Demography India
Vol. 24, No. I (1995), **pp. 133-146**

Sabari Bandyopadhyay* and Debesh Chakraborty*

Inter District Migration in West Bengal During 1971-81 Pattern and Causes : An Exploratory Study

Introduction

MIGRATION may be defined as a permanent or semipermanent change of residence.

Migration—internal and international—has been focus of attention by the demographer and policy makers. Indian census figures record that in 1961, 144.8 million persons which constitute about 33% of the total population were enumerated at places other than birth place and hence counted as lifetime migrants. In 1981 this figure increased to 203.6 mil lion and constituted 30.6% of the total population.

Based on place of birth and place of enumeration internal migrants can be classified into three migration streams:

(a) Interstate migrants—Persons born (or with last residence) in the states/union territories of India but beyond that of enumeration;
(b) Inter-district migrants—Persons born (or with last residence) outside the district of enumeration but within the same state/union territories; and
(c) Inter-district migrants—Persons born (or with last residence) outside the place of enumeration but within the same district.

From census data we find that in India and in West Bengal as well the size of inter-district and intra-district migration is significant. Both account for more than 70% of the total migration. In West Bengal, particularly the intra-districi and inter-district migrants account for 62% and 21% respectively in 1981. Unfortunately this aspect of migration has received less attention by the demographers although there is a considerable number of studies regarding the migrational aspect of the Indian population.

Davis (1951), Zacharia (1964), Mitra (1967), Bose (1980), Nair (1985), Saxena (1977) have dealt with primarily migration issue at all India level. Important regional studies have been conducted by Chowdhury (1982), Xaxa (1983), Sarkar(1989) and Chakraborty (1989). Works on intra-district and inter-district migration are few. Of the studies done on this area

•Department of Economics. Jadavpur University, Calcutta- 700 032.

mention may be made of Prem i (1979), Dasgupta (1984) and Ghosh (1961). Dasgupta and Ghosh have worked on Calcutta while Premi on the districts of Rajasthan.

In India and particularly in West Bengal decentralization of planning has assumed much importance in the recent period. District level and Block level planning in West Bengal is generating various economic activities which, in turn, are accelerating the movement of population within the different parts of the state. Unfortunately, little is known about the size ofthe movement and its determinants.So this hampers properplanning. Detailed and in depth investigation ofthe pattern and extent of inter-district migration in West Bengal is needed. The present study would make a modest contribution to this area.

The paper would concern with the pattern of inter-district migration in the State of West Bengal and intends to establish the fact that the inter-district migration took place from the less developed districts to the developed districts.

In Section I we shall discuss the nature and pattern of inter-district migration of West Bengal, on the basis of 1981 census data. In Section 11 we shall test the hypothesis that the inter-district migration to West Bengal has taken place from the less developed districts to the developed districts.

Section I: Pattern of Inter-district Migration of West Bengal

From the Census data of 1981 an inter-district life-time immigration-emigration matrix of total migrants of West Bengal has been constructed (Appendix I). From this matrix Table 1 is prepared which helps identify the gaining and the loosing districts of West Bengal with respect to net migration.

TABLE 1 : LIST OF GAINING AND LOOSING DISTRICTS WITH RESPECT TO TOTAL MIGRATION

Gaining Districts	*Loosing Districts*
1. Jalpaiguri	1 . Kooch Bihar
2. Darjiling	2. Maldah
3. West Dinajpur	3. Murshidabad
4. Twenty-four I'arganas	4. Nadia
5. Hugh	5. Medinipur
6. Barddhaman	6. Bankura
	7. Puruliya
	8. Birbhum
	9. Haora
	10. Calcutta

In 1981 , among these 1 6 districts of West Bengal we observed that only six are gaining districts and the rest are loosing. However, it is quite interesting to note that Calcutta and Haora belong to the list of loosing districts.

Table 2 presents the list of loosing and gaining districts for each of the four streams-rural-to-rural (R-R), rural-to-urban (R-U), urban-to-urban (U-U), and urban-to-rural (U-R).

