IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Pattern Of Migration Among Rural Households In West Khasi Hills District Of Meghalaya

Veni Excel Amity Marwein
Research Scholar,
Department of Economics,
North - Eastern Hill University, Shillong.

Abstract: Migration is one of the factors determining population growth. There is a general perception that migration in Meghalaya is on the higher side. Incidentally, the decadal growth rate of Meghalaya during 2001 to 2011 is the highest among all the states of India. According to the 2011 Census, about 25.60 percent of the total population are migrants in the state of Meghalaya.Of these a major share belongs to intra-state migrants. The paper examines migration among rural households in Meghalaya by using primary data sources. The area of study is West KhasiHills District of Meghalaya with a random sample size of 400 rural households. The paper will focuson the reasons for migration. Migration in West Khasi Hills is influenced by both push and pull factors highlighted by Ravenstein (1885) and Lee (1966). Apart from economic migrants, non-economic migrants include migration for education and marriagemigration. Findings show marriage migration is higher among males than the females which is dictated by the matrilocal system of the matrilineal society of Meghalaya. Interestingly, educational migration is higher among females than males. This shows that educational aspiration among females is greater than their male counterparts.

Keywords: migration, reasons, West Khasi Hills

I. INTRODUCTION

The complexity of migration in modern terminology is evident from the interchangeability of the terms migration and mobility. It ventures how migration is no longer a one-sided permanent/temporary human movement but the fluidity of the nature of human movement that involves other agents and is a progressive concept. COVID-19 impact on migrants highlights the importance of debates in public policy for migrants, especially in terms of labour rights, health inequalities and ethnicity.

Migration has been defined differently by different scholars but, fundamentally it is understood as the movement of an individual or groups of individuals from one place to another place fora period of time. The Census of India has defined migration on two accounts – by place of birth and place of last residence. A person is a migrant if he/she moves away from his/her place of birth either permanently or temporarily to a new destination. Migration by place of residence is when a person moves away from his usual place of residenceto a new place. While the former is a one point of time phenomenon, the latter is a dynamic phenomenon which covers a movement from place to place over a period of time. Also, migration has been regionally differentiated as either international migration or internalmigration.

Migration is one of the factors determining population growth. There is a general perception that migration in Meghalaya is on the higher side. Incidentally, the decadal growth rate of Meghalaya during 2001 to 2011 is the highest among all the states of India. According to the 2011 Census, about 25.60 percent of the total population are migrants in the state of Meghalaya.Of these, a major share belongs to intra-state migrants. The paper will focus on the reasons behind migration and on internal remittances in rural Meghalaya.

Meghalaya is primarily a matrilineal society inhabited by three major tribes – the Khasis, the Jaintias and the Garos. The people of the state are steeped in migration history with the Khasis and Jaintias believed to have migrated from Mon-Khmer region of Cambodia and the Garos from Tibet. Parida (2019), stated that there was an increasing trend in the migrant population within Meghalaya which could be the result of structural transformation in the state but, there was a decline in out-migrants to other states.

According to 2011 Census, West Khasi Hills District (WKHD) is the largest district of Meghalaya covering an area of 3911.22 sq km. It has 834 villages under four C&RD Blocks. The district has a population of 2,87,781 with a literacy rate of 78.83% according to Census 2011. Its sex ratio is 982.89F/1000M which is above the national average of 910F/1000M at birth according to UNFPA State of World Population 2020.Since its inception it has been bifurcated into two Civil Sub-Divisions and two new Districts, South West Khasi Hills District and Eastern West Khasi Hills District. Its headquarter Nongstoin is the largest town in the District and is its centre of economic activity. It has a population of 28,742 of which 14,252 are males and 14,490 are females as per the 2011 Census report. 9715 were engaged in work or business activities as per the 2011 Census survey. The migration data provided by Census 2011 is for an undivided West Khasi Hills District. The total number of migrants is 103,817 out of which 58,305 are males and 45,512 are females.

