4.69	1266

NOTE : The above percentages may be different from those based on Table D III since the absolute numbers in Tables D III and D VI are different in some cases.

SOURCE : Census of India, 1961, Vol. I, *India*, Part II-C(iv), *Migration Tables*, Table D VI, pp. 4, 10, 16.

TABLE 2-WORKER RATES AND INDUSTRIAL DISTRIBUTION OF WORKERS BY MIGRATION STATUS OF THE POPULATION IN RURAL AND URBAN AREAS OF INDIA, BY SEX, 1961 CENSUS

Migration Status	Per Cent of Popu- lation	Worker Rate (per 1000 persons)	Sector®			Industrial Category®								
			P	S	T	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Males														
Rural Areas														
1. All Persons	100.00	582	801	85	114	611	158	33	57	19	9	26	8	80
2. (a) Nonmigrants*	85.92	561	833	74	93	656	152	25	55	14	5	22	6	65
(b) Intradistrict														
3a. (i) Intrarural Migrants	9.22	696	711	113	176	450	213	48	70	29	14	36	11	129
3b. (ii) Urban-Rural Migrants	0.53	518	409	202	389	265	96	48	98	69	35	93	36	260
(c) Interdistrict														
4a. (i) Intrarural Migrants	2.59	699	629	153	218	360	187	82	67	47	39	41	20	157
4b. (ii) Urban-Rural Migrants	0.34	531	343	234	423	198	81	64	86	87	61	80	56	287
(d) Interstate														
5a. (i) Intrarural Migrants	1.22	785	552	201	247	242	116	194	50	86	65	59	31	157
5b. (ii) Urban-Rural Migrants	0.18	598	309	252	439	144	56	109	64	102	86	103	68	268
Urban Areas														
6. All Persons	100.00	524	102	326	572	56	22	25	58	229	39	180	93	299
7. (a) Non migrants*	60.02	409	162	328	510	101	35	26	87	205	36	186	74	250
(b) Intradistrict**														
80. (i) Rural-Urban Migrants	9.32	629	123	280	597	55	38	30	59	184	37	157	90	350
86. (ii) Interurban Migrants	3.06	541	70	307	623	32	15	23	62	207	38	164	105	354
(c) Interdistrict														
9a. (i) Rural-Urban Migrants	9.09	700	57	347	596	14	10	33	31	271	45	131	108	347
94. (ii) Interurban Migrants	5.39	578	29	313	658	9	4	16	37	235	41	151	128	379
(d) Interstate														
10a. (i) Rural-Urban Migrants	8.09	796	36	378	586	5	4	27	22	306	50	165	101	320
10b. (ii) Interurban Migrants	5.03	660	18	340	642	4	2	12	25	275	40	195	115	332

Females

Rural Areas

	100.00	314	856	80	64	589	248	20	70	7	3	10	—	54-
2	54.87	214	846	87	67	562	261	23	77	9	1	10	N	57
3a	35.00	462	874	69	57	620	243	11	63	4	2	9	N	4S
3b	0.98	311	696	162	142	454	227	15	143	15	4	27	1	114
4a	6.65	363	840	89	71	558	257	25	72	9	8	11	1	59-
4b	0.51	247	664	151	185	434	201	29	120	18	13	28	1	156--
5a	1.80	446	837	80	74	539	182	116	52	21	16	9	1	64
5b	0.19	238	644	169	187	413	159	72	108	26	35	31	3	153-

Urban Areas

6	100.00	111	254	322	424	121	106	28	198	99	25	68	12	344
7	57.42	89	255	354	391	120	113	22	245	94	15	76	9	306
8a	13.20	215	377	275	348	188	161	28	169	85	21	58	7	283
8b	4.52	131	265	331	404	143	102	20	237	80	14	67	7	330
9a	8.63	142	209	301	490	82	72	55	132	119	50	72	18	400
9b	6.72	93	113	288	599	61	37	15	176	93	19	72	18	509
10a	4.82	132	160	394	446	57	43	60	121	172	101	56	28	362
10b	4.69	82	71	274	655	33	20	18	128	112	34	71	26	558

*Excludes persons born in place of enumeration in case of Goa, Daman and Diu as data were not separately collected.

