

# Urban-to-Urban Migration from Himachal Pradesh to other States of India, 1991-2001

Archana Sharma

Resource Person, PGGC-11, Chandigarh

**Abstract:**

*This paper is an attempt to explore the patterns and determinants of urban-to-urban migration from Himachal Pradesh to other states of India. Census data for census years 1991 and 2001 has been analyzed to bring out the patterns and determinants of interstate urban-to-urban out-migration.*

**Keywords**

*Migration, urban-to-urban, out-migration, patterns, reasons*

**1. Introduction**

A study of migration by various streams is integral to the study of migration. Urban-to-urban migration carries people from small urban centers to larger ones in want of better and diversified economic opportunities and infrastructure. It was the second and third largest stream of migration during the census years 1991 and 2001 respectively (Tables 1 and 2).

**Table 1**  
**Himachal Pradesh**  
**Out-migrants by Various Streams, 1991-2001**

	Person	Male	Female
<b>Total Migrants</b>	<b>340,901</b>	<b>155,523</b>	<b>185,378</b>
Rural-to-Rural	28.01	16.47	38.01
Rural-to-Urban	34.94	42.81	28.12
Urban-to-Urban	31.59	35.54	28.17
Urban-to-Rural	5.46	5.19	5.71

Source: Computed from:- Census of India 1991

**2. Urban-to-Urban Out-Migration**

In terms of absolute numbers, only 5,967 migrants (5.60 percent) were added to this stream during the period 1991-2001 (from 104,060 in 1991 to 110,027 in 2001). In case of males, this increase was even smaller. Only 143 males were added to urban-to-urban migration during the intercensal decade 1991-2001 (Table 3). This small increase is attributable to low level of urbanization in Himachal Pradesh. Proportion of urban population in total

population of the state is quite low which means fewer potential urban migrants. Moreover whatever urban centres are there, are neither over populated nor is there the problem of underemployment. People from these urban centres don't get required quantum of push to move to other urban settlements in the country.

**Table 2**  
**Himachal Pradesh**  
**Out-migrants by Various Streams, 2001**

	Person	Male	Female
<b>Total Migrants</b>	<b>410,809</b>	<b>186,837</b>	<b>223,972</b>
Rural-to-Rural	27.69	16.62	36.94
Rural-to-Urban	41.80	50.67	34.41
Urban-to-Urban	26.78	28.97	24.96
Urban-to-Rural	3.72	3.75	3.70

Source: Computed from:-Census of India 1991

Punjab, Delhi, Chandigarh and Haryana were the main destination states of urban-to-urban migrants. Punjab and Haryana apart from being neighbouring states are more urbanized than Himachal Pradesh. These two states have some metropolitan cities like Ludhiana, Jalandhar & Amritsar in Punjab; and Gurgaon, Faridabad & Panipat in Haryana, which attract migrants from small towns of Himachal Pradesh. So apart from locational factor, higher level of urban development acted as catalyst for people from small urban centers of Himachal Pradesh to big cities of these neighbouring states. Urban-to-urban migrants were mainly professionally or technically qualified personnel who were unable to find a job as per their acquired skills in small towns of Himachal Pradesh.

Delhi and Chandigarh are although not the immediate neighbours of Himachal Pradesh yet are well connected to main towns of Himachal Pradesh via road or rail networks. High level of urbanization and resultant employment potential of Delhi and Chandigarh attract young job seekers from small towns of Himachal Pradesh which often lack in diversified economic opportunities.

**Table 3**  
**Himachal Pradesh**

**Urban-to-Urban Out-migration, 1991-2001**

1991				2001			
Destination	Total	Male	Female	Last Residence	Total	Male	Female
<b>All States/ UTs</b>	<b>104,060</b>	<b>53,977</b>	<b>50,083</b>	<b>All States/ UTs</b>	<b>110,027</b>	<b>54,120</b>	<b>55,907</b>
Punjab	29.49	27.36	31.79	Punjab	24.74	23.07	26.37
Delhi	23.58	24.64	22.45	Delhi	22.35	23.51	21.22
Chandigarh	20.10	22.09	17.96	Chandigarh	16.97	18.86	15.15
Haryana	9.39	8.80	10.03	Haryana	12.17	10.88	13.42
Uttar Pradesh	6.36	5.71	7.07	Maharashtra	4.76	5.32	4.22
Maharashtra	2.76	2.98	2.52	Uttar Pradesh	4.45	3.96	4.93
Remaining States/ UTs	8.32	8.42	8.18	Remaining States/ UTs	14.56	14.4	14.69