TABLE 2: LIST OF GAINING AND LOOSING DISTRICTS IN DIFFERENT STREAMS

Stream	*Gaining Districts*	*Loosing Districts*
Rural -to-rural (R-R)	Jalpaiguri, West-Dinajpur. Nadia, Hugh, Birhhum, Twenty-four parganas, Barddhaman	Kooch Bihar, Maldah, Murshidabad. Haora. Medinipur, Bankura, Puruliya
Rural-to-urban (R-U)	Darjiling, Twenty-four Parganas, Barddhaman, Calcutta	Kooch Bihar, Jalpaiguri, West Dinajpur, Maldah, Murshidabad, Nadia, Twenty-four Parganas. Haora, Hugli, Medinipur, Bankura, Puruliya, Birhhum
Urban-to-rural (U-R)	Barddhaman, Twenty-tour Parganas, Birhhum, Medinipur. Hugli, Nadia, West-Dinajpur, Jalpaiguri, Maldah. Bankura, Puruliya	Darjiling, Murshidabad, Calcutta, Haora
Urban-to-urban (U-U)	Barddhaman, Twenty-four Parganas, Birbum, Darjiling, Hugli, West-Dinajpur, Jalpaiguri, Puruliya	Kooch Bihar, Murshidabad, Nadia. Maldah, Calcutta, Haora

The pattern of net in-and-out migration in four streams is different. We find that only Twenty-four Parganas and Barddhaman have gained very substantially through inter-district migration of all the four streams, while Hugli, West Dinajpur and Jalpaiguri have gained in all the streams except in R-U case. Darjiling was a gaining district with respect to R-U and U-U streams otherwise it was found to be a loosing district in other two streams. In other words, we can say that Darjiling has gained in the inter-district migration towards its urban areas. Calcutta is a gaining district with respect to R-U streams.

For the total inter-district migrants of West Bengal it is observed that Darjiling, Jalpaiguri and West Dinajpur in the north and Barddhaman, Hugli and Twenty-four Parganas in south formed two clusters of immigrating districts in 1981. Various factors are at play behind this. Barddhaman is industrially very developed district. In this district there are industries like Railway Engine Industry in Chittaranjan, Electric-Wire Industry in Rupnarayanpur, Cycle Industry in Asansol, Paper Industry in Raniganj, Aluminium Industry in Anupnagar, Iron and Steel Industry in Kulti and Burnpur, Coke, Gas and Iron Steel Industry in Durgapur. All of these industries attract large number of migrants to this district.

Hugli is also an industrially developed district. It has Textile Industry in Tribeni, India's one of the biggest motor-car building factories in Hindmotor, Thermal-Power Station and Rubber Industry in Bandel. Besides these, there are many Jute Mills on the bank of Hugli river. This has created employment opportunities in this district. It becomes naturally an immigrating district.

Twenty-four Parganas (especially the North) is another industrially advanced district in the State. It has various industries like Paper Industry in Titagarh, Naihati, Kakinara; Cotton-Textile Industry iri Panihati, Shyamnagar, Belgharia and many other factories and Jute Mills. Besides these it has exployment potential in the agricultural, pisicultural activities. With all its employment opportunities it attracts large number of migrants.

Darj iling and Jalpaiguri have more than two hundred tea gardens. Tea gardens used large number of workers. But Darjiling and Jalpaiguri districts are not very populous districts with the density of population. 327 and 353 persq km respectively in 1981. So the excess demand for labour is normally met through the immigrating labour force. Siliguri town of Darjiling district is becoming more and more important for its commercial and various economic activities. With the construction of Farakka Bridge this town is well-connected with Calcutta and all of South Bengal. Moreover, Darjiling town is a well known tourist spot. This has led to the establishment of hotels, tourist lodges and marketing facilities for tourists. So many people from other districts came here to earn their living.

But it is difficult to indicate the basis of net immigration in West Dinajpur district. Since it is not an industrially and commercially developed district, there are few employment opportunities to attract migrants. Perhaps most of the migrants came here due to 'marriage' as is evident from the share of the female migration which form 54.51% of the total immigrants of the district in 1981.

We have observed that inspite of being highly industrially developed, Calcutta and Haora are the net out-migrating districts. Reasons are worth investigating. Both these districts have high density of population (Calcutta 31,651 per sq km and Haora 2,006 persq km in 1981) compared to other districts. This implies that these two districts have now less capacity to absorb people from the outside. Moreover, shortage of residential housing and high cost of living are some of the factors which perhaps acted as deterrent factors to migration from the districts.

