Determinants and Consequences of Cross-Border Migration of Nepalese People to India

(A Study of Daijee Village Development Committee, Kanchanpur District, Far-Western Region of Nepal)

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES,

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY (TU),

in Fulfillment of the Requirements for DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

POPULATION STUDIES

By

Laxman Singh Kunwar

Department of Population Studies (DPS)

Patan Multiple Campus, Patan Dhoka

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Tribhuvan University

November 2012

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION

We certify that this dissertation entitled "DETERMINANATS AND CONSEQUENCES OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION OF NEPALESE PEOPLE TO INDIA: A STUDY OF DAIJEE VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE, KANCHANPUR DISTRCT, FAR-WESTERN REGION OF NEPAL" is prepared by Laxman Singh Kunwar under our guidance. We hereby recommend this dissertation for the final evaluation by the Research Committee of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Tribhuvan University in Fulfillment of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN POPULATION STUDIES.

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

Prof. Dr. Bal Kumar KC Supervisor

> Dr. Bhim Raj Suwal Research Expert

Date:

ACKOWLEDGEMENTS

The cross-border movement of people in developing countries primarily in search of employment is an inescapable consequence of development and the globalization process. Labor migration has become a persistent and accelerating reality in many developing countries, including Nepal. How this impacts on family members including intergenerational solidarity is a matter of considerable debate. Yet little research has been conducted to examine the determinants and consequences of such migration for the families involved in the context of Nepal.

I express my deep sense of indebtedness and heartfelt gratitude to Prof. Dr. Bal Kumar KC, my supervisor, for his constant inspiration, suggestions, and guidance during the entire course of this research. Despite his busy schedule, he provided me sufficient time to reorganize, edit and finalize my research work. This study would not have been completed without his continuous insightful and scholarly persuasion.

I am grateful to Dr. Bhim Raj Suwal, Associate Professor of Central Department of Population Studies, research expert of this study, for his eternal feedback and scholarly comments in completing this research.

I wish to express my thanks to Dr. Pushpa Kamal Subedi, Dr. Govind Subedi, Keshab Prasad Adhikari, Yogendra Bahadur Gurung, library staffs and administration of Central Department of Population Studies, Tribhuvan University for their cordial help during the working period of my research.

I am highly indebted to Shankar Bhatta for his tireless support to organize field works. I would like to express my sincere thanks to Arjun Bhattrai, Ram Shrestha, Mira Poudel, Kamala Bhatta, Hari Subedi, Kamalapati Bhatta, Mohan Khujum and Kalyan Tamang for their valuable support during field work and data management.

I am also indebted to University Grants Commission (UGC) for providing partial fellowship to carry out this study. I would like to acknowledge Patan Multiple Campus, Dean's Office, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Tribhuvan University for providing me study leave to complete this research work. I would like to extend my sincere thanks to REMESO, Graduate School on Migration, Ethnicity and Society, Linkoping University, Sweden for providing opportunity to join the

course on "Theories and Politics of International Migration", from where I got an opportunity to gain more theoretical knowledge in the field of Migration.

I am also grateful to all my friends and colleagues who inspired and encouraged me to carry out this research work.

I would like to thank my parents, brothers, sisters, daughters Pratistha, Nishma and son Pragyan for their valuable love, affection, cooperation and continuous encouragement. I am highly indebted to my brother Narayan Singh Kunwar for moral and financial support to complete this study. I must thank my spouse Subhadra Khadka (Kunwar) for her love, encouragement and unflagging support throughout the research period.

Last but not the least I can never forget the valuable contribution of residents of Daijee VillageDevelopment Committee who warmly responded my questionnaires and provided valuable inputs sincerely. I would like to extend my sincere thanks to all those presented in district level consultation meeting and provided feedback while selecting Daijee VDC as a proper site of cross-border migration study in the district. Final errors, however, remain my own.

Laxman Singh Kunwar Lecturer in Population Studies Patan Multiple Campus Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Tribhuvan University Kathmandu

ABSTRACT

The movement of people from rural areas in developing countries to cities and across borders, primarily in search of employment, is an inescapable consequence of development and the globalization process. Cross-border migration of Nepalese people to India provides a unique historical setting in which in search of employment has become an increasing reality. Yet little research has been conducted to examine the determinants and consequences of such cross-border migration for the families involved. This study examines determinants and consequences of migration at the family level with a focus on the variable effects of cross-border migration in the areas of origin.

The study addressed on vital economic and social research questions borne out of the review of literature. Economic domain included differences in land ownership and size, occupation, income and, indebtedness. The social domain included educational and social participation status between migrants and non migrant households. The study also explores the seasonal variation of the volume of cross border migration, role of ancestors/household experience on cross border migration and flow of current migration, the interrelations between duration of stay at destination and income earning by migrants, effect of poverty on volume of cross border migration, interrelationship between social networks and cross border migration, main areas of investment of remittance, difference between human capital (education and acquired training) and income earnings by migrants.

This research examines migrants (current, return and both current and return) and non-migrant households at the family level with focus on variable determinants and consequences of cross- border migration. The analysis is based on quantitative and qualitative data from a field study conducted in April and May 2011 in Daijee Village Development Committee of Kanchanpur, Far-western region of Nepal.

After determining the sample size, sampling frame covering all nine wards of Daijee VDC was carried out and 809 out of total 3,712 households in VDC were included in the sample by using systematic random survey. Among them 52.3 per cent were non-migrants and 47.7 per cent were migrant's households.

Most of the sample households (80%) in the study area were originated from Hill and Mountain districts of Far and West- development regions of Nepal, among them more than 40 per cent of households were found continuing their ancestral practice of cross-border migration to India. Cross-border migration has been a new source of generating income which has been just practiced among current generation of Tharu community.

The age group 15-59 years was nearly 44 times more likely to migrate with compared to those from the age group 0-14 years. Females were 97.2 per cent less likely to migrate than males. Other caste groups were 1.5 times more likely to migrate than upper caste groups. Ever married were nearly two times more likely to migrate than those who had never married. Those with primary education were 2.5 times more likely to migrate than illiterates. Those living in a joint family were 1.4 times more likely to migrate than those living in a nuclear family. Migrants belonging to the third, fourth and fifth wealth quintiles were 34.5 per cent, 40.6 per cent and 45.0 per cent were respectively less likely to migrate than compared with the first quintile. Household's members with middle level social participation index were 22.6 per cent less likely to migrate when compared to household members belonging to the low social participation index category.

More than four fifth of migrants crossed the border many times (2 to more than 11 times) and only 14.6 per cent of migrants were crossing the border for the first time. More than two third (66.4%) of cross-border migrants were engaged in physical or unskilled type of labour, more than one-fourth (28.2%) and only (5.4%) of total cross-border migrants were involved on semi skilled and skilled types of labour.

All together, 17 hypotheses were set in the study, among them 9 were related with determinants and remaining 8 were related with consequences of cross-border migration.

The main hypotheses related with determinants were comparison between nonmigrants and migrant's households of the study area and showed non-migrants households were better off than migrant's households in terms of mean land holding size, mean annual household's income by selling food grains and years of schooling of head of households supporting the hypotheses. The volume of cross-border migration and the lack of employment opportunities at migrants' place of origin, volume of cross-border migration and household's indebtedness, volume of cross-border migration and ancestors' participation in cross-border migration, volume of crossborder migration and frequencies of migrants' cross-border migration and volume of cross-border migration migrant's established networks were positively correlated supporting hypotheses.

The main hypotheses related with consequences were the duration of stay at the migrant's workplace and increased in the income, improvement in household consumption (food and clothes) and remittances, improvement in education of children and remittances, health and sanitation condition of a household and remittances, earned of physical properties (land and house) by migrant's households and remittances were positively correlated supporting hypotheses. The income of cross-border migrants and the training received (before migration), income of cross-border migrants and educational attainments (before migration), improvements in cash and remittances were positively correlated supporting these hypotheses.

Out of total cross-border migrants (89.1%) mentioned that, currently they have no any alternative of cross-border migration to meet their daily needs. Existing poverty and unemployment at the place of origin were respectively reported by 74.4 per cent and 24.1 per cent migrants as compulsion to join cross-border migration. Cross-border migrants themselves and Government staff of both countries working at transit point have very low level of knowledge about rights of migrant's workers and provisions included in Nepal-India Peace and Friendship Treaty of 1950.