""Includes persons born in taluk of enumeration in Goa, Daman and Diu as data for persons born in place of enumeration were not separately collected. N stands for negligible.

©Industrial categories are : I: Cultivation; II: Agricultural Labour; IfI: Mining, Quarrying, Animal Husbandry, Forestry, Fishing, Plantation Work, Orchardry and Allied Activities; IV : Household Industry; V : Manufacturing other than Household Industry; VI: Construction; VII: Trade and Commerce; VIII : Transport, Storage and Communication; IX : Other Services. The sectoral figures are obtained as follows : P : Primary sector—I, II and III; S : Secondary sector—IV, V and VI; and T : Tertiary sector—VII, VIII and IX.

SOURCE : Census of India, 1961, *India*, Vol. I, Part IIC (iv), *Migration Tables*, Table D VI, pp. 10-11, 16-17.

the observed intradistrict migration and a much smaller proportion of the inter-district migration is spurious, due to the practice of pregnant women going to their parents' home for delivery. Some small scale survey data suggest substantial intercaste differentials in the extent of prevalence of this practice and the influence of this factor is probably exaggerated but it is certainly a relevant factor. The sex ratios of migrants suggest a declining excess, or a rising deficit, of females among rural as well as urban migrants, associated with a probably increasing average distance from intradistrict to interdistrict and further to interstate migration. These figures support the impression of a progressively greater importance of economically motivated male movement in long-distance migration.

The Worker Rates and the Industrial Classification of Workers by Migration Status, India, 1961

Table 2 shows the worker rates and the industrial distribution of workers by migration status, for males and the females in rural and urban India. We shall discuss the data first for males and then for females.

(a) *Rural Males.* In rural India, the worker rates of intrarural male migrants were significantly higher than those of nonmigrants as well as urban-rural migrants. The rates for both intrarural and urban-rural migrants increased with increasing distance of movement; but the proportion of workers among the urban-rural migrants was consistently lower than among the intrarural migrants. In all probability, the lower worker rates were a result mainly of the age composition of the relevant group of persons. Migrants from urban to rural areas as well as the nonmigrants tend to include a higher proportion of the young and/or the elderly than persons who move from one villages to another, be it in the same district, across the district, or across the state.

Interestingly, the proportion of agricultural labourers is significantly higher and that of cultivators lower among the intradistrict, interdistrict, intrarural migrants than among the nonmigrants. It is likely that persons who own or can lease in land for cultivation migrate less frequently than the landless agricultural labourers⁵ who move to augment their duration of employment as well

5. A similar **conclusion** is suggested by the findings of a survey of 14 villages of **Kutch** district in **Gujarat State**, conducted by the author in **1966**. **The data have been analysed by Chandan Savla in her *Some Aspects of Out-Migration from Gujarat (With Special Reference to Kutch District)*, a thesis submitted to the University of Bombay in candidacy for the Ph. D. degree, October 1973.**

as income. Further, the proportion of workers engaged in cultivation or agricultural labour and in the primary sector as a whole declines with increasing distance. The urban-rural migrant workers engage mainly in the tertiary or other services sectors but their proportion in the secondary sector also tends to be significantly higher than among the nonmigrants or the intrarural migrants. Presumably, the urban-rural migrants brought with them certain skills (including educational qualifications) and/or capital which enabled them to take up activities like construction, trade, transport, nonhousehold manufacturing or "other services",

(b) *Urban Males.* The worker rate of urban males was about 10 per cent lower than of rural males. Among urban males, the nonmigrants and the interurban intradistrict migrants report substantially lower worker rates than the other categories of migrants. The rural-urban migrants record much higher worker rates, which increase directly with the distance moved. As in the case of rural males, differences in the age composition of the nonmigrants and of different categories of migrants appear to be the likely explanatory factor.