State Planning Board (1990), Government of West Bengal, comments that "There was a loss of households in absolute terms in Calcutta city between 1971-81 because of inadequate residential housing and high cost of living had failed to hold back erstwhile immigrants from the surrounding districts as well as the refugee migrants, who have gone back to their native places or found new shelters in nearby districts without loosing their root in the city proper. They have taken advantage of commuting facilities offered by electrification of railways, extension of suburban bus services etc. Again the households living in rented houses in Calcutta city constituted 81 % and 75% of the total households in 1971 and 1981 respectively. The reduced proportion of tenant households is also supported by absolute shrinkage in the number of tenant households from 4.60 lakhs in 1971 to 4.47 lakhs in 1981. The inevitable conclusion is that these households have been eased out of the city into the surrounding areas of Calcutta.

And al I these emigrating households have left their residence in the city but not their jobs or other socio-economic and cultural mornings. They have made ingress into rural areas, transformed the rural habitants into towns and yet pounce upon the core city during the day to draw their economic, social and cultural life force.

The economic uplift in the rural areas of the nearby districts of Calcutta has put a break on the cityward movement. In Calcutta the joint family breaks, and houses change hands from middle class to the rich commercial class, high rise mansion stay side by side with slums. The way of this co-existence has started lashing down suburb of Calcutta".

Perhaps, Haora District is also subject to the above reasons. Besides these, many industrial units of these two big developed districts are closed. For that reason unskilled labourers have gone back to home districts. These are some of the reasons which might explain the fact that why Calcutta and Haora have recorded as net out migrating districts in the 1981 census.

Migration from the Neighbouring Districts

Another interesting aspect of the inter-district migration is that migration from the neighbouring districts constitutes a large proportion of both male and female migration in West Bengal.

With the help of the following Table 3 we can explain the pattern of migration from the neighbouring districts to the gaining districts

TABLE; 3: PERCENTAGE OF IMMIGRATION FROM THE NEIGHBOURING DISTRICTS TO THE GAINING DISTRICTS

Total Migration	0-25%	25-50%	50-75%	*Above* 75%
		Darjiling	West Dinajpur, Jalpaiguri	Barddhaman, Hugli, Twentyfour Parganas
R-R			West Dinajpur	Jalpaiguri, Malda, Twentyfour Parganas, Hugli, Barddha man, Birbhum
R-U			Darjiling, Twenty-four Parganas, Calcutta	Barddhaman
U-R		Medinipur, West Dinajpur, Maldah	Jalpaiguri, Bankura, Puruliya, Nadia, Barddhaman	Twentyfour Parganas, Birbhum, Hugli
U-U	Maldah	Darjiling, West Dinajpur, Puruliya, Barddhaman, Birbhum, Jalpaiguri		Twentyfour Parganas, Hugli.

At first considering the gaining districts which are based on the total life-time inter-district immigration-emigration matrix it can be observed from Table 3 that among these gaining districts Darjiling has the share of about 25-50% migration from their neighbouring districts. And in other gaining districts more than 50% come from their neighbouring districts. Among these districts, Barddhaman, Hugli, Twenty-four Parganas have more than 75% immigration from their neighbouring districts.

This analysis is also presented in each of the four migration streams mentioned earlier. From Table 3 we observe that all of the gaining districts in the R-R streams in 1981 get more then 50% immigrants from their neighbouring districts. All of the gaining districts except West Dinajpur (which get more than 50% but less than 75%) get above 75% immigration from the neighbouring districts.

It is also evident that all of the four gaining districts of R-U stream get more than 50% immigration from their neighbouring districts. Among these districts Barddhaman has a share of 75% immigration from its neighbouring districts.

Table 3 also demonstrates that among the eleven gainingdistricts of the U-R stream only, three districts—Medinipur, West Dinajpur, Maldah got less than 50% but greater than 25% immigration from their neighbouring districts. Besides these three districts all the other districts get more than 50% immigration from its neighbouring districts. Among these districts Twenty-four Parganas, Birbhum and Hugli more than 75% migrants came from their neighbouring districts.

It can also be seen that among U-U migration stream, only Twenty-four Parganas and Hugli have above 75% immigration from their neighbouring districts. Besides these two districts all of the other districts get not more than 50% immigration from their neighbouring -districts. Among these districts Maldah gets less than 25% immigrants from its eighbouring districts.