**Source:** Computed from:- Census of India 1991 and 2001

Considerable proportion of urban-to-urban migrants was enumerated in far off state Maharashtra as well. Maharashtra has big cities like Mumbai, Pune and Nagpur etc. which are destinations for job seekers from all over India. Mumbai, being the economic capital of India, has always been attracting migrants, both skilled and unskilled, from all over the country. Flow of people from Himachal Pradesh to this far flung state has been on increase because of increasing affordability of people to migrate over larger distances. Moreover job opportunities and better infrastructure continue to draw migrants from smaller urban centres to larger ones.

This was the only stream of migration in which there was no significant difference in the proportion of male and female migrants. Neighbouring states namely Punjab, Haryana and Uttar Pradesh (part of Uttar Pradesh, present day Uttarakhand, shared boundary with Himachal Pradesh at the time of census of 1991) had a little higher proportion of females whereas farther destinations like Chandigarh, Delhi and Maharashtra had dominance of males from Himachal Pradesh. This is explicable in terms of reasons of male and female migration. Female migration was primarily marriage migration spreading over shorter distances. Male migration, on the other hand, was mainly for the purpose of employment which may spread over longer distances as well depending on the availability of employment opportunities and net monetary gains. So males outnumbered their female counterparts when the destinations were farther like Delhi, Chandigarh and Maharashtra. On the other hand, when the destinations were nearby states like Punjab and Haryana, females were reported in higher numbers.

Destination states of urban-to-urban migrants were largely the same during the census of 2001. No significant change was observed during the intercensal decade 1991-2001.

### 3. Reasons of Urban-to-Urban Out-migration

Various reasons for urban-to-urban out migration from Himachal Pradesh to other states/ union territories have been depicted in Table 4. During the census of 1991, employment was the main cause of urban-to-urban out migration followed by family moved and marriage. Urban-to-urban migration takes place between cities/ towns for economic gains and professional growth. So majority of the urban-to-urban migrants were economic migrants moving from one urban center to another to pursue jobs. Family moved was cited by the second largest proportion of migrants. Urban-to-urban migrants are generally qualified personnel engaged in skilled jobs. Prime reason for their movement from one urban center to another is that they are unable to find a job in town/ city of origin as per the acquired skill. They are well paid professionals who can afford to bring their families after some time, generally spreading over a couple of months, once they get settled at the place of destination.

During the census of 2001 moved with household was cited by the largest number of urban-to-urban migrants followed by work/ employment and marriage respectively (Table 4). With an arithmetic increase in number of urban-to-urban migrants migrating for jobs, there is an exponential increase in number of people citing moved with household as a reason for migration. This is because along with one earning member of the family, whole family consisting of three to four members moves. As stated in the preceding paragraph, urban-to-urban migrants are generally skilled personnel and are second generation urbanites. So migration for this class of people is not a survival strategy as in case of rural-to-rural and rural-to-urban migrants. Migration for them is an opportunity for economic and professional growth.

**Table 4**

**Himachal Pradesh**  
**Reasons for Urban-to-Urban Out-migration, 1991-2001**

All Reasons							
1991				2001			
Reason	Total	Male	Female	Reason	Total	Male	Female
<b>All Reasons</b>	<b>104,060</b>	<b>53,977</b>	<b>50,083</b>	<b>All Reasons</b>	<b>110,027</b>	<b>54,120</b>	<b>55,907</b>
Employment	36.63	55.26	16.56	Work/ Employment	25.82	47.93	4.43
Business	2.74	4.78	0.55	Business	1.64	2.78	0.54
Education	3.40	4.52	2.18	Education	4.13	5.72	2.59
Family moved	28.35	22.71	34.43	Marriage	21.41	0.58	41.58
Marriage	19.00	1.24	38.14	Moved after birth	3.83	4.64	3.05
Natural calamities	0.11	0.16	0.05	Moved with household	32.26	25.95	38.38
Others	9.76	11.33	8.08	Others	10.90	12.41	9.44
Reasons Excluding Marriage							
<b>All Reasons</b>	<b>84,288</b>	<b>53,308</b>	<b>30,980</b>	<b>All Reasons</b>	<b>86,467</b>	<b>53,807</b>	<b>32,660</b>
Employment	45.23	55.95	26.78	Employment	32.86	48.21	7.58
Business	3.39	4.84	0.89	Business	2.09	2.80	0.92
Education	4.19	4.58	3.53	Education	5.25	5.75	4.44
Family Moved	35.00	23.00	55.66	Moved after birth	4.87	4.67	5.21
Natural Calamities	0.14	0.17	0.09	Moved with household	41.05	26.10	65.69
Others	12.06	11.47	13.06	Others	13.87	12.48	16.15