II. THEORETICAL CONTEXT

The earliest migration theory was developed by Ravenstein (1885), who observed that most migration is short distance from agricultural regions to commercial regions. Everett Lee (1969) further developed this theory by bringing forth the factors that affect migration. These factors can be negative or positive factors. In the general literature, it is generally accepted thattwo factors influence migration – Push and Pull factors. Push factors are those factors that pushed people to migrate from their place of residence to another centre. They aresocio-political factors like religious and cultural persecution, warfare, insurgency; economic factors such as unemployment and overall economic condition in the region and natural calamities. Pull factors are those factors that attract a person to move from his place of residence to the new destination. They include economic factors such as employment opportunities, better standard of living, better access to quality infrastructures, and socio- political factors such as religious tolerance, political stability and protection of human rights.

During the 1950s and the 1960s two theories became dominant in the migration debate- the Lewis Theory (1954) and Harris- Todaro (1967). These two theories propagated that as long asthere is economic disparity such as wage differentials in different areas, migration would happen. However, these theories did not place the importance of remittances on migration decisions and the impact of remittances on the left behind family. The New Economics of Labour Migration (Stark & Bloom, 1993) brought a new dynamic by taking into account the individual behaviour of the migrant. NELM introduced migration as a way of spreading risk to migrant households and communities and as a way of overcoming market constraints.While previous theories ignored remittances, within NELM, they are perceived as one of the most essential motives for migrating. According to the theory, the patterns of remittances suggest a mutual arrangement between the household and the migrant of the decision to migrate and remit as a result of altruism.

The application of the above theories in the context of Meghalaya is a complex combination of more than one theory. In the context of this paper, migration in Meghalaya is influenced by the push and pull factors as described by Ravenstein (1885) and Lee (1966). The rural-urban migration evident in the state due to structural transformation follows the Lewis theory (1954). The New Economic Theory of Labour Migration by Stark and Bloom (1988) which stress on household utility maximisation through migration and on networks and connections migrants explains the migration process that is linked to connections made through people.

III. SOURCE OF DATA

The article is based on Primary Data which was been collected from 400 randomly selected rural households from 20 villages under West Khasi Hills District, Meghalaya. The total sampled individuals is 2138 and total sampled migrants is 427. Since West Khasi Hills is majorly a rural and agricultural based economy, villages were chosen based onthe total number of households in these villages according to Census 2011. The argument behind the reasoning for choosing these villages is that with higher number of households and higher population, it is expected that migrants would be present.

Table (i): Sampled Data Size

Sampled Individuals		
Migrants	***Non-Migrants***	***Total***
427	1711	2138
19.97%	80.03%	100%

Source: Primary Data

III. DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANTS IN WEST KHASI HILLS BASED ON REASONS OF MIGRATION AND SEX

Table 2: Distribution of migrants by Reason for migration and Gender				
Reason for Migration	**Migrant Sex**			
		F	M	Total
search for employment	Count	1	11	12
	% within Migrant Sex	0.6%	4.2%	2.8%
	% of Total	0.2%	2.6%	2.8%
better employment opportunities	Count	15	26	41
	% within Migrant Sex	9.4%	9.8%	9.6%
	% of Total	3.5%	6.1%	9.6%
Business	Count	1	3	4
	% within Migrant Sex	0.6%	1.1%	0.9%
	% of Total	0.2%	0.7%	0.9%
to take up employment	Count	14	73	87
	% within Migrant Sex	8.8%	27.7%	20.4%
	% of Total	3.3%	17.1%	20.4%
transfer of service	Count	0	3	3
	% within Migrant Sex	0.0%	1.1%	0.7%
	% of Total	0.0%	0.7%	0.7%
Studies	Count	103	49	152
	% within Migrant Sex	**64.0%**	18.6%	35.6%
	% of Total	24.1%	11.5%	**35.6%**
Marriage	Count	10	95	105
	% within Migrant Sex	6.3%	**36.0%**	24.6%
	% of Total	2.3%	22.2%	**24.6%**
migration of parent/ earning member of family	Count	16	6	22
	% within Migrant Sex	10.1%	2.3%	5.2%
	% of Total	3.7%	1.4%	5.2%
Others	Count	1	0	1
	% within Migrant Sex	0.6%	0.0%	0.2%
	% of Total	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%
Total	Count	161	266	427
	% within Migrant Sex	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	37.7%	62.3%	100.0%
Source: Author's Calculation from Primary Data				