The study presents a scenario of determinants and consequences of cross-border migration of Nepalese people to India. The socio-economic characteristics of migrant's themselves and their households, level of migrant's knowledge on their rights and perceptions of governments staff of Nepal and India regarding on cross-border migration and existing open border between two countries would be helpful to further analyze in cross-border migration study. Remaining on its base and by analyzing the cost and benefit of cross-border migration, it would be helpful in designing proper and safe cross-border migration policies especially to source country Nepal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION	II
ACKOWLEDGEMENTS	III
ABSTRACT	V
TABLE OF CONTENTS	VIII
LIST OF TABLES	XV
LIST OF FIGURES AND MAPS	XXII
LIST OF BOXES	XXVI
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	XXVII
CHAPTER I	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Problem Statements	3
1.3 Objectives	5
1.4 Hypotheses	6
1.5 Rationale of the Study	10
1.6 Limitations of the Study	10
1.7 Organization of the Study	11
CHAPTER II	12
REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	12
2.1 Categorization of Migration Theories	12
2.1.1 Review of Theoretical Literature	13
2.1.1.1 The Classical and Neo-Classical Perspectives	13
2.1.1.2. Marxist/neo- Marxist Perspectives	15

	10
2.1.1.3.1 The Mobility Transition	19
2.1.1.3.2 The Migration Hump	20
2.1.1.4 Internal Dynamics and Feedbacks: Networks and Migration Systems	21
2.1.1.4.1 Social Capital, Chain Migration and Network Theory	21
2.1.1.4.2 Migration Systems Theory	23
2.1.1.5 Pluralists Approaches on Migration	24
2.1.1.5.1 New Economics of Labour Migration (NELM)	24
2.1.1.5.2 Migration as a Household Livelihood Strategy	26
2.1.1.5.3 A Transnational Perspective on Migration	27
2.1.1.6 Main Theoretical Debates of Migration	28
2.1.1.7 Main Assumptions, Propositions and Critiques of Migration Theories	30
2.2 Empirical Literature Review	30
2.2.1 Categorization of History of International Migration Phase	30
2.2.2 Cross-border Migration of Mexican to USA	32
2.2.3 Cross-border Migration of Canadian to USA	34
2.2.4 Cross-border Migration of Croatian to Italy	34
2.2.5 Cross-border Migration of Vietnamese to China	36
2.2.6 Cross-border Migration of Afghani People to Pakistan	37
2.3 Cross-border Migration Studies in Nepal	39
2.4 Conceptual Framework of the Study	42
CHAPTER III	45
CHAPTER III METHODS AND MATERIALS	45 46
CHAPTER III METHODS AND MATERIALS 3.1. The Study Area	45 46 46
CHAPTER III METHODS AND MATERIALS 3.1. The Study Area 3.1.1 Introduction to Study Area	45 46 46 46
CHAPTER III METHODS AND MATERIALS 3.1. The Study Area 3.1.1 Introduction to Study Area 3.1.2 Selection of the Study Area	45 46 46 46
CHAPTER III METHODS AND MATERIALS 3.1. The Study Area 3.1.1 Introduction to Study Area 3.1.2 Selection of the Study Area 3.1.3 Justification of the Study Area	45 46 46 46 46 49
CHAPTER III METHODS AND MATERIALS 3.1. The Study Area 3.1.1 Introduction to Study Area 3.1.2 Selection of the Study Area 3.1.3 Justification of the Study Area 3.2 Sample Design and Size	45 46 46 46 46 49 49
CHAPTER III METHODS AND MATERIALS 3.1. The Study Area 3.1.1 Introduction to Study Area 3.1.2 Selection of the Study Area 3.1.3 Justification of the Study Area 3.2 Sample Design and Size 3.3 Survey Instruments	45 46 46 46 46 49 49 52
CHAPTER III METHODS AND MATERIALS 3.1. The Study Area 3.1.1 Introduction to Study Area 3.1.2 Selection of the Study Area 3.1.3 Justification of the Study Area 3.2 Sample Design and Size 3.3 Survey Instruments 3.3.1 Questionnaires	45 46 46 46 46 46 49 49 49 52 52
CHAPTER III METHODS AND MATERIALS 3.1. The Study Area 3.1.1 Introduction to Study Area 3.1.2 Selection of the Study Area 3.1.3 Justification of the Study Area 3.2 Sample Design and Size 3.3 Survey Instruments 3.3.1 Questionnaires 3.3.2 Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)	45 46 46 46 46 49 49 49 52 52 53
CHAPTER III METHODS AND MATERIALS 3.1. The Study Area 3.1.1 Introduction to Study Area 3.1.2 Selection of the Study Area 3.1.3 Justification of the Study Area 3.2 Sample Design and Size 3.3 Survey Instruments 3.3.1 Questionnaires 3.3.2 Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) 3.3.3 Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)	45 46 46 46 46 49 49 49 52 52 53 54
 CHAPTER III METHODS AND MATERIALS 3.1. The Study Area 3.1.1 Introduction to Study Area 3.1.2 Selection of the Study Area 3.1.3 Justification of the Study Area 3.2 Sample Design and Size 3.3 Survey Instruments 3.3.1 Questionnaires 3.3.2 Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) 3.3 Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) 3.4 Operational Definition of Variables, Hypotheses and Techniques of Analysis 	45 46 46 46 46 49 49 49 52 52 53 54 54
 CHAPTER III METHODS AND MATERIALS 3.1. The Study Area 3.1.1 Introduction to Study Area 3.1.2 Selection of the Study Area 3.1.3 Justification of the Study Area 3.2 Sample Design and Size 3.3 Survey Instruments 3.3.1 Questionnaires 3.3.2 Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) 3.3 Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) 3.4 Operational Definition of Variables, Hypotheses and Techniques of Analysis 3.4.1 Cross-border Migrants and Migrant's Households 	45 46 46 46 46 46 49 49 52 52 53 54 54 54
 CHAPTER III METHODS AND MATERIALS 3.1. The Study Area 3.1.1 Introduction to Study Area 3.1.2 Selection of the Study Area 3.1.3 Justification of the Study Area 3.2 Sample Design and Size 3.3 Survey Instruments 3.3.1 Questionnaires 3.3.2 Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) 3.3.3 Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) 3.4 Operational Definition of Variables, Hypotheses and Techniques of Analysis 3.4.1 Cross-border Migrants and Migrant's Households 3.4.2 Defining Poverty 	45 46 46 46 46 46 49 49 52 52 53 54 54 54 54

3.4.2.2 Household's Wealth Index Approach	55
3.4.3 Social Participation Index	56
3.5 Hypotheses	56
3.5.1 Cross-border Migration (CBM) as Dependent variable	56
3.5.2 Independent Variables	57
3.6. Techniques of Analysis	67
CHAPTER IV	71
DEMOGRAPHIC AND ETHNIC CHARACTERISTICS	71
4.1 Population Composition	71
4.2 Population Composition of Study VDC and Sample Households	74
4.2.1 Population, Family Size, Sex Ratio, Ageing Index and Dependency Ratio	74
4.2.2 Caste/Ethnic Composition	76
4.2.2.3 Mother Tongue and Religion Composition of Study Households	79
4.3 Migration Status of Sample Households	80
4.4. Transit Point (Gadda Chowki as the Transit Point for Cross-border Migrants	81
CHAPTER V	84
SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERSTICS OF SAMPLE	
HOUSEHOLDS	84
5.1 Social Characteristics	84
5.1.1 Literacy Status and Educational Attainment	84
5.1.2 Sex Composition of Household Heads	85
5.1.3 Social Participation of Households Members	86
5.2 Economic Characteristics	87
5.2.1 Agriculture as Main Income Source of Households	87
5.2.2 Land Ownership and Size of Land	88
5.2.3 Situation of Indebtedness and Debt Amount	90
5.2.4 Situation of Household Income Sufficiency	92
5.2.4 Situation of Wealth Status	93
5.3 Current Migration Status of Sample Households with Place of Origin	94
	6 -

CHAPTER VI

97

SOCIAL, DEMOGRAPHIC AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF	
CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS	97
6.1 Social Characteristics of Cross-border Migrants	97
6.1.1 Educational Attainment of Cross-border Migrants	97
6.1.2 Types of Skill Training Received by Cross-border Migrants	98
6.1.3 Mother Tongue of Cross-border Migrants	100

6.1.4 Caste/Ethnicity of Cross-border Migrants	101
6.1.5 Level of Social Participation	102
6.1.7 Cross-border Migrants and Affiliation with any Organization	103
6.1. 7 Cross-border Migrants and Knowledge on Migrant's Workers Rights	104
6.1.8 Knowledge and Perceptions about Nepal-India Friendship Treaty of 1950	106
6.2 Demographic Characteristics of Cross-border Migrants	106
6.2.1 Age and Sex of Cross-border Migrants	106
6.2.2 Marital Status of Cross-border Migrants	108
6.2.3 Family Structure of Cross-border Migrants	109

b	
6.2.3 Family Structure of Cross-border Migrants	109
6.2.4 Frequencies of crossing the border by Migrants	110
6.2.5 Duration of Stay of Cross-border Migrants at the Working Place	111
6.2.6 Place of Work of Cross-border Migrants in India	112