From the following Table4 which gives the proportion of m igrants from the neighbouring districts as an average of the district figures in the four m igration streams as well as in the total migration for 1981, it is found that in the case of total migration on an average 69.46% comes from the neighbouring districts. Also it is clear from Table 4 that on an average for R-R 87.37%, for R-U 65.38%, for U-U 51.41% and for U-R 61-76% come from the neighbouring districts.

TABLE 4: INTER-DISTRICT LIFETIME MIGRATION FROM NEIGHBOURING DISTRICTS WITHIN THE STATE OF ENUMERATION AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL INTER-DISTRICT IMMIGRATION OF EACH DISTRICT BY MIGRATION STREAM WEST BENGAL 1981

Migration stream	*Average*
Total	73.75
R-R	87.37
R-U	65.38
U-U	51.41
U-R	61.76

In other words, on an average at least 51% of the migrants come from the neighbouring districts to the gaining districts.

It should be noted that the proportion of migrants from the neighbouring districts was highest in the R-R stream. It was followed by R-U, U-R and lastly by U-U stream.

Section II: Migration from the Less Developed Districts to the Developed Districts

We have analysed the pattern of inter-district migration in Section I. In this section we wish to test the hypothesis that inter-district migration has taken place from the less developed districts to the developed districts.

There may be differences in expected income between the developed districts and the less developed districts. Migrants consider the various labour market opportunities available to them between the developed and. the less developed districts and choose one which maximizes their expected gains from migration. Expected gains are measured by the difference in real income between the work in the developed district with prevailing income in the less developed district and migrate if the former exceeds the latter. The above argument can be presented in a formal way.

The Model

Let W_{ld} and W_d represent wage rates of less developed and developed districts respectively. E_d, L_d denote the number of jobs and the labour force respectively in the developed districts. Expected income differential (n_y) between less developed and developed districts can then be written as

$$n_y = W_d \frac{E_d}{L_d} - W_{ld}$$

Thus migration is a function of this expected income difference between developed and less developed districts. Since the level of wage in ith region (W_i) is likely to be influenced by the level of the economic development of that region (D_i) i.e. $W_i = f(D_i)$, we can rewrite the above equation as follows

$$n_y = d_d \frac{E_d}{L_d} - d_{ld}$$

where d_d is the level of development index of the developed district and d_{ld} is the development index of the less developed district.

The equation for inter-district migration in our Model is as follows:

$$\frac{M_i}{P_i} = F(d_i - d_j)$$

where
M_i = Net inter-district migrating of ith district
P_i = Total population of ith district
d_i = Development index of ith district
d_j = Development index of jth districts.

Empirical Work:

Data

Net migration. In this cross-section study based on the 1981 Census data in West Bengal, we have made use of theTable D-13 of the 1981 Census. Dividing the total number of each migrants in a district by the corresponding district population, we obtain the rate of flow of migration of the respective district in West Bengal.

Development index differential. To obtain the value of development index differential we have at first taken the difference of development index of each district (except Calcutta and Haora), from the other districts. Then we have taken the average of these differences for each district. This development index is presented in Appendix II.

We now come to the findings of our study in the light of our hypothesis that, in general, the phenomenon of inter-district migration is a consequence of imbalances in the relationship between the developed and the less developed districts reflected in the income differential. We now obtain here the regression equation in order to identify the pattern of relationship between the rate of migration and the relevant socio-economic variable.

Let m_i = The rate of net inter-district migration per thousand of district population.

$$D_i = \sum_{j=1}^{13} \frac{(d_i - d_j)}{13}$$

where D_i is the development index of the ith district $i \neq j$, $i = 1, \ldots, 14$; $j = 1, \ldots, 14$.

The resulting regression equation is

$$m_i = 4.88049 + 0.377723\ 6\ D_i \quad R^2 = .649$$
$$(4.51783)$$

Now we shall test null hypothesis H_0: the coefficient of D_i to be zero.

This is referred to test the significance of D_i. If the hypothesis is true, the D variable plays no role in the determination of m_i. Here we see that computed $t_{11} = 4.51783$ which is greater than the tabulated value of $t_{11}, .025 = 2.201$ and also $t_{11}, .005 = 3.106$, so H_0 is rejected both at 5% and 1% level of significance. So we accept the alternative hypothesis and conclude that D plays a significant role in the determination of m. The variable D explain 65% of the total variation in m. In other words, development index has a key role to play in the inter-district migration, since the development index has been used as a proxy for the wage level of a region. It can be said that difference in wage levels in less developed and the developed districts, which reflects the expected income differential is the main reason for the inter-district migration in West Bengal.