In a number of studies, the determinants of migration are assumed to be exclusively influenced by the characteristics of the migrants (Taylor, 1969). A network of push and pull factors influence the decision to migrate. Table “reasons for migration by Gender” provides us information with regards to reasons for migration by gender. It is observed that out of the sampled migrants, 35.6 per cent migrate to pursue education. A high proportion of migrants are marriage migrants. Migration for economic reasons are low. About 20.4 per cent of the migrants are observed to migrate to take up employment. The other economic reasons for migrating take a lower share. However, summing the figures of other economic

reasons together, we observed migration for other economic reasons besides to take up employment takes a share of 14.05 percent. A small share of migrants, 5.20 percent migrate due to migration of the earning member of the family.

Observing the gender aspect on reasons for migration, we find that while male dominates for all reasons for migration, women are found to have a higher share of student migrants at 64.00 per cent and migrating due to earning member of the family. Marriage migration is dominated by men taking a share 36.00 per cent of the total sampled migrants. This is juxtaposed to the national level figures which indicates women's higher share in marriage migration. This is attributed to the matrilineal society and the tribal population of the state practices. The marriage mechanism in matriliny is the exchange of men as opposed to patriliny, that is, men move in to live with their wives and thus a change in their respective residences. However, it is observed that higher share of females migrate along with the parent or the earning member of the family at 10.1 per cent of the total migrants. This shows that men are more willing to take the risk and leave home for better job opportunities as compared to females.

Table 3: Educational level and Reason for migration

Educational level	Reason for migration									
	search for employment	better employment opprtunities	business	to take up employment	transfer of service	studies	marriage	migration of parent/ earning member of family	others	Total
Below Primary	1	0	0	3	0	0	4	0	0	8
	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	**1.9%**
Graduate	0	5	0	9	2	31	11	8	0	66
	0.00%	1.17%	0.00%	**2.11%**	**0.47%**	**7.26 %**	2.58%	**1.87%**	0.00 %	**15.46 %**
higher Secondary	2	2	0	6	0	26	7	5	0	48
	0.5%	0.5%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	**6.1%**	1.6%	1.2%	0.0%	**11.2 %**
illiterate	0	9	1	6	0	7	18	1	0	42
	0.0%	**2.1%**	0.2%	1.4%	0.0%	1.6%	4.2%	0.2%	0.0%	**9.8%**
literate without Schooling	0	0	3	9	0	4	8	2	0	26
	0.0%	0.0%	**0.7%**	2.1%	0.0%	0.9%	1.9%	0.5%	0.0%	**6.1%**
post graduate	0	1	0	5	0	5	1	0	0	12
	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	1.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	**2.8%**
primary	1	6	0	22	0	23	13	2	0	67
	0.2%	1.4%	0.0%	**5.2%**	0.0%	5.4%	3.0%	0.5%	0.0%	**15.7 %**
secondary	3	9	0	18	1	40	22	2	1	96
	0.7%	**2.1%**	0.0%	**4.2%**	0.2%	**9.4%**	**5.2%**	0.5%	**0.2%**	**22.5 %**
Upper primary	5	9	0	9	0	16	21	2	0	62
	1.2%	**2.1%**	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	3.7%	4.9%	0.5%	0.0%	**14.5 %**
Total	12	41	4	87	3	152	105	22	1	427
	2.8%	**9.6%**	**0.9%**	**20.4%**	**0.7%**	**35.6 %**	**24.6%**	**5.2%**	**0.2%**	100.0 %

Source: Author's Calculation from Primary Data

IV. MIGRATION ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

Educational level plays a pivotal role in influencing migration as depicted in Table 3. The primary data reveals that the persons of higher educational attainment migrate more. For instance, migrants with secondary level of education accounts 22.5 per cent which is the highest share of migrants. This is followed by those who have obtained or are pursuing graduate-level of education at 15.46 per cent. In addition, Migrants with primary, upper primary

and higher secondary level of education respectively constitute 15.7 percent, 14.5 per cent and 11.2 percent. Migrants with below primary level of education constitute a smaller portion at 1.9 per cent, while illiterate migrants and those who are literate without formal schooling migrants respectively accounts for 9.8 percent and 6.1 percent. A small percentage, 2.8 per cent of individuals who have obtained or are pursuing post graduate education also migrate.