The differences in the sectoral and the industrial category distribution of urban workers with different migration statuses are much less pronounced than among the rural males. However, it is perhaps significant that the proportion of workers engaged in trade and commerce or the tertiary sector as a whole tends to be higher and the proportion in the nonhousehold manufacturing, to be lower among the interurban migrant workers (both interstate and intrastate inter-district) than among the corresponding rural-urban migrants. Quite probably, this situation reflects the lower educational qualifications or the paucity of requisite contacts and resources among rural-urban migrants than among inter-urban migrants.

(c) *Rural Females.* The worker rate for females in rural areas is about half that of males. Yet, the differentials in the worker rates of rural women according to migration status were broadly similar to those for males, excepting that the rates for rural-urban female migrants decline with increasing distance of movement. The proportion of female workers engaged in the tertiary sector (mainly in "other services") or in the secondary sector (mainly in household industry) tends to be higher among urban-rural migrants than among intrarural migrants. As a logical corollary, the proportion of the urban-rural migrant female workers was lower in the primary sector. This situation is not surprising because the urban-born women located in rural areas are unlikely to have the skills or aptitude for agricultural work.

(d) *Urban Females.* The proportion of workers among urban females is much lower than among males and only about one-third that of their rural sisters. Further, the worker rate for migrant women steadily declines with an increase in the distance moved. Also, the interurban migrants report significantly lower worker rates than their rural-born sisters. These differences are perhaps associated with the selectivity of migrant women in terms of caste or income and/or educational level.

A majority of interurban migrant women workers who had moved across the district or across the state are engaged in the services. Besides, a higher proportion of such women work in household industries than that for the rural-urban migrant women. The latter work as cultivators or as agricultural labourers to a much greater extent. In all probability, women who move within the district, whether from a rural place or from an urban place, include a high proportion of marriage migrants, who participate in the familial vocations. They are able to work as cultivators or as agricultural labourers in the rural fringe which surrounds most of our urban areas.

To sum up, the worker rates of migrants are significantly higher than those of the non-migrants, for both males and females. As already noted, the differences in the age composition of the nonmigrants and migrants are likely to be an important explanatory factor. Unfortunately, the data do not show the age distribution of the two groups and therefore it is not possible to estimate the standardised worker rates. We, however, supplement the preceding discussion with an analysis of the data for Greater Bombay.

Worker Rates by Migration Status, Greater Bombay, 1961

Greater Bombay with a total population of 4.15 million in 1961 constituted 0.9 per cent of the total population of the country but more than 5 per cent of the total urban population. In 1961, nearly 78 per cent of the males and 68 per cent of the females, aged 10 or more and enumerated in Greater Bombay, were reported to be lifetime immigrants. The differentials in worker rates by migration status prevailing in Greater Bombay are, therefore, of considerable interest. They are also likely to be representative of the situation in other metropolitan areas of India.

Table 3 below shows the worker rates for the population of Greater Bombay by migration status and age. While the crude worker rate for the migrant males is 2.7 times higher than for the nonmigrants, the exclusion of age group 0-9 substantially narrows the difference. The age-standardised rates show a difference of only 16 per cent. Interestingly, the differences between the worker rates of

TABLE 3—WORKER RATES (WORKERS PER 1000 POPULATION) IN GREATER BOMBAY BY AGE, SEX AND MIGRATION STATUS, 1961 CENSUS

Age	Males				Females			
	All (1)	Migrants (2)	Non- Migrants (3)	Relative Level of Rate for Migrants (4) = $\frac{(2/3)}{X}$	All (5)	Migrants (6)	Non- Migrants (7)	Relative Level of Rate for Migrants (8) = $\frac{(6/7)}{x 100}$
All Ages	617	774	284	273	88	108	61	177
10 and over	61	833	506	165	121	123	115	107
10-14	72	140	21	667	27	45	15	300
15-19	426	558	128	436	78	93	58	160
20-24	811	842	702	120	128	123	140	88
25-29	941	939	950	99	134	116	192	60
30-34	964	966	953	101	161	135	258	52
35-44	965	967	952	102	186	169	246	69
45-59	903	910	868	105	162	163	158	103
60 and over	520	545	436	125	74	72	78	92
Standardised Rate for Ages JO and over	698	731	629	116	120	116	143	81