6.3 Economic Characteristics of Cross-border Migrants	114
6.3.1 Land Size Holding	114
6.3.2 Income Sufficiency of Cross-border Migrants	115
6.3.3 Cross-border Migrants and their Household Indebtedness	116
6.3.4 Cross-border Migrants and Wealth Status of their Households	117
6.3.5 Types of Labour Force Participation at the Work Place in Destination	118
6.3.6 Monthly Income of Cross-border Migrants at their Working Place	118
6.3.7 Duration Stay and Monthly Income of Cross-border Migrants at their	
Working Place	119

6.4 Interrelationships between Migrant Households and Individual Migrants 121

6.3.8 Migrant's Destination and Monthly Average Income

CHAPTER VII 126

DETERMINANTS AND CONSEQUENCES OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION

7.1 Migration Process of Cross-border Migrants	126
7.1.1 Involvement of Ancestors in Cross-border Migration	126
7.1.2 Source of Information of Cross-border Migrants	128
7.1.3 Cross-border Migrants and their Fellows while Joining Work	130
7.1.4 Decision Makers of Cross-border Migrants while Joining Work	131

	132
7.2.1 Reasons for Choosing India as the Destination	133
7.2.2 Lack of Employment and Household Poverty	134
7.2.3 Low Income	137
7.2.4 Land Holding Size	137
7.2.5 Indebtedness	137
7.2.6 Frequency of Migrants Crossing the Border	138
7.2.7 Off Farming Duration	138
7.3 Consequences of Cross-border Migration	139
7.3.1 Duration of Stay and Income of Cross-border Migrants	141
7.3.2 Remittances and Household's Consumption	142
7.3.3 Improvement in Human Capital	144
7.3.4 Improvement on Education of Children	145
7.3.5 Improvement in Health Status of Family	146
7.3.6 Improvement in Food Consumption, Quantity and Quality of Clothes of	
Household's Member	151
7.3.7 Role of Education	153
7.3.8 Role of Training	154
7.3. 9 Saving, Investment in Physical Properties and Cash Accumulation	155
7.3.10 Relationship within Family Members, Neighborhood and Participation in	
Religious and Cultural Activities	157
7.4 Perceived Advantages and Disadvantages of Cross-border Migration	159
7.5 Views of Government Staff (Nepal and India on the Issue of Cross-border	
7.5 Views of Government Staff (Nepal and India on the Issue of Cross-border Migration	162
7.5 Views of Government Staff (Nepal and India on the Issue of Cross-border Migration CHAPTER VIII	162 164
7.5 Views of Government Staff (Nepal and India on the Issue of Cross-border Migration CHAPTER VIII EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION	162 164 164
7.5 Views of Government Staff (Nepal and India on the Issue of Cross-border Migration CHAPTER VIII EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION CHAPTER IX	162 164 164 189
7.5 Views of Government Staff (Nepal and India on the Issue of Cross-border Migration CHAPTER VIII EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION CHAPTER IX SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH	162 164 164 189 189
7.5 Views of Government Staff (Nepal and India on the Issue of Cross-border Migration CHAPTER VIII EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION CHAPTER IX SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH 9.1 Summary	162 164 164 189 189
7.5 Views of Government Staff (Nepal and India on the Issue of Cross-border Migration CHAPTER VIII EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION CHAPTER IX SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH 9.1 Summary 9.1.1 The Study Area and Infrastructural Development	162 164 164 189 189 189 190
7.5 Views of Government Staff (Nepal and India on the Issue of Cross-border Migration CHAPTER VIII EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION CHAPTER IX SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH 9.1 Summary 9.1.1 The Study Area and Infrastructural Development 9.1.2 Characteristics of Population and Cross-border Migrants	162 164 164 189 189 189 190 190
 7.5 Views of Government Staff (Nepal and India on the Issue of Cross-border Migration CHAPTER VIII EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION CHAPTER IX SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH 9.1 Summary 9.1.1 The Study Area and Infrastructural Development 9.1.2 Characteristics of Population and Cross-border Migrants 9.1.2.1 Demographic Characteristics 	162 164 164 189 189 189 190 190 190
7.5 Views of Government Staff (Nepal and India on the Issue of Cross-border Migration CHAPTER VIII EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION CHAPTER IX SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH 9.1 Summary 9.1.1 The Study Area and Infrastructural Development 9.1.2 Characteristics of Population and Cross-border Migrants 9.1.2.1 Demographic Characteristics 9.1.2.2 Social Characteristics	162 164 164 189 189 189 190 190 190 190
 7.5 Views of Government Staff (Nepal and India on the Issue of Cross-border Migration CHAPTER VIII EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION CHAPTER IX SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH 9.1 Summary 9.1.1 The Study Area and Infrastructural Development 9.1.2 Characteristics of Population and Cross-border Migrants 9.1.2.1 Demographic Characteristics 9.1.2.3 Economic Characteristics 	162 164 164 189 189 190 190 190 191 193
 7.5 Views of Government Staff (Nepal and India on the Issue of Cross-border Migration CHAPTER VIII EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION CHAPTER IX SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH 9.1 Summary 9.1.1 The Study Area and Infrastructural Development 9.1.2 Characteristics of Population and Cross-border Migrants 9.1.2.1 Demographic Characteristics 9.1.2.2 Social Characteristics 9.1.3 Determinants of Cross-border Migration 	 162 164 164 189 189 189 190 190 190 191 193 194
 7.5 Views of Government Staff (Nepal and India on the Issue of Cross-border Migration CHAPTER VIII EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION CHAPTER IX SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH 9.1.1 The Study Area and Infrastructural Development 9.1.2 Characteristics of Population and Cross-border Migrants 9.1.2.1 Demographic Characteristics 9.1.2.3 Economic Characteristics 9.1.3 Determinants of Cross-border Migration 9.1.3.1 Reasons behind choosing India 	 162 164 164 189 189 190 190 190 191 193 194 195

9.1.3.2 Econo	mic Reason	195
9.1.3.3 Land	Holding Size	195
9.1.3.4 Freque	ency of Migrants crossing the border and Intergenerational Prac	tice 196
9.1.3.5 Off-fa	rming Seasons/Duration	196
9.1.3.6 Netwo	ork	196
9.1.4 Consequer	nces of Cross-border Migration	197
9.1.4.1 Remit	tances: Main Share for household Consumption	197
9.1.4.2 Impro	vement of Human Capital and Prevalent Infectious Diseases.	197
9.1.4.3 Variat	ion in Income of Cross-border Migrants	198
9.1.4.4 Saving	g, Investment on Physical Properties and Cash Accumulation	199
9.1.4.5 Relati	onship within Family Members, Neighborhood and Participatio	n on
Religious and	Cultural Activities	199
9.1.5 Testing of	Hypotheses	199
9.1.5.1 Testin	g of Hypotheses Related with Determinants of Cross-border	
Migration		200
9.1.5.2 Testin	g of Hypotheses Related with Consequences of Cross-border	
Migration		201
9.2 Conclusions		202
9.2.1 Unemploy	ment at the Place of Origin: Main Reason of Cross-border	
Migration		202
9.2.2 Cross-bord	der Migration: Intergenerational Practice	202
9.2.3 Involveme	ent in Cross-border Migration: A Gateway to Marry	203
9.2.4 Tharu Cor	nmunity: A New Test of Cross-border Migration	203
9.2.5 Testing of	Hypothesis	203
9.2.6 Remittanc	es: Mainly to Fulfill Household Consumption	204
9.2.7 Household	Is Wealth Status and Involvement in Cross-border Migration	205
9.2.8 Social Par 9.2.9 Remittanc	ticipation Index and Involvement in Cross-border Migration es: Investment in Human Capital (Education and Health of	205
Children)		206
9 2 10 Income/F	Remittances: Varies with Attained Level of Education and Trair	nings207
9 2 11 Lack of F	Snowledge on Right's of Migrant's Workers	207
9.2.12 Knowled	ge on Migrant's Rights and Distinct Perspectives of Governmer	nt · /
Staff (Nepal and	l India)	207
9.3 Further Resea	arch Issues	208
APPENDIX I: AS	SSUMPTIONS, PROPOSITIONS AND CRITIOUES OF	
MIGRATION T	HEORIES	209
APPENDIX – II:	FIELD QUESTIONNAIRE	215
APPENDIX III: 1	FGD GUIDELINES	237