Conclusion

The paper has discussed pattern and causes of the inter-district migration of West Bengal. With the help of 1981 Census data of West Bengal we have studied the pattern of inter-district migration of this state and have observed that among the 16 districts only 6

districts, namely, Darjiling, Jalpaiguri, West Dinajpur, Barddhaman, Twenty-four Parganas, and Hugli are gaining and the rest are loosing. It has been observed that despite being highly industrially developed, Calcutta and Haora belong to the group of loosing-districts. The pattern of net in and out migration in four streams (R-R, R-U, U-R, U-U) is different. Only Twenty-four Parganas and Barddhaman have gained very substantially through inter-district migration of all the four streams. Hugli, West Dinajpur and Jalpaiguri have gained in all the streams except in R-U case. Darjiling. is a gaining district with respect to R-U and U-U streams otherwise it is found to be a loosing district in other two streams. It has also been found (hat inter-district migration has taken place from the neighbouring districts. On an average at least 51% of the migrants came from the neighbouring districts to the gaining districts. We have noticed that the proportion of migrants from the neighbouring districts is highest in the R-R stream. It is followed by R-U, U-R and lastly by U-U stream. These findings are more or less in conformity with those of Premi (1989) for inter-district migration of Rajasthan. In this paper we also have tried to establish that inter-district migration takes place from the less-developed districts to the developed districts in West Bengal.

References

Bose, A. 1980, *India's Urbanisation. 1901-2001.* Tata McGraw Hill Publishing Company Limited. New Delhi.

Census of India, 1961, *Vol. I, India. PartllC(ii).*

Census of India, 1981, Series I, *India. Pi. 5A & B (i).*

Census of India, 1981, Series 23, *West Bengal. Part \'A and \'B.*

Centre for Monetoring Indian Economy, 1985, *An Overall I'ieit^Index of Levels of Economic Development.*

Chakraborty, D., 1989, Migration and Regional Differences in Population Growth in Eastern India during 1921 - 1981. ICSSR Project Report, Jadavpur University, Calcutta.

Choudhury, T. K., 1982, *Demographic Trends in Assam. 1921-1971.* B. R. Publishing Company, Delhi. Dasgupta, B., 1984, Issues of Migration and Employment with reference to Calcutta. Paper presented in the Conference on Problem of Development in Metropolitan area with Special Reference to Calcutta. Centre for Urban Economic Studies, Department of Economics, Calcutta University.

Davis, K., 1951, *Population of India and Pakistan.* Princeton. New Jersey. Economic Review, 1981-82, Statistical Appendix. Government of West Bengal.

Gnosh, A., 1961, *Calcutta the Primate City- Census of India.* Office of the Regional General of India, New Delhi.

Mitra, A., 1967, Internal Migration and Urbanisation in India, 1961. Report submitted to the Meeting of Export Group on Internal Migration and Urbanisation, ESCAP, Bangkok. Nair, P. S., 1985, Inter-State Period Migration in India, 1971 -1981. Levels and Flows. Paper presented in the I Oth Annual Conference of the IASP, Bangalore. Premi, M. K., 1989, Pattern of Internal Migration in India- Some New Dimensions. *In:* S. N. Singh. M. K. Premi. P. S. Bhattaand A. Bose(eds), *Population Transition in India.* Vol.2. B. R. PublishingCompany. Delhi.

Sarkar, P., 1989, Determinants of Rural Urban Migration in West Bengal. *In.* Biplab Dasgupta, (ed.). *Urbanisation. Migration and Rural Change - A Study of West Bengal.* A. Mukherjee & Co. Private Limited. Saxena, D. P., 1977, *Rural Urban Migration in India. Causes and Consequences.* Popular Prakashan. Stale Planning Board, Development & Planning Department, Government of West Bengal, 1990, A Perspective Plan for Calcutta: 2011. Xaxa, V., 1983, Tribal Migration to Plantation Estates in North East In.dia: Determinates and Consequences, Paper presented at the Ninth Annual Conference of the IASP. Jaipur. Zachariah, K. C., 1964, *A Historical Study of Internal Migration in the Indian Sub-continent. 1901-1931.*