Source: Computed from:-

**D3 Migration Tables** of all states and UTs of India, Census of India 1991 and 2001, Data available on CD.

Marriage was also cited by a considerable proportion of urban-to-urban migrants. But marriage as a reason for movement was significant only in case of females. Males scarcely moved because of marriage. This has its roots in traditional marriage practices in India in which a female has to shift to the place of her in-laws after marriage. Moved with household was the second important reason for migration of females. These two reasons were cited by more than fifty percent female migrants. Even on exclusion of marriage as a reason for migration, employment did not find a significant place in reasons of female migration (Table 4). More than fifty percent females reported to have moved with the household even on excluding marriage as a reason for migration. Males, however, remained unaffected on excluding marriage from the reasons of migration. This is because only a negligibly small proportion of males had reported to migrate in response to marriage. Thus it is clear that male migration was economically motivated and female migration was determined to a large degree by familial/ social factors.

#### 4. Conclusions

Urban-to-urban migration was the second largest and the third largest stream of migration during the census years 1991 and 2001 respectively. It was the only stream of migration in which there was no significant difference in the proportion of male and female migrants. Neighbouring states namely Punjab, Haryana and Uttar Pradesh (part of Uttar Pradesh, present day Uttarakhand, shared boundary with Himachal Pradesh at the time of census of

1991) had a little higher proportion of females whereas farther destinations like Chandigarh, Delhi and Maharashtra had dominance of males from Himachal Pradesh. This is explicable in terms of reasons of male and female migration. Female migration was primarily marriage migration spreading over shorter distances. Male migration, on the other hand, was mainly for the purpose of employment which may spread over longer distances as well depending on the availability of employment opportunities and net monetary gains. So males outnumbered their female counterparts when the destinations were farther like Delhi, Chandigarh and Maharashtra. On the other hand, when the destinations were nearby states like Punjab and Haryana, females were reported in higher numbers.

#### 5. References

- [i] Census of India (1991). Town Directory, Series-9, Part IX, Himachal Pradesh.
- [ii] Census of India (2001). *Rural-Urban Distribution*. Series-3, Paper 2, Himachal Pradesh.
- [iii] Chandna, R. C. (2006 ). *Geography of Population*. New Delhi: Kalyani Publishers.
- [iv] Gaurav. (2008). *Patterns of Migration to, from and within Punjab: A Spatial Perspective*. Panjab University, Department of Geography. Chandigarh: Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis.
- [v] NIUA (1986). *Patterns of Migration in the National Capital Region*. Research Study Series Number 7, National Institute of Urban Affairs, New Delhi.



---

[vi] NIUA (1988). *State of India's Urbanization*. National Institute of Urban Affairs, New Delhi.

[vii] NIUA (1989). *Profile of the Urban Poor: An Investigation into their Demographic, Economic and Shelter Characteristics*. Research Study Series Number 40, National Institute of Urban Affairs, New Delhi.

[viii] NIUA (1992). *Single Women Migrant Workers in Asian Metropolis: A Case Study of Delhi*. Prepared for UNESCO, National Institute of Urban Affairs, New Delhi.

[ix] Planning Commission (2009). *Himachal Pradesh Development Report*, Planning Commission of India, New Delhi.

[x] Sharma, A. (2015). *Changes in Patterns of Migration in Himachal Pradesh since 1991*. Panjab University, Department of Geography. Chandigarh: Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis.

[xi] Zipf, G. K. (1946). The P1 P2/D Hypothesis: On the Intercity Movement of Persons. *American Sociological Review*, 2, 766-786.