APPENDIX IV: KEY INFROMANT GUIDELINES	239
APPENDIX V: CO-LINEARILTY STATSTCS	243
APPENDIX VI: VIEWS OF GOVERNMNET STAFF	244
APPENDIX VII: TABLE OF THE STANDARD NORMAL DISTRIBUTION	247
REFERENCES	249

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 2.1: CATEGORIZATION OF MIGRATION THEORIES	13
TABLE 2.2: OPPOSING VIEWS ON MIGRATION THEORIES	29
TABLE 2.3: HISTORY OF INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION PHASE	31
TABLE 3.1: WARD WISE DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS BY CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION STATUS	51
TABLE 4.1: POPULATION DISTRIBUTION OF THE STUDY AREA BY AGE AND SEX	71
TABLE 4.2: RELIGIOUS COMPOSITION OF HOUSEHOLD AND POPULATION OF HOUSEHOLD AND POPULATION THE STUDY DISTRICT	ON 73
TABLE 4.3: CASTE/ ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF HOUSEHOLD AND POPULATION IN THE STUDY DISTRICT	73
TABLE 4.4: CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDY POPULATION	74
TABLE 4.5: AGE-SEX DISTRIBUTION OF THE STUDY POPULATION	75
TABLE 4.6: WARD-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE HOUSEHOLD BY CASTE/ ETHNICITY	77
TABLE 4.7: WARD WISE DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLED HOUSEHOLD BY MOTHER TONGUE	79
TABLE 4.8: WARD-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE HOUSEHOLD BY RELIGION	80
TABLE 4.9: DISTRIBUTION OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO PLACE OF BIRTH/ ORIGIN	80
TABLE 4.10: PERCENTAGE OF INCOMING AND OUTGOING NEPALESE CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS FROM GADDA CHOWKI IN THE MONTH OF DECEMBER, 2010	82

TABLE 5.1: DISTRIBUTION OF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF HEADS OF SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS	85
TABLE 5.2: DISTRIBUTION OF SEX OF HEAD OF SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS	86
TABLE 5.4: DISTRIBUTION OF MAIN SOURCE OF INCOME OF SAMPLE HOUSEHOLD	88
TABLE 5.5: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY OWNERSHIP OF LAND	89
TABLE 5.6: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY SIZE OF LAND HOLDIN (IN <i>KATTHA**</i>)	G 89
TABLE 5.7: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY INDEBTEDNESS STATU	JS 91
TABLE 5.8: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY AMOUNT OF INDEBTEDNESS (IN NRS.)	91
TABLE 5.9: DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS BY INCOME SUFFICIENCY	92
TABLE 5.10: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY WEALTH STATUS	93
TABLE 5.11: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLD BY MIGRATION STATUS WITH PLACE OF ORIGIN	95
TABLE 6.1: DISTRIBUTION OF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF CROSS- BORDER MIGRANTS	98
TABLE 6.2: DISTRIBUTION OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS BY RECEIVE TRAINING AND TYPES	D 99
TABLE 6.3: DISTRIBUTION OF MOTHER TONGUE OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS	100
TABLE 6.4: DISTRIBUTION OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANT'S BY CASTE/ETHNICITY	101
TABLE 6.5: DISTRIBUTION OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS BY THE LEV OF SOCIAL PARTICIPATION INDEX	EL 102

TABLE 6.6: DISTRIBUTION OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS BY AFFILIATION TO ANY ORGANIZATIONS AND TYPES	104
TABLE 6.7: DISTRIBUTION OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS BY KNOWLEDGE ON MIGRANTS WORKERS RIGHTS	105
TABLE 6.8: DISTRIBUTION OF AGE OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS	107
TABLE 6.9: DISTRIBUTION OF AGE OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS AT THE TIME THEIR FIRST MIGRATION TO INDIA	107
TABLE 6.10: DISTRIBUTION OF MARITAL STATUS OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS	108
TABLE 6.11: DISTRIBUTION OF MARITAL STATUS ACCORDING TO THE FIRST TIME PARTICIPATION IN CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION	EIR 109
TABLE 6.12: DISTRIBUTION OF F CROSS-BORDER MIGRANT'S BY FAM STRUCTURE	ILY 110
TABLE 6.13: DISTRIBUTION OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS ACCORDIN TO THEIR FREQUENCIES OF CROSSING THE BORDER TO JOIN WORK	NG 111
TABLE 6.15: DISTRIBUTION OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS ACCORDIN TO THEIR DURATION OF STAY AT WORKING PLACE, INDIA (IN MONT	NG HS) 112
TABLE 6.16: DISTRIBUTION OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS ACCORDIN TO THEIR DESTINATION OF WORK PLACE IN INDIA	NG 113
TABLE 6.17: DISTRIBUTION OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS BY THEIR SIZE OF LAND HOLDING (IN <i>KATTHA</i> **)	115
TABLE 6.18: DISTRIBUTION OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS ACCORDIN TO THEIR INCOME SUFFICIENCY	NG 116
TABLE 6.19: DISTRIBUTION OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS BY THEIR HOUSEHOLD INDEBTEDNESS	116
TABLE 6.20: DISTRIBUTION OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS WITH THE HOUSEHOLD WEALTH STATUS	IR 117

xvii

TABLE 6.21: DISTRIBUTION OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS ACCORDING TO THEIR LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPATION IN INDIA	NG 118
TABLE 6.22: DISTRIBUTION OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS ACCORDING TO THEIR MONTHLY INCOME AT WORKING PLACE, INDIA (IN NRS)	NG 119
TABLE 6.23: DISTRIBUTION OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS ACCORDING TO THEIR DURATION OF STAY AND MONTHLY INCOME (IN NRS)	NG 120
TABLE 6.24: DISTRIBUTION OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS ACCORDING TO THEIR AVERAGE MONTHLY INCOME AT THEIR DESTINATION	NG 120
TABLE 6.25: B (BETA), S.E., SIG., EXP (B) AND 95.0 % C.I. FOR EXP (B) C MIGRANT HOUSEHOLDS BY SELECTED INDEPENDENT VARIABLES)F 123
TABLE 7.1: DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANTS ACCORDING TO THEIR ANCESTORS PARTICIPATED IN CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION	127
TABLE 7.2: DISTRIBUTION OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS ACCORDIN TO THEIR SOURCES OF INFORMATION	G 129
TABLE 7.3: DISTRIBUTION OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS ACCORDIN TO THEIR ACCOMPANIES WHILE JOINING TO WORK IN INDIA	G 130
TABLE 7.4: DISTRIBUTION OF DECISION MAKER OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS IN MIGRATION PROCESS	131
TABLE 7.5: DISTRIBUTION OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS BY REASON FOR CHOOSING INDIA	NS 133
TABLE 7.6: DISTRIBUTION OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS ACCORDIN TO THEIR REASONS FOR MIGRATION	G 134
TABLE 7.7: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS EXPRESSING THE REASO FOR CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION OF THEIR FAMILY MEMBERS)NS 136
TABLE 7.8: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO THEIR SEASON/TIME OF PARTICIPATION IN CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION	139
TABLE 7.9: DURATION OF STAY AT WORKING PLACE AND MEAN INCOME OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS	142

TABLE 7.10: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY MAIN AREA OF USE REMITTANCES	2 OF 143
TABLE 7.11: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO IMPROVEMENT IN EDUCATION OF CHILDREN	145
TABLE 7.12: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO IMPROVEMENT ON HEALTH SERVICES/ CAPACITY)	148
TABLE 7.13: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO IMPROVEMENT ON SANITATION AND HEALTH CONDITION	149
TABLE 7.14: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO DISEA SUFFERED BY THEIR MIGRANTS MEMBERS	SES 150
TABLE 7.15: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO IMPROVEMENT ON HOUSEHOLDS CONSUMPTION	152
TABLE 7.16: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO IMPROVEMENT ON QUANTITY AND QUALITY OF CLOTHES FOR FAM MEMBERS	IILY 152
TABLE 7.17: DISTRIBUTION OF LEVEL OF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMEN AND MEAN MONTHLY INCOME OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS (IN N	NT RS) 153
TABLE 7.18: DISTRIBUTION OF TYPES AND TRAINING RECEIVED BY CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS AND THEIR AVERAGE MONTHLY INCOM SENT AT HOME (IN NRS.)	IE 154
TABLE 7.19: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO ECONO STATUS AFTER INVOLVEMENT IN CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION	OMIC 155
TABLE 7.20: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO IMPROVEMENT ON PHYSICAL PROPERTIES AND AREAS OF INVESTM AFTER CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION	IENT 156
TABLE 7.21: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO ACCUMULATED CASH PROPERTIES AFTER CROSS-BORDER MIGRAT	ION 157