Table 3: Educational level and Reason for migration

Educational level	Reason for migration							
	search for employment	better employment opportunities	business	to take up employment	transfer of service	studies	marriage	migration of parent earning member of family
Illiterate	0	9	1	6	0	7	18	1
	0.0%	**2.1%**	0.2%	1.4%	0.0%	1.6%	4.2%	0.2%
Literate Without Schooling	0	0	3	9	0	4	8	2
	0.0%	0.0%	**0.7%**	2.1%	0.0%	0.9%	1.9%	0.5%
Below Primary	1	0	0	3	0	0	4	0
	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%
Primary	1	6	0	22	0	23	13	2
	0.2%	1.4%	0.0%	**5.2%**	0.0%	5.4%	3.0%	0.5%
Upper Primary	5	9	0	9	0	16	21	2
	1.2%	**2.1%**	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	3.7%	4.9%	0.5%
Secondary	3	9	0	18	1	40	22	2
	0.7%	**2.1%**	0.0%	**4.2%**	0.2%	**9.4%**	**5.2%**	0.5%
Higher Secondary	2	2	0	6	0	26	7	5
	0.5%	0.5%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	**6.1%**	1.6%	1.2%
Graduate	0	5	0	9	2	31	11	8
	0.00%	1.17%	0.00%	**2.11%**	**0.47%**	**7.26%**	2.58%	**1.87%**
Post Graduate	0	1	0	5	0	5	1	0
	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	1.2%	0.2%	0.0%
Total	12	41	4	87	3	152	105	22
	2.8%	**9.6%**	**0.9%**	**20.4%**	**0.7%**	**35.6%**	**24.6%**	**5.2%**

Source: Author's Calculation from Primary Data

*Figures in the first row of each category represents absolute value

** Figures in the second row of each category represents percentage value

Furthermore, Table 3 highlights a large proportion of migrants are students accounting for 35.6 per cent. Among student migrants, the majority,9.4 per cent have completed secondary education. This is followed by graduate education and higher secondary education respectively at 15.46 percent and 11.2 percent. Other prominent reasons for migration are marriage migration, 24.6 per cent and migration to take up employment, 20.4 per cent. Respectively, most marriage migrants have at least secondary level of education, accounting for 5.2 per cent, while those who migrate to take up employment have primary education also accounting for 5.2 per cent. It must be noted a sizable proportion who migrate to take up employment are seasonal migrants (14.5 per cent) as depicted in Table 3.

Table 3 also reveals around 2.8 per cent of migrants migrate in search for employment, with majority of such migrants having Upper Primary level of education. A significant percentage of migrants, 9.6 percent, migrate due to better employment opportunities, with a significant number of these migrants being either illiterate or having completed upper primary and secondary education, with each accounting for 2.1 percent. Additionally, 5.2 percent of migrants migrate due to migration of their parents or primary earning member of the family. In such a case, most of these migrants,1.87 percent have completed graduate level of education.