SOURCE : (1) Census of India, 1961, Vol. X, Maharashtra, Part X (1-C), Greater Bombay : *Special Migration Tables*, 1966.

(2) Unpublished tables compiled under a special project **undertaken by the author** at the University of Bombay in collaboration with the Office of the Registrar General, India.

NOTE : The age distribution of the male and the female population of Maharashtra State as a whole, aged 10 years and over in 1961, has been used as the standard.

migrants and nonmigrants are substantial in the age group 10-19 and much smaller in the age group 20-24 and 60 and over. In ages 25 to 59 the differences are minor, not more than 5 per cent. On the whole, the differential between the workers rates of migrants and nonmigrant males form an inverted T-shaped curve as we move from young to old ages. In all probability, the large differential in the young ages of 10 to 19 reflects differentials in the enrolment in schools and colleges. In ages 60 and over, the differential probably arises from the

likely retirement of the nonmigrant workers whose proportion tends to be higher in the organised sector.

Turning to females, the crude worker rate of migrant females is almost 80 per cent higher than that of nonmigrant females, but the differential is much smaller than in the case of males; and the exclusion of age-group 0-9 reduces it to less than 10 per cent. As in the case of male worker rates, the differential follows an inverted 'J'-shape curve. Rather surprisingly, in the age groups 20 to 44, the proportion of workers tends to be significantly higher among nonmigrant women than among the migrant women. The standardised worker rate for migrant women aged 10 and over is almost 20 per cent lower than that for the nonmigrant women. This observation is contrary to general belief and needs due attention.

Worker Rates for Females in Greater Bombay by Migration and Marital Status

According to Table 4, the proportion of workers among immigrant females is generally lower than among the nonmigrants among the married and the widowed; but the contrary is true for the never-married and the divorced. Of course, there are a few exceptions—ages 15-19 and 45-59 among the married, ages 60 and over among the widowed, ages 25-34 among the never married and ages 45-59 among the divorced. The age pattern of the differentials does not show a clear trend, such as reflected by Table 3. However, the standardized rates for the married and widowed migrant females aged 10 and over are 30 per cent lower than those for their nonmigrant counterparts. On the other hand, among the never-married and the divorced, the standardised rates for migrant females are about 13 to 15 per cent higher than those for their locally-born sisters. The married and the widowed constituted a majority of the total female population of Greater Bombay and this fact supports the observation that the standardised worker rate for migrant women as a group is about 19 per cent lower than among the nonmigrants.

Worker Rates by Migration Status, Greater Bombay, 1971

The evidence presented in Tables 3 and 4 can be supplemented by the data based on a special survey conducted in Greater Bombay in 1971. The classification of the survey population by migration status, used to study the level and pattern of economic activity, is based on the criterion of place of usual residence. According to this criterion, about 48 per cent of the males and 41 per cent of the females are classified as immigrants. (According to the place of birth, about 57 per cent of the males and 50 per cent of the females in Greater

**TABLE 4—WORKER RATES (WORKERS PER 1000 POPULATION) FOR FEMALES
IN GREATER BOMBAY, BY AGE, MARITAL AND MIGRATION STATUS,
ACCORDING TO THE 1961 CENSUS**