TABLE 7.22: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO IMPROVEMENT OF RELATIONSHIP WITHIN FAMILY MEMBERS AN NEIGHBORHOOD AFTER CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION OF HOUSEH	ID IOLDS
MEMBERS	158
TABLE 7.23: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO INC IN PARTICIPATION IN RELIGIOUS AND CULTURAL ACTIVITIES	REASE 159
TABLE 7.24: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO PERCEIVED ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF CROSS-BOR MIGRATION BY THEIR FAMILY MEMBERS	DER 160
TABLE 8.1: COMPARISON OF MIGRANT AND NON- MIGRANT HOUSEHOLDS (N=423 NON MIGRANT AND 386 MIGRANT HHS).	165
TABLE 8.2: INTER CORRELATIONS, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR TWO VARIABLES (N=386)	165
TABLE 8.3: INTER CORRELATIONS, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR TWO VARIABLES (N=386)	166
TABLE 8.4: INTER CORRELATIONS, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR TWO VARIABLES (N=386)	166
TABLE 8.5: INTER CORRELATIONS, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR TWO VARIABLES (N=386)	168
TABLE 8.6: INTER- CORRELATIONS, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR TWO VARIABLES (N=386)	169
TABLE 8.7: INTER CORRELATIONS, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR TWO VARIABLES (N=386)	170
TABLE 8.8: INTER CORRELATIONS, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR TWO VARIABLES (N=386)	171
TABLE 8.9: INTER CORRELATIONS, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR TWO VARIABLES (N=386)	173
TABLE 8.10: INTER CORRELATIONS, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR TWO VARIABLES (N=386)	175

TABLE 8.11: INTER CORRELATIONS, MEANS, AND STANDARDDEVIATIONS FOR TWO VARIABLES (N=386)	175
TABLE 8.12: INTER CORRELATIONS, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR TWO VARIABLES (N=967)	177
TABLE 8.13: INTERCORRELATIONS, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR TWO VARIABLES (N=386)	178
TABLE 8.14: INTER- CORRELATIONS, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR TWO VARIABLES (N=386)	179
TABLE 8.15: INTER- CORRELATIONS, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR TWO VARIABLES (N=386)	181
TABLE 8.16.A: INTECORRELATIONS, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR TWO VARIABLES (N=386)	183
TABLE 8.16.B: INTER CORRELATIONS, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR TWO VARIABLES (N=386)	185
TABLE 8.17: INTER CORRELATIONS, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR TWO VARIABLES (N=386)	186
TABLE 8.18: SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESIS TESTING	187

LIST OF FIGURES AND MAPS

FIGURE 1.1: INTERRELATIONSHIP AMONG RESEARCH QUESTIONS, OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESIS	8
FIGURE 2.1: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY	45
FIGURE 3.2: MIGRATION STATUS OF THE SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS	51
FIGURE 4.1: POPULATION PYRAMID OF STUDY DISTRICT	72
FIGURE 4.2: POPULATION PYRAMID OF THE THE STUDY POPULATION	76
FIGURE 4.3: PER CENT OF SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS BY CASTE/ETHNICIT	Y 78
FIGURE 4.4:DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS BY MOTHER TONGUE	79
FIGURE 4.5: DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS BY RELIGION	80
FIGURE 4.6: NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO THEIR DISTRICTS OF ORIGN	81
FIGURE 4.7: MAIN ORIGIN DISTRICTS AND DESTINATION OF MIGRANT AT GADDA CHOWKI TRANSIT POINT	S 83
FIGURE 5.1: PER CENT DISTRBUTON OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLDS BY LITERCAY STATUS AND LEVEL OF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	85
FIGURE 5.2: PER CENT OF SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS BY SOCIAL PARTICIPATION LEVEL	87
FIGURE 5.3: PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS BY MAIN INCOME SOURCE	88
FIGURE 5.4: PER CENT OF SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS BY LAND HOLDING PATTERN	90
FIGURE 5.5: PER CENT OF SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS BY INDENTEDNESS	91

FIGURE 5.6: PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDSACCORDING TO INCOME SUFFICIENCY93
FIGURE 5.7: PER CENT OF SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO WEALTH STATUS INDEX 94
FIGURE 5.8: PER CENT OF SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO THEIR PLACE OF ORIGIN 96
FIGURE 6.1: PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF LITERACY STATUS ANDEDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF MIGRANTS98
FIGURE 6.2: PER CENT AND NUMBER OF MIGRANTS ACCORDING TOTHEIR RECEIVED TRAINING AND TYPES100
FIGURE 6.3: PER CENT OF MIGRANTS ACCORDING TO THEIR MOTHER TONGUE 101
FIGURE 6.4: PER CENT OF MIGRANTS ACCORDING TO CASTE/ETHNICITY 102
FIGURE 6.5: PER CENT OF MIGRANTS ACCORDING TO THEIR LEVEL OF SOCIAL PARTICIPATION 103
FIGURE 6.6: PER CENT OF MIGRANTS ACCORDING TO KNOWLEDGE ON RIGHTS OF MIGRANTS WORKERS AND ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION 106
FIGURE 6.7: PER CENT OF MIGRANTS ACCORDING TO THEIR CURRENT AND FIRST TIME INVOLVEMENT AGE IN CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION 108
FIGURE 6.8: PER CENT OF MIGRANTS ACCORDING TO THEIR MARITAL STATUS (CURRENT AND FIRST TIME INVOLVEMENT IN CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION) 109
FIGURE 6.9: PER CENT OF HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDNG TO TYPES OF FAMILY 110
FIGURE 6.10: PER CENT OF MIGRANTS ACCORDING TO FREQUENCY OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION 111

FIGURE 6.11: PER CENT OF MIGRANTS ACCORDING TO DURATION OF STAYED AT THEIR DESTINATION	112
FIGURE 6.12: PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANTS ACCORDING TO THEIR DESTINATION (WORKING/WORKED PLACES)) 114
FIGURE 6.13. PER CENT OF MIGRANTS ACCORDING TO THEIR LAND HOLDNG PATTERNS	115
FIGURE 6.14: PER CENT OF MIGRANTS ACCORDING TO INDEBTEDNES	S 117
FIGURE 6.15: PER CENT OF MIGRANTS ACRCORDING TO TYPE OF LABOUR AT DESTINATION	118
FIGURE 6.16: PER CENT OF MIGRANTS ACCORDING TO THEIR MONTH INCOME AT THEIR WORKED/WORKING PLACES (IN NRS)	LY 119
FIGURE 7.1: PER CENT OF MIGRANT ACCORDING TO THEIR ANCESTO INVOLVEMENT IN CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION	RS 127
FIGURE 7.2: PER CENT OF MIGRANT'S ACORDING TO MAIN SOURCE O INFORMATION ABOUT WORKING/WORKED PLACES	F 129
FIGURE 7.3: PER CENT OF MIGRANTS ACCORDING TO ACCOMPANY WHILE CROSSING THE BORDER	131
FIGURE 7.4: PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF MAIN DECISION MAKER IN MIGRATION PROCESS	132
FIGURE 7.5: PER CENT OF MIGRANTS ACCORDING TO REASONS FOR CHOOSING INDIA	133
FIGURE 7.6: PER CENT OF MIGRANTS WITH REASONS FOR CROSS- BORDER MIGRATION	135
FIGURE 7.7: PER CENT OF HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO SEASON/TIM OF MIGRATION	IE 139
FIGURE 7.8: PER CENT OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH MAIN AREA OF INVESTMENT OF REMITTANCE	144

FIGURE 7.9: PER CENT OF HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO IMPACT OF	
REMITTANCE ON EDUCATION OF CHILDREN	146

FIGURE 7.10: PER CENT OF MIGRANTS ACCORDING TO HEALTH STATUS AFTER MIGRATION 149

FIGURE 7.11: NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS ACCORDING TO TYPES OF DISEASES SUFFERED BY THEIR MIGRANTS HOUSEHOLD MEMBER 151