VI. DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANTS BY AGE AND GENDER

Table 4: Migrants by Age Group and Migrant's Sex				
Age Group	**Sex / Gender**			**Total**
		F	**M**	
5-9	Count	1	1	2
	% within Migrant Sex	0.6%	0.4%	0.1%
	% of Total	**0.2%**	**0.2%**	**0.5%**
10-14	Count	5	4	9
	% within Migrant Sex	3.1%	1.5%	0.4%
	% of Total	**1%**	**0.9%**	**2.1%**
15-19	Count	34	18	52
	% within Migrant Sex	8.0%	6.8%	2.4%
	% of Total	**1.5%**	**4.2%**	**12.2%**
20-24	Count	74	46	120
	% within Migrant Sex	46.0%	17.3%	5.6%
	% of Total	**17.3%**	**10.8%**	**28.1%**
25-29	Count	26	49	75
	% within Migrant Sex	16.4%	18.6%	3.5%
	% of Total	**6.1%**	**11.5%**	**17.6%**
30-34	Count	5	30	35
	% within Migrant Sex	3.1%	11.3%	1.6%
	% of Total	**1.2%**	**7.0%**	**8.2%**
35-39	Count	3	27	30
	% within Migrant Sex	1.9%	10.2%	1.4%
	% of Total	**0.7%**	**6.3%**	**7.0%**
40-44	Count	2	21	23
	% within Migrant Sex	1.3%	8.0%	1.1%
	% of Total	**0.5%**	**4.9%**	**5.4%**
45-49	Count	2	21	23
	% within Migrant Sex	1.3%	8.0%	1.1%
	% of Total	**0.5%**	**4.9%**	**5.4%**
50-54	Count	1	20	21
	% within Migrant Sex	0.6%	7.6%	1.0%
	% of Total	**0.2%**	**4.7%**	**4.9%**
55-59	Count	2	16	18
	% within Migrant Sex	1.3%	6.1%	0.8%
	% of Total	**0.5%**	**3.7%**	**4.2%**
60-64	Count	3	4	7
	% within Migrant Sex	1.9%	1.5%	0.3%
	% of Total	**0.7%**	**0.9%**	**1.6%**
65-69	Count	2	3	5
	% within Migrant Sex	1.3%	1.1%	0.2%

	% of Total	**0.5%**	**0.7%**	**1.2%**
70-74	Count	1	5	6
	% within Migrant Sex	0.6%	1.9%	0.3%
	% of Total	**0.2%**	**1.2%**	**1.4%**
75-80	Count	0	1	1
	% within Migrant Sex	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%
	% of Total	**0.0%**	**0.2%**	**0.2%**
Total	Count	161	266	427
	% within Migrant Sex	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	**37.7%**	**62.3%**	100.0%

Source: Author's Calculation from Primary Data

Table 4 illustrates migration by their age group and gender. The Primary data reveals the age group 20-24 years accounts for the most migrants at 28.1 percent. This is followed by the 25-29 and 15-19 age groups respectively at 17.6 percent and 12.2 percent. Other age groups including 30-34 years, 35-39 years, 40-44 years, 45 49 years represent 8.2 percent, 7.0 percent and 5.4 percent of migrants, respectively. The primary data shows a clear pattern, as age advances the proportion of migrants decreases. For instance as the age group progresses from 45-49 years to 50-54 years and to 55-59 years there is a decline in the percentage share of migrants from 5.4 percent to 4.9 percent and further to 4.2 percent. This declining trend continues as individuals advance to senior citizen age groups, with a drop of 1.6 percent among 60-64 age group to 1.2 percent in 65-69 years and further to 0.2 percent in 75-80 age group. It is noted that age groups, 5-9 years and 10-14 years also accounts for a smaller proportion of migrants at 0.5 percent and 2.1 percent, respectively. When examining the gender aspect, in all age groups it is evident that migration is male dominant with the exception in the 20-24 years group where we see female migrants dominating at 17.3 percent as against to male at 10.8 percent.

VII. REASONS FOR MIGRATION OF DIFFERENT AGE GROUPS

Examining the age groups by reasons for migration from Table 5, we find age group 20-24 dominates for reasons of search for employment, 1.2 percent and migrating for further education, 21.8 percent. Whereas, majority in the age group 25-29 relocate for better employment opportunities, 4.4 percent and to take up employment in another place,7.0

Table 5: Reason for Migration by Age Group

Reason for Migration	Age Group															Total
	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-80	
search for employment	0	0	1	5	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	12
	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	1.2%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	**2.8%**
better employment opportunities	0	0	1	8	19	7	3	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	41
	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	1.9%	4.4%	1.6%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**9.6%**
business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	4
	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.9%**
to take up employment	0	0	3	12	30	14	11	5	7	2	2	0	0	1	0	87
	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	2.8%	7.0%	3.3%	2.6%	1.2%	1.6%	0.5%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	**20.4%**
transfer of service	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.7%**
studies	2	5	42	93	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152
	0.5%	1.2%	9.8%	21.8%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**35.6%**
marriage	0	0	0	0	10	12	14	12	13	18	14	4	3	4	1	105