Age	Never Married				Married			
	All (1)	Migrants (2)	Non- Migrants V)	(4) = (2/3) X 100	All (5)	Migrants (6)	Non- Migrants (7)	8 = (6/7) x 100
10 and over	109	145	82	177	104	98	126	78
10-14	25	42	14	300	144	119	265	45
15-19	78	103	55	187	77	79	69	114
20-24	289	354	223	159	78	75	87	86
25-29	450	410	496	83	97	91	118	77
30-34	512	473	552	86	124	106	199	53
35-44	460	479	442	108	133	121	179	68
45-59	329	448	265	169	106	117	62	189
60 and over	168	182	159	114	70	60	94	64
Standardised Rate for Ages								
10 and over	289	314	272	115	106	99	139	71
	Widowed				Divorced			
	All	Migrants	Non- Migrants	(4) = (2/3) X 100	All	Migrants	Non- Migrants	8 = (6/7) x 100
10 and over	222	214	254	84	435	461	395	117
10-14	419	320	833	38	280	333	231	144
15-19	338	283	434	65	236	244	227	107
20-24	365	338	431	78	330	356	301	118
25-29	461	433	534	81	426	432	417	104
30-34	504	478	584	82	508	533	470	113
35-44	418	392	529	74	536	580	440	132
45-59	222	213	253	84	471	445	518	86
60 and over	70	72	65	111	308	321	282	114
Standardised Rates for Ages								
10 and Over	364	324*	484*	67	388	410	363	113

The figure for nonmigrant widows in Greater Bombay is affected by a very high rate in ages 10-14, based on a small frequency. The standardised rates for widows 15 years and over are 326 for the migrants and 419 for the nonmigrants.

Bombay were inmigrants.)⁸

The worker rates by sex, age and migration status in Table 5-refer to 1971. It is reassuring that the level and pattern of the differentials in the worker rates

TABLE 5—WORKER RATES (WORKERS PER 1000 POPULATION) IN GREATER BOMBAY, BY AGE, SEX AND MIGRATION STATUS, 1971 SURVEY

Age	Males				Females			
	All (1)	Migrants (2)	Non-Migrants (3)	Relative Level of Rate for Migrants (4) = (2/3) X 100	All (5)	Migrant (6)	Non-Migrants (7)	Relative Level of Rate for Migrants (8) = (6/7) X 100
All Ages	532	812	276	294	94	134	66	203
10 and over	686	831	467	178	123	137	107	128
10-14	48	128	32	400	16	93	6	1550
15-19	268	414	200	207	49	67	42	160
20-24	740	780	692	113	170	133	208	64
25-34	926	936	898	104	161	142	201	71
35-44	954	957	946	101	172	162	203	80
45-54	920	934	847	110	154	136	301	45
55-59	857	850	892	95	110	137	29	472
60 and over	556	584	439	133	121	125	111	113
<i>Standardised Rules</i>								
All Ages	474	501	446	113	88	87	108	82
10 and over	663	703	624	112	123	125	152	83

NOTE : The data pertaining to nonmigrants include those for return migrants. The return migrants constituted 1.58 per cent of the total population and 2.88 per cent of nonmigrants and return migrants, together.

The age distribution of the population of Maharashtra, enumerated in the 1961 Census, is used as the standard.

of migrants and nonmigrants reflected were quite similar to those reported by the 1961 census data. The standardised worker rate for age group 10 and over shows the proportion of workers among the migrant males to be about 12 per

6. Unfortunately the 1971 census data on the subject were not available at the time of writing in October 1973.

cent higher than among nonmigrants. The corresponding standardised worker rate for the migrant women is about 17 per cent lower than that for the non-migrant women. This differential seems to be a result of the difference observed in ages 20 to 54. Apparently the lower worker rates for migrant females than for the nonmigrants are a persistent feature of the situation in Bombay.