FIGURE 7.12:. PER CENT OF MIGRANT'S HOUSEHOLD ACCORDING TO ECONOMIC STATUS AFTER MIGRATION OF HOUSEHOLD MEMBER 156

LIST OF BOXES

BOX 4.1: THARU COMMUNITY: A NEW TEST OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION	78
BOX 7.1: KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW WITH LABOUR CONTRACTOR/MEITH FROM SINDHUPALCHOWK	127
BOX 7.2: KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW WITH ACTIVIST OF EMIGRATICOUNSELING CENTER	ON 134
BOX: 7.3: KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW WITH LABOUR CONTRACTOR MEITH	t∕ 136
BOX: 7. 4: FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION WITH NON-MIGRANTS HOUSEHOLDS	162

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CBM	Cross-border Migration
CBS	Central Bureau of Statistics
CDO	Chief District Officer
CDPS	Central Department of Population Studies
CI	Confidence Interval
CSPro	Census and Survey Processing System
DDC	District Development Committee
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
HHs	Households
HIV/ AIDS	Human Immune Virus/ Acquired Immune Deficiency
	Syndrome
ID	Identity Card
IDI	In-depth Interview
IDPS	Internally Displaced Persons
ILO	International Labour Organization
INF	International Nepal Fellowship
IOM	International Organization on Migration
KII	Key Informant Interview
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
LDO	Local Development Officer
MCC	Migration Counseling Center
MEBDC	Migration, Employment, Birth, Death and Contraception
NIDS	National Institutes of Development Studies
NLEM	New Economy of Labour Migration
NPC	National Planning Commission
NRs	Nepalese Rupees
PCA	Principal Component Analysis
RMMRU	Refugee and Migration Study Unit
SE	Standard Error
SPSS	Statistical Package for the Social Science
UN	United Nations

UNDP	United Nations Development Program	
UNHCR	United Nations High Commission on Refugees	
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Emergency Fund	
USINS	United States Immigration and Naturalization Service	
USA	United States of America	
VDC	Village Development Committee	
VIF	Variance Inflation Factor	
VND	Viet Nam Dong	
WB	World Bank	

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Migration is usually defined as the movement of people from one place to another seasonally, temporarily, and permanently, for a number of voluntary or involuntary reasons. This definition includes refugees and internally displaced persons. Voluntary migrants move freely internally and to a limited extent internationally. Refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs) are those who move involuntarily usually because of wars or other violent conflicts, and human rights abuse.

Migration promotes exchange in work skills and experiences, enhances development of individuals, influences the size and shape of families, and age and sex composition. Migration has both positive and negative impacts on migrants themselves in their place of origins and destinations Contemporary migration in the world vary in volume, distance, and duration. It has become a challenge to policy makers in regulating migration and protecting migrants from abuse and exploitations.

The last two decades witnessed increase in the scale and complexity of international migration (Hugo, 2007). In 2005, the number of migrants worldwide was estimated at 185 to 192 million (IOM, 2005), representing approximately three per cent of the world population. This figure has more than doubled since 1975. Castles and Miller (2003) call the "age of migration" people flows have become global and affect nearly all countries on earth, whether as sending, receiving or transit countries, or as a combination of these. Developed countries are far from being the most affected by migration: approximately 46 per cent of the world's migrants and 81 per cent of its refugees live in developing countries (IOM, 2005). Now, politicians and government's official are emphasizing international migration as a means to bring economic and social development in the countries of origin (Castles, 2008). Remittances have become focal point within the

migration-development nexus. Remittances have been taken as a part of solution for development and poverty reduction strategy in sending or origin countries of migrants.

The history of foreign employment in Nepal dates back almost 200 years, when Britain began recruiting men from the hillsides of Nepal into the British armed forces. After India's independence in 1947, the Indian military also began enlisting Nepali men. Currently, about 3,500 Nepali soldiers serve in the British army and more than 50,000 Nepalese are enlisted in the Indian military. India was the first country to attract civilian migrants from Nepal. The inflow of working migrants to India has increased sharply since the 1950s and 1960s. India is the largest destination country for Nepalese migrants (Seddon, 2005). The movement of people between Nepal and India is largely facilitated by the open borders between the two countries. The open border has helped both countries to develop harmonious, socio-economic, cultural and religious relationships. However, it has made easier for weapons and drugs smuggling, cross-border terrorism, human trafficking, robbery, tax and custom evasion, loss of real national income and increasing security threat in both the countries.

The Foreign Employment Act of 1985 was the first legislative document to officially recognize the benefits of international migration (Jha, 1999). Around that time, foreign labour migration from Nepal extended from India to other Asian countries. The preliminary census result (2011) showed, the absentee population in Nepal increased by almost three times from 762,181 in 2001 to 1,917,903 in 2011 (CBS, 2011).

Seddon et al., (2001) estimated that there were approximately 1.3 million Nepalese emigrants working in India. India Nepalese Immigrant Association estimated 3 million Nepalese in India alone (Thieme, 2006). These figures, though not verified, were two to five times higher than those reported in Nepalese censuses. There has been a decreasing trend of Nepalese migrants to India with increasing preference of Nepalese to migrants to other countries for foreign labour employment (CBS, 1995 and 2003).

The armed conflicts for 'Gorkha Land' campaign, expulsion of Indian citizen of Nepali origin from Assam and Meghalaya and inflow of refugees from Bhutan to Nepal are other dimensions of cross-border. High Himalayan range along the border between Nepal with China is working as a wall restricting the free flow of people between these two countries even though both countries have maintained socio-economic and political interrelationships since time immemorial. The flow of Tibetan refugees through the Himalayan border with China to Nepal when Dalai Lama left Lhasa for asylum to India in 1959 has left its distinct imprint still now. Cross-border movement of capital and goods as well as movement of people in South Asia is significant, countries of South Asia comprise sending, receiving and transit countries, some of which are both or all three.

1.2 Problem Statements

Millions of people are now crossing their border due to voluntary and involuntary causes. Migrants are accounted of targets of suspicion or hostility in the communities where they live and work. In most cases, migrants are financially poor, and they share the handicapped economy, society and culture of the least-favoured groups in the society of the host state. Discrimination against migrant workers in the field of employment takes many forms. These include exclusions or preferences as regard the types of jobs which are open to migrants, and difficulty to access to vocational training. Migrant workers are known to be excluded from the scope of regulations covering working conditions, and have denied the rights to take part in trade-union activities.

In the Nepalese context, foreign labour occupation has been developed as an emerging business area. The irregularities in foreign labour migration, problems faced by labour migrants before and after their departure for foreign employment are not properly addressed from the policy level. It has not been a respectful area of occupation. A migrant worker has to face numerous problems while he/she makes decision to migrate for foreign employment. Lack of information on actual cost and earning, social, cultural and working environment about the country of destination can be considered as main problems. Most of the migrant workers aboard are working in a vulnerable situation without any effective legal protection. The minimum or basic efforts are lacking to protect the rights of the migrant workers and assure their safety to the country of destination. Until the late 1990s, National Planning Commission (NPC) deemed

agriculture to be the key to rural development (Gurung et al., 2003). Agricultural based economy turned toward remittance based economy. No any treaty existing between Nepal and India ever mentioned for the regulation of the Nepal-India border. The trade agreement has specified the agreed routes for mutual trade. But there is no agreement regarding movement of the people and the agreed routes for both countries along the border. The concept of open border between Nepal and India has still remained an enigma, besides, there are several sub-customs posts. It is alleged that it is possible to have illegal movement of people and goods in collaboration with personnel deputed in those posts. Open border between Nepal and India has facilitated illegal smuggling of goods, trafficking of girls to brothels in Indian cities, trafficking in narcotic drugs, arms and ammunition and movement of criminals and terrorists. In principle, both Nepal and India have positively agreed to control such illegal activities along the border without pragmatic approach.

"Of the three demographic processes: birth, death and migration, the later (Migration) remains the least understood and researched area in Nepal. But some of Nepal's social, economic, demographic and political problems are intricately woven with the process of internal and international migration" (KC, 1998:4).

Cross-border migration of people between Nepal and India and their socio-economic and demographic dimensions have not been studied in any detail previously. Better understanding of the causes of the flows of cross-border migration and their relationship with development and answers to policy questions arising there from are hampered by scarcity of up-to-date and reliable quantitative information concerning the cross-border migration.

Cross-border migration, with its intricate web of demographic, social, economic and political determinants and consequences, is the topic that has moved to the forefront of the national and international agenda. The variation in geographical and population size and political power, historical settings, open border, conflicts among the people, the cross-border migration between Nepal and India holds a unique position and is difficult to properly address by existing systems, laws and theories of migration.