	0.0 %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3 %	2.8 %	3.3 %	2.8 %	3.0 %	4.2 %	3.3 %	0.9 %	0.7 %	0.9 %	0.2 %	**24.6 %**
migration of parent/ earning member of family	0	4	5	2	1	2	2	2	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	22
	0.0 %	0.9%	1.2%	0.5%	0.2 %	0.5 %	0.5 %	0.5 %	0.2 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.5 %	0.0 %	0.2 %	0.0 %	**5.2 %**
others	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	0.0 %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.2 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	**0.2 %**
Total	2	9	52	120	75	35	30	23	23	21	18	7	5	6	1	427
	0.5 %	2.1%	12.2%	28.1%	17.6 %	8.2 %	7.0 %	5.4 %	5.4 %	4.9 %	4.2 %	1.6 %	1.2 %	1.4 %	0.2 %	**100. 0%**

Source: Primary Data
*Figures in the first row of each category represents absolute value
** Figures in the second row of each category represents percentage value

Percent. Examining the age groups by reasons for migration from Table 5, we find age group 20-24 dominates for reasons of search for employment, 1.2 percent and migrating for further education, 21.8 percent. Whereas, majority in the age group 25-29 relocate for better employment opportunities, 4.4 percent and to take up employment in another place,7.0 percent. Age group 50-54 years are mostly marriage migrants. Other age groups also follow suit at 3.3 percent for age group 54-59 years and 35-39 years, 3.0 percent for age group 45-49 years. It can be seen that among younger age groups such as 15-19 years, 1.2 percent and 10-14 years, 0.9 percent migration is mostly due to migration of parent or the primary earner of the family.

VIII. LABOUR AND NON-LABOUR MIGRATION

Table 6: Type of Migration and Status of Migration

Type of Migration		**Status of Migration**		Total
		Seasonal Migration (less than 6 months)	***Long Term Migration (more than 1 year)***	
Labour migrants	Count	77	68	145
	% within Status of Migration	97.5%	19.5%	34.0%
	% of Total	**18.0%**	**15.9%**	**34.0%**
Non-Labour	Count	2	280	282
	% within Status of Migration	2.5%	80.5%	66.0%
	% of Total	**0.5%**	**65.6%**	**66.0%**
Total	Count	79	348	427
	% within Status of Migration	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	**18.5%**	**81.5%**	**100.0%**

Source: Author's Calculation based on Primary Data

Table 6 analyses the type and status of migration. Migrants have been classified into Labour migrants and Non-Labour migrants. Whereas status of migration have been classified as seasonal migration and long-term migration. The sampled primary data indicates a total of 77 seasonal labour migrants which makes up a total of 97.5 percent of labour migrants and 18.0 percent of the total migrants. In contrast, 68 are Long-term labour migrants accounting for 19.5 percent of labour migrants and 15.9 percent of the total migrants in the study. In total, labour migrants account for 145 individuals which makes up 34.0 percent of the total migrants. On the other hand, non-labour seasonal migrants constitute of 2 individuals which account for 2.5 percent of non-labour migrants. In comparison, the bulk of non-labour migrants, 280 individuals, accounts for 80.5 percent of non-labour migrants and 65.6 percent of the total sampled migrant individuals. Non-labour migrants constitute 66.0 percent of total migrant population. Overall, we see that seasonal migrants constitute 18.5 percent of the population while long-term migration constitute 81.5 percent of the migrant population.

IX. MIGRANT'S NETWORK

Table7: Migrants' Network		
	Frequency	**Percent**
family member	73	17.1
relatives	41	9.6
friends or acquaintances	75	17.6
previous colleague	9	2.1
agent at origin	10	2.3
agent at destination	8	1.9
others (because of studies then stayed back for employment)	22	5.2
others	189	44.3
Total	427	100.0

Source: Primary Data

The largest category of network is others at 44.3 percent. This could suggest that a large number of migrants are influenced by other less well-known factors that are recognized as traditional social networks. Among the traditional networks, friends and acquaintances (17.6 percent) and family members (17.1 percent) highly influence migration. This is consistent with traditional migration patterns where family ties play a crucial role. The importance of friends and acquaintances in migration shows the importance of a social network broader than immediate family members. Relatives is another important category that is linked to migration. It highlights the significance of extended family members in providing aid to the migrant.