Appendix-I

INTER DISTRICT MIGRATION IN WEST BENGAL IN 1981

Birth Place		Place of Enumeration																	
		Koochbihar		Jalpaiguri		Darjiling		West Dinajpur		Maldah		Murshidabad		Nadia		24-Parganas		Calcutta	
		R	U	R	U	R	U	R	U	R	U	R	U	R	U	R	U	R	U
Koochbihar	R			26294	3087	613	941	377	381	174	98	189	99	221	196	287	1073		544
	U			2588	3025	277	1684	173	530	113	165	60	206	103	317	100	1550		660
Jalpaiguri	R	16223	1538			4918	3715	1132	552	1202	184	188	78	366	249	455	1702		1175
	U	1803	1471			872	3468	350	1125	260	386	79	251	224	394	152	2971		1112
Darjiling	R	266	616	6400	2094			1775	319	162	100	58	57	133	100	237	943		807
	U	313	550	2615	5158			706	790	215	313	54	124	158	274	243	1965		1632
West Dinajpur	R	415	249	2610	815	2464	1415			11015	859	428	208	644	261	328	1440		734
	U	220	259	584	1058	470	1251			779	534	127	333	131	356	108	1298		443
Maldah	R	492	157	531	518	306	459	25595	1798			6841	1273	469	224	332	2282		1172
	U	73	161	117	537	169	674	1170	1392			338	981	135	309	130	1354		666
Murshidabad	R	76	116	1421	325	624	299	8096	510	6888	1054			28563	2671	1983	8917		6057
	U	70	177	131	424	120	431	687	433	935	557			1870	1962	383	4290		3602
Nadia	R	1162	240	2338	758	373	532	2899	495	1616	326	21610	2886			16518	24509		7385
	U	350	227	513	872	257	877	632	462	207	346	1584	2323			2523	16494		6108
24-Parganas	R	1714	350	750	601	381	687	1207	424	624	204	754	678	22454	5826				48738
	U	215	271	523	1111	319	999	447	553	246	403	864	1433	5854	8729				17204
Calcutta	R	-	-																
	U	500	1082	1768	3026	1637	4002	864	1692	610	1125	1656	4086	7680	10833	35864	286827		

Haora	R	61	81	144	80	129	146	68	57	65	75	121	117	584	561	12270	22584	17117
	U	50	74	100	145	114	299	93	147	77	74	185	386	542	1119	3002	22789	12332
Hugli	R	103	69	219	109	137	123	173	127	169	83	494	324	4122	2317	4760	14607	11300
	U	51	54	62	251	127	382	96	135	69	151	365	534	867	2191	1683	19691	7580
Medinip.ur	R	75	91	316	241	208	210	154	96	79	34	303	352	945	1418	68634	25490	28881
	U	37	110	61	211	57	187	39	109	54	33	114	297	242	682	1596	7117	10945
Bankura	R	74	44	99	128	80	81	81	79	152	58	209	131	508	388	739	3901	4588
	U	-	32	62	73	19	120	25	25	20	64	61	100	79	263	201	1661	2045
I'uruliya	R	40	4	76	16	63	26	114	30	186	38	75	28	71	86	223	1260	1088
	U	5		78	50	23	35	20	6	35	22	45	119	17	130	96	730	690
Barddhaman	R	277	61	521	251	179	449	593	233	391	220	10737	1696	13634	5555	2339	12383	9471
	U	59	117	156	430	132	468	207	257	256	147	1460	1289	1368	2310	1122	9399	6403
Itirbhum	R	19	55	97	140	108	177	159	187	417	209	28280	2827	582	443	534	3458	2713
	U	20	33	33	62	18	201	89	60	143	75	1278	983	163	333	185	1595	1266
Total	R	20997	3671	4181.6	9163	10583	9260	42423	5288	23140	3542	70287	10754	73296	20295	109639	124549	141770
	U	3766	4618	9391	16433	4611	15078	5598	7716	4019	4395	8270	13445	19433	30202	47388	379731	72688

Source: Table D-13: Census of India 1981. Series 23. West Bengal
Part VA & B.