This study specially seeks answers to the following research questions:

- Is there any difference on economic (land ownership and size, occupation, income, indebtedness) and social (education) status between migrants and non-migrant households?
- Is there any seasonal variation on the volume of cross-border migration to India?
- Is there any role of ancestors/household experience on cross-border migration on flow of current migration?
- What are the interrelations between duration of stay at destination and income earning by migrants?
- What is the effect of poverty on volume of cross-border migration?
- What is the interrelationship between social networks and cross-border migration?
- What is the main area of investment of remittance from cross-border migration?
- Is there any difference between human capital (only education and acquired training) and income earnings by migrants?

1.3 Objectives

The study examines the major factors of determinants and consequences of cross-border migration of Nepalese people to India. The study is based on social, economic, as well as administrative and political context between two countries. The study provides an input in updating knowledge on cross-border migration of Nepalese people to India.

The specific objectives of the study are:

- To examine the economic differences (land ownership and size, occupation, Income, indebtedness) and social difference (education) between non-migrants and migrants households
- To examine the main season/time duration of migrants' crossing the border to join work,

- 3. To analyze the role of intergenerational (ancestors/ household member) and frequencies of migration on the flow of current migration,
- 4. To explore the characteristics of migrant's involving in cross-border migration.
- 5. To examine the interrelationship between duration of stay and earning by migrants at the place of destination,
- 6. To examine the role of household poverty with respect to land size, income sufficiency and indebtedness on the volume of cross-border migration,
- 7. To analyze the effect of social network on the volume of cross-border migration,
- 8. To examine the use of remittances at the place of migrants' origin,
- 9. To analyze the role of education and training on income of migrants' at the place of destination.

1.4 Hypotheses

- 1: Non migrant households are better off in (size of land holding, annual household income on selling food grains, household indebtedness, and years of schooling of household head) than migrants households.
- 2: The volume of cross-border migration increases with the decrease in the annual household income sufficiency.
- 3: Volume of cross-border migration increases with decrease in ownership of cultivable land holding the size.
- 4: The volume of cross-border migration increases with the lack of employment opportunities at migrants' place of origin.
- 5: The volume of cross-border migration increases with the increase in the household indebtedness.
- 6: The volume of cross-border migration increases with ancestors' participation in crossborder migration.
- 7: The volume of cross-border migration increases with increased frequencies of crossborder migration.

- 8: The volume of cross-border migration increases with increased networks of migrants.
- 9: The volume of cross-border migration increases with off farming duration.
- 10: The duration of stay at the migrant's workplace increases with the increase in the income receiving at the workplace.
- 11: Household consumption improves with increase in the household remittances.
- 12: There is a positive correlation between education of children and household remittance.
- 13: There is positive correlation between loan/debt pay and remittances.
- 14: The health and sanitation condition of a household improves with the increase in the amount of remittance sent by cross-border migrants.
- 15: Physical properties (land and house) earned by household increases with the increase in the household remittance.
- 16(a): Income of cross-border migrants increases at the work-place with the training received by migrants (before migrating.
- 16(b): Income of cross-border migrants increases at the work-place with the level of education received by migrants (before migrating).
- 17: There is positive correlation between improvements in cash saving and remittances from cross-border migration.

Figure 1.1: Interrelationship among Research questions, objectives and Hypothesis

Objectives	Research Questions	Hypothesis
↓		↓
Describe economic and social differences between migrants and non-migrants househol	What are the main differences between ds migrants and non-migrants household?	→ Non-migrants households are economically and socially better off than migrants' households.
↓		,↓
Describe the seasonal variation of cross-borde migration	r Is there any difference on volume of cross- border migration of people in a year?	- Volume of cross-border migration increases with off farming duration/seasons
Evaluate the impact of intra generational flow of migration on current migrants	What is the role of ancestor's participated/HH experiences of migration on flow of current migrants?	a) Ancestors participated on cross-border migration increases the volume of migration b) Volume of cross-border migration increases with migrants' frequencies on cross-border migration.
<pre>↓Examine the relationship between duration of stay and income earning at</pre>	Is there any relationship between duration of stayed at working place and migrants' income	Duration of stay at working place increases with increased in income at destination.
destination	curring:	
↓Analyze the role of HH poverty on volume of cross-border migration ↓	How the level of HH poverty andVolumeinvolvement on cross-border migrationin incoare and related?	e of cross-border migration increases 1, with decreased me sufficiency, 2, decreased in size of cultivable land, 3, ncreased in indebtedness.
Examine the role of social networks on the volume of cross-border migration	Is there any impact of social network on joining to migration process?	Volume of cross-border migration increases with established social networks of migrants.
 Examine the uses of remittances at place of origin 	What are the main areas of investment of remittances/income earned by migrants?	HH consumption, Children education, family health and earning of physical properties (land, house), improvements in cash saving are positively co-related with remittance
Examine the role of human capital and income earning at place of destination	Is there any contribution of human capital on income of migrants at destination?	Human capital (education, trainings) and income earnings are positively correlated
1.5 Rationale of the Study

There has been little research in Nepal on the impact of cross-border migration on the migrants themselves, to their household and community. Numbers of cross-border migrants have been steadily increasing but the impacts occurred due to migration has not been previously analyzed adequately. Cross-border migrants are considered with having lack of proper information and services at both source and destination communities. There is very little data and information available on cross-border migrants' determinants and consequences. Cross-border migrant's knowledge on migrants' rights at their working place, situation of abuse and exploitation, problems faced while exit and entry from the border. The perception of migrants' on Nepal India friendship treaty of 1950 as well as knowledge of cross-border migrant's on provision for working people of both countries have not been studied in any detail.

The role of intra-generation migration and network to contribute safe migration and increasing the volume of cross-border migrations' also has not been analyzed. It is essential to generate data or information by understanding and dynamics of diverse migrants' communities crossing to border to work and their experiences at working place. There is lack of awareness to make safe cross-border migration by reducing migrant's vulnerabilities and exploitation. There is a need to identify the role of community and societal resources, which can be brought together to address various issues and problems faced by cross-border migrants from Nepal. The overall goal of the study is to determine the major causes and consequences of cross-border migration and identify key issues of abuse and exploitations faced by migrants. The study provides feedback to analyze the Nepal –India relation in a new dimension mainly in the area of cross-border migration of people of both countries and existing open border between them.

1.6 Limitations of the Study

• The study is based in Daijee VDC of Kanchanpur district and nearly 80 per cent of study households were originated from Hills and Mountains regions of Far and Mid-western regions of Nepal.

- The study confined only to those cross-border migrants who cross and returns back through Gadda Chowki/ Banbasha transit point.
- The study is confined to the place of current origin of households of migrants (current, return and both migrants). Information regarding return migrant's households were collected from return migrants themselves, whereas information of current migrants were collected through their head of households as well as with their nearest source of information in the study households.

1.7 Organization of the Study

This study is organized into nine chapters. Chapter one provides background of study, problem statements, objectives, hypotheses, rationale and limitations of the study. Chapter two is devoted to the review of relevant literatures on migration theories, empirical literature on cross-border migration studies between some countries, cross-border migration studies in Nepal and conceptual framework of the study. Chapter three includes methods and materials used in this study in which selection of study, justification of study area, households and respondents, sample size, survey instruments, operational definition of key variables used in study and hypothesis set in the study are discussed.

Chapter four includes introduction of the study area and location, composition of population and migration history of the study population. Chapter five examines the characteristics of study households on the basis of social, economic and origin and distribution of the study households. Chapter six describes characteristics of cross-border migrants on the basis of their social, demographic and economic background. Chapter seven analyses the migration process, determinants and consequences of cross-border migration. Chapter eight includes the testing off hypotheses. Chapter nine includes summary, conclusions and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

There is a remarkable renaissance of interest in the issue of migration and development in migrant-sending societies among policy makers and scholars (Kapur, 2003; Ratha, 2003). Human migration is both the cause and consequence of social change for individuals and society in both origin and destination. Many socio-economic and cultural characteristics directly or indirectly influence migration phenomenon (Cebula, 1979; Liaw, 1990). Income gaps between rich and poor countries create incentives for international migration. Most people do not migrate at all, even when income is far higher abroad than at home. International migration is driven by private contacts and recruitment. Once international migration from a particular region reaches a certain point, it tends to take on a life of its own. It is unquestionably an integral part of income growth in all countries. It is an important component of national income in many less developed countries. Economic developments and underdevelopment influence migration and are also influenced by it The critical question for LDC government is how to design policies that can enhance the potential for migration to contribute to economic development in migrant sending regions (Taylor, 2006). The demographic and socio-economic diaspora of any region or country is determined by inflow and outflow of migration.