Other networks are less influential. Colleagues from previous employment play a minor role in influencing migration (2.1 percent). Migration agents at the origin and destination play a minimal role which reflects the lesser reliance on professional services for migration and in the context of West Khasi Hills a minimal or non-existent reliance on organised migration channels. Another channel of migration are those who had previously migrated for studies but had either dropped out or had completed their studies and decided to stay back at the place of destination to take up employment.

X. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

A study conducted by Tripathi et.al (2018) in Hsar District of Haryana revealed that an over- whelming majority of youths decide to out-migrated due to better availability of jobs in urbanareas, better educational institutions and opportunities and better income opportunities. Youngpeople usually migrate to urban centres for primary access to quality education and better schooling, provided that their families can support them financially (Elder et.al, 2015). The findings of this paper lends support to this conclusion. In the rural areas of West Khasi Hills District of Meghalaya, a sizable portion of out- migrants are youths. Many of theseyouths are motivated to migrate to seek higher level of education in Urban centres such as in Shillong and Nongstoin Town. Another portion of youths though out-migrate with a desire to find better employment opportunities in other parts of the state. This begs for the government to improve employment opportunities for youths in rural areas as well as to initiate development of higher educational institutions in rural areas so as to make rural educationallyaspiring youths have better access to education.

Another important notion of rural out-migration in Meghalaya is the higher presence of male migration for marriage as against the common norm in India. The study shows that most marriage migrations among rural males is 19.2 per cent while the rest of India is at 10.5% (NSSO -78th Round).

Many studies have shown that educational attainment and age also determines migration. Among the rural out-migrants of West Khasi Hills, Meghalaya it was found that those who hadattained Secondary, Higher Secondary and Graduate level of Education also tend to migrate more with a higher proportion in Secondary and Higher Secondary level of Education. On further observation, the age group of 15-23 years and 24-32 years are the age groups that havehigher proportion who have attained the above education levels. The majority of migrants are long term migrants (81.5 percent) and non-labour migrants dominates this category at 80.5 percent. Labour migration is more common in seasonal migration which accounts for 97.5 percent. However, non-labour migrants represent the majority of migrant population accounting for 66.0 percent

The primary survey also found that seasonal migration in West Khasi Hills, Meghalaya is during the dry and winter months. Most of seasonal migrants workers are either coal miners in Maweit and a small portion in Shahlang , or are those who works as lumbers.

References:

1. Parida, J.K. (2019). "Employment Potential of Migrant Workers in Meghalaya: An Empirical Exploration." In Virginius Xaxa, Debulal Saha and Rajdeep Singha (Eds), *Employment and Labour-Market in North-East India – Interrogating Structural Changes* (pp. 263-283). Routledge, New York.
2. Ravenstein, E.G. (1885). The Laws of Migration. *Journal of the Statistical Society of London* 48(2):167-235.
3. Lee, E. (1969). A Theory of Migration. In J.A Jackson (Ed), *Migration Sociological Studies 2* (pp.99-133). Cambridge University Press.
4. Lewis, W. A. (1954). Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour.*The Manchester School* 22(2):139-191.
5. Stark, O. & Bloom, D. E. (1985). The New Economics of Labor Migration.*The American Economic Review* 75(2):173-178.
6. Tripathi, H., Dixit,VB., Singh, S., Yadav, R. & Singh, I.(2018) An Analysis of Causes for Rural Youth Migrations *Indian Journal of Extension Education.* 54 (3): (53-58)
7. Elder, S., de Haas, H., Principi, M. & Schewel, K. (2015). Youth and rural development:evidence from 25 school-to-work transition surveys. *Work4Youth Publication Series*,No.29,Geneva:ILO http://www.skillsforemployment.org/wcmstest4/idcplg?IdcService=GET_FILE&d