INTER DISTRICT MIGRATION IN WEST BENGAL IN 1981

Birth Place		Place of Enumeration															
		Haora		Hugli		Medinipur		Bankura		Puruliya		Bardhman		Birbhum		Total	
		R	*U*	R	U	R	U	R	U	R	U	R	U	R	U	R	U
Koochbihar	R	5	84	99	109	15	88	5	5	11	24	61	254	45	42	28396	7025
	U	37	147	24	325	60	139	14	32	21	25	62	349	20	54	3652	9208
Jalpaiguri	R	35	201	97	320	146	86	2843	23	9	20	102	349	64	121	27780	10313
	U	21	281	94	316	76	186	122	70	51	66	130	512	30	151	4264	12760
Darjiling	R	13	153	15	141	1438	56	30	24	10	24	35	271	10	19	10582	5724
	I)	25	277	97	425	274	208	51	23	10	99	77	550	40	71	4878	12459
West Dinajpur	R	20	265	84	189	231	69	61	19	2035	40	226	469	59	51	18620	7083
	U		171	47	330	50	173	53	9	58	59	170	476	74	121	2871	6871
Maldah	R	157	196	79	126	350	131	24	24	542	26	288	814	355	84	36361	9284
	U	26	126	52	190	65	72	27	33	23	113	118	543	118	242	2561	7393
Murshidabad	R	361	1668	3219	3252	296	535	2098	155	110	163	17541	7857	39950	3614	107226	37193
	U	85	661	531	1542	270	361	158	138	76	374	1420	3592	2869	1951	9605	20495
Nadia	R	254	2926	6394	4909	674	810	714	151	166	244	16137	8303	733	479	71588	54953
	U	120	1810	1881	3832	497	805	261	247	106	399	4014	5558	509	571	13454	40931
24-Parganas	R	7132	10607	6310	9463	12783	2946	806	219	291	424	6110	6698	458	523	61774	88388
	U	2228	9230	4701	15902	2192	2341	503	377	247	841	2230	6521	481	735	21050	66650
Calcutta	R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	U	4712	30463	1 1009	38080	7612	7900	1702	1963	625	2027	5578	24162	2057	2587	83874	419855

Haora	R		32871	6263	17607	2965	330	122	136	131	2602	3477	255	279	67243	54055
	U		64445	12843	2903	1813	314	221	176	334	1183	3704	318	429	15502	567009
Hugli	R	18145	13733		17051		916	411	175	271	40174	7149	519	438	95457	55081
Medinipur	U	1062	6985		1177		786	480	181	454	5377	5278	382	578	12285	45955
	R	9714	14435	21557	5367		21316	1704	2025	777	3557	5652	437	280	129320	85028
	U	680	3021	1564	2066		1321	1129	209	1396	606	2412	184	353	6764	30066
Bankura	R	251	1691	15318	2969	24986	3473	-		26677	2657	34184	28596	1193	489	104551	49223
Puruliya	U	39	417	983	938	1512	1621			940	1780	1900	5475	138	398	5979	15012
	R	44	407	779	352	1671	546	24595	1410			15194	12711	395	160	43526	18162
	U	4	141	109	304	266	461	1355	1171			1008	2644	93	108	3154	6611
Bardhman	R	578	4374	34827	13599	1049	1216	24334	1596	5350	1251			31356	3387	126165	55742
	U	230	2269	3192	4502	724	1133	3528	1515	1989	1741			3303	2169	17726	34149
Birhhum	R	140	882	978	2254	301	389	1290	209	460	301	37731	15650			71096	29894
	U	31	400	172	867	109	277	158	190	107	270	2551	3794			5057	10406
Total	R	36849	51622	122627	49313	78598	17330.	87662	6072	35997	6353	173942	98200	71829	9966	999685	567184
	U	9300	56399	30901	82462	17787	18701	10353	7598	4819	9978	26424	65570	10616	10518	212676	795532

Source: Table D-13: Census of India 1981. Scries 23. West Bengal
Part VA & B.

Appendix - II

INDEX OF LEVEL OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, 1980

Districts	*Development Index*
Bankura	57
Barddhaman	124
Birbhum	68
Calcutta	942
Darjiling	102
Haora	121
Hugli	118
Jalpaiguri	95
Kooch Bihar	43
Maldah	43
Mcdinipur	45
^Nadia	66
Murshidabad	51
Puruliya	43
Twenty-four Parganas	96
West Dinajpur	48

Source Centre For Monetoring Indian Economy (1985).