Incidence of Unemployment by Migration Status

The small sample size precludes the estimation of worker rates by migration as well as marital status from the data of the 1971 survey. However, the data can be used to examine whether the lower worker rates are due to a higher incidence of unemployment among migrant females. For this purpose, Table 6 shows the

TABLE 6—INCIDENCE OF UNEMPLOYMENT (UNEMPLOYED AS PER CENT OF THE LABOUR FORCE) BY SEX, AGE AND MIGRATION STATUS, GREATER BOMBAY, 1971 SURVEY

Age	Males			Females		
	All	Migrants	Non-Migrants	All	Migrants	Non-Migrants
10-14	—	—	12.39	—	—	—
15-19	21.70	16.08	26.57	48.08	23.17	55.74
20-24	11.24	10.90	11.72	17.59	21.55	14.73
25-34	4.00	4.10	3.79	3.36	2.13	5.09
35-44	2.81	2.37	4.52	2.27	3.25	—
45-54	1.99	1.78	3.21	—	—	—
55-59	3.18	3.78	—	—	—	—
60 and over	1.49	1.76	—	—	—	—
All Ages	5.69	4.56	8.76	9.65	5.77	14.66
Standardised	5.63	4.91	8.39	8.99	6.52	9.53

incidence of unemployment by migration status. Interestingly, the incidence of unemployment, both crude and age standardised, is smaller among the migrants than among the nonmigrants. This finding is consistent with the results of the Bombay Survey conducted during 1954-57.⁷ The migrants cannot afford to remain without some means of livelihood for any length of time. And therefore they probably accept even less remunerative jobs or opportunities for work.

7. D. T. Lakdawala *et al.*, *Work, Wages and Well-Being in an Indian Metropolis : Economic Survey of Bombay City*, University of Bombay, 1963, pp. 481-486. The classification of population by economic activity, adopted in the Bombay Survey, was largely patterned after the 1951 Census. But the earner-population ratios for immigrant females were lower than for the nonmigrants. Among males, these ratios were higher for migrants than for nonmigrants in ages 10-44. The reverse was true for older age groups. *Ibid.*, pp. 232-234.

Other Explanations for Lower Worker/Participation Rates of Migrant Females

The lower female participation rates among migrants are not a result of higher family incomes. The 1971 survey data show that about 35 per cent of the nonmigrant heads of household have monthly household incomes of Rs. 500 or more, while the corresponding proportion for the migrant heads is 24 per cent.⁸ The average monthly income is Rs. 424 for households with migrant heads and Rs. 504 for households with nonmigrants.⁹

The explanation for the lower worker rates of migrant female has, therefore, to be sought in other factors. Among such factors is the possibility that even the lower incomes of migrants are low only relatively to those of nonmigrants. Compared to their incomes and living conditions in places of origin, the migrants in Bombay have probably experienced a significant improvement. This factor could induce the migrant women to restrict their activities to the home. Besides, the nonmigrant females usually have an advantage over the migrants in terms of their educational attainment. As a result, the nonmigrant women are better equipped for the jobs available in the metropolitan area. The migrant females may also be more conservative in their attitudes and less willing to work outside home in the metropolitan working conditions. A verification of these alternative hypotheses requires an intensive study of an inter-disciplinary character.

Conclusion

In conclusion, a reference may be made to the fact that even in the United States, the labour force participation rates of the white female interstate migrants, standardized for marital status, are lower than those of the total civilian population (including the migrants) at all ages except 14-17.¹⁰ It, therefore, appears that the labour force participation rates of migrant women do not follow the usually expected pattern not only in Bombay but also in other parts of the world. It would be interesting to undertake a similar study for other metropolitan areas of India and for other countries.

8. Interestingly, a smaller proportion of migrant heads (4.9 per cent) reported a monthly income of Rs. 100 or less. The corresponding proportion for the nonmigrants was 6.6 per cent.

9. These estimates are based on the assumption that the average monthly income of households in the highest income class interval (households with an income of Rs. 1501 or more) was Rs. 1750.

10. Ann R. Miller, "Migration Differentials in Labour Force Participation : United States, 1960", *Demography*, 2(1), 1966, pp. 58-67.