2.1 Categorization of Migration Theories

Demographers have offered the role of migration on population growth rate together with extended life expectancy resulting in significant demographic differences between regions and corresponding variation on labour supply. Economists have tended to emphasize economic opportunities, sociologists have focused on characteristics of migrants, and geographers have highlighted the spatial structure of migration flows with a genuine convergence of the disciplinary foci (Cadwallader, 1992). Differences in

disciplinary paradigm and the focus of analysis have created diversity on the nature, causes, and consequences of migration (Massey et al., 1993).

Discipline	Dependent Variables	Independent Variables		
Demography	Population dynamics (population	Migrant behavior and its impact on the		
	distribution, and fertility, mortality, population (fertility rates for instan			
	and migration rates)			
Anthropology	Migrant behavior (external migration	Social and cultural context (transnational		
	and migrant integration)	networks)		
Economy	Migrant behavior (immigration,	Wages, wage discrepancies, supply and demand (attraction and expulsion factors),		
	integration, and economic impacts)			
		human capital, and the proportion of the		
		mentioned factors		
History	Migrant experiences	Historical/ social context of migration		
Law	Legal, political, social, and economic	Law or policies		
	treatment of migrants			
Political	Policies (tolerant, prohibitive) and	Regimes and institutions, rights, and interests		
Sciences	their results (accuracy and integration)			
Sociology	Migrant behavior	Networks, social capital, and migrant		
	(immigration and its causes)	pockets.		

Table 2.1: Categorization of Migration Theories

Source: Brettell and Holifield, 2007.

2.1.1 Review of Theoretical Literature

Over the twentieth century, several theoretical perspectives on migration have evolved in isolation from one another with differences in their level of analysis and thematic orientation. Among the main reasons explaining why it is so difficult to generalize determinants and consequences of migration are the diversity and complexity of migration phenomenon and the difficulty of separating migration from other socioeconomic and political processes.

2.1.1.1 The Classical and Neo-Classical Perspectives

The 'laws of migration' formulated by Ernest Georg Ravenstein in 1885 is the oldest concept in understanding migration. According to this law, migration is an inseparable part of development and the major causes of migration were economic (Ravenstein 1885; 1889). The push-pull model is present in both origin and destination (Lee 1966). People

are expected to move from low income to high income areas, and from densely to sparsely populated areas creating a certain spatial-economic equilibrium (Castles and Miller, 2003). Lee (1966) revised Ravenstein's laws on migration and proposed that the decision to migrate is determined by factors associated with the area of origin and destination; intervening obstacles such as distance, physical barriers and immigration laws, and personal factors. The theory emphasized that migration tends to take place within well-defined "streams", from specific places at the origin to specific places at the destination, not only because opportunities tend to be highly localized but also because the flow of knowledge back from destination facilitates the passage for later migrants. Lee also stated that migration is selective with respect to individual characteristics of migrants because people respond differently to plus and minus factors at origins and destinations and have different abilities to cope with the intervening variables (Reniers, 1999). Lee's push-pull model is basically an individual choice and equilibrium model (Passaris, 1989).

Harris-Todaro model (1970) remained the basis of neo-classical migration theory. It called for modifying simple wage differential approach not only looking at the prevailing income differentials but also rural-urban income differential adjusted for the probability of finding an urban job (Todaro, 1969). Borjas (1989; 1990) postulated the idea of an international immigration market, in which potential migrants base the choice of destination on individual, cost-benefit calculations. At the macro-level, neo-classical theory explains that migration is caused by geographical differences in the supply and demand for labour and capital moving in opposite direction. At the micro-level, neo-classical migration theory views migrants as individual, rational actors, who decide to move on the basis of a cost-benefit analysis (Harris and Todaro, 1970; Lewis 1954; Todaro and Maruszko, 1987). In the long run, this process would remove the incentives for migrating. The assumptions of this perspective are; free choice and full access to information of origin and destination of migrants, as well as able to earn the highest wages, factor price equalization will eventually result in growing convergence between wages at the sending and receiving end (Todaro, 1969).

This perspective largely ignores the existence of market imperfections and other structural constraints on development. This is hardly realistic, particularly in the context of many developing countries. In most developing countries, factor markets such as capital and insurance are typically far from perfect, making access to financial services and capital difficult or even impossible for marginalized groups. This makes actual migration patterns difficult to explain within a neo-classical framework that mainly focuses on expected income. Neo-classical migration theory is also not able to deal with constraining factors such as government restrictions on migration. It has also been criticized for being a-historical and Eurocentric, supposing that migration (i.e., the transfer of labour from agricultural rural to industrial urban sectors) fulfils the same facilitating role in the modernization of currently developing countries as it did in nineteenth and twentieth century in Europe. In fact, the structural conditions under which contemporary migration in and from developing countries takes place are rather different (Skeldon, 1997). The neo-classical, individual- centered approach towards migration leaves no room for remittances (Djajic, 1986; Taylor, 1999).

Human capital framework treats migration as an investment. In economic theory, human capital has increasingly been recognized as a crucial factor in the process of economic development (Becker, 1962; Sjaastad, 1962). Other refinements of neo-classical migration theory relate to the selectivity of migration in which without denying the importance of expected wage differentials, the likelihood of particular individuals and groups emigrating is also supposed to depend on both the costs and risks of migration and individual human capital characteristics. Human capital theory assumes that personal assets such as skills, education, and physical abilities are fundamental capitals that boost economic production.

2.1.1.2. Marxist/ neo- Marxist Perspectives

A radically different interpretation of migration was embedded in the intellectual root of Marxist political economy in 1960s known as historical-structural theory (Castles and Miller, 2003). It emerged in response to neo-classical approaches. Historical-structural theory postulated that economic and political power is unequally distributed among developed and underdeveloped countries, that people have unequal access to resources,

and that capitalist expansion has the tendency to reinforce these inequalities. Instead of modernizing and gradually progressing towards economic development, underdeveloped countries are trapped by their disadvantaged position within the global geopolitical structure.

Migration is a direct result and cause of the circumstances of underdeveloped societies and the international division of labour. International capitalist penetration into these societies deepens; their labour migratory process intensifies, moving from an initial stage of low migration to increasing pressure for more and more migration (Porters, 1978; Zelinsky, 1971). Migration, once induced or forced, becomes a self-perpetuating and selfregulating process of dependency. It emerges as a necessary economy activity, a kind of unavoidable tradition in the face of underdevelopment, uneven development and rapid population growth (Shrestha, 2001). This theory of migration is built on the conceptual foundation of two specific components of the existing social formation, which are the relations of production and uneven geographical development. Though, the uneven development process is not independent of the social relations of production but evolving spatial structure and relations are the key actors that induce migration (Amin, 1980; Lipton, 1977). In the process of production, people enter into definite social relations of production, in which they occupy certain positions and perform certain acts (Marx, 1976). Migrants are an integral part of such relations (Leeds, 1977). Marxists primarily concentrate on the colonial-capitalist penetration into domestic modes of production in underdeveloped countries, and argued that the global colonial expansion following the industrial revolution was directly linked to over production and the falling rate of profits and hence a crisis in capital accumulation, and a growing mass of industrial reserve army or relative surplus population and consequent poverty and social conflicts between capital and labour. Colonialism and colonial migration has considered as a salvation to these problems (Marx, 1976). The free geographical mobility of labour power appears a necessary condition for the accumulation of capital (Harvey, 1982). According to Lenin (1969) neutralized competition from other industrial powers by assuring total control over both the raw materials and the markets of the colony, becomes an outlet for excess capital whose investment in the colonies produced high profits because of their scarce capital, low wages, and cheap raw materials (Zolberg, 1978).

It was the search for low cost labour and raw materials which led to the geographical expansion of the world system of capitalism in the form of colonialism (Wallerstein, 1983). Migration is conditioned by the externally superimposed structural and materials forces, and is a form and mechanism of labour control by capital within the capitalist social formation (Wallerstein, 1974).

Emmanuel Wallerstein's (1974, 1980) world-systems theory classified countries according to their degree of dependency, and distinguished between the capitalist core nations, followed by the semi-peripheral, peripheral, and isolated nations in the external area, which were not yet included in the capitalist system. In this perspective, the incorporation of the peripheries into the capitalist economy is associated with putting migration drain on them, exactly the opposite of factor price equalization presumed by neo-classical theory. Instead of flowing in the opposite direction of capital as predicted by neo-classical category, the idea is that labour follows where capital goes.

Gunnar Myrdal (1957) developed cumulative causation theory designed to explain the general perspective on the concentration of economic activities. Cumulative causation theory postulates that once differential growth had occurred, internal and external economies of scale will perpetuate and deepen the bipolar pattern characterized by the vicious cycle of poverty in the periphery and the accelerated growth of the core region. Myrdal argued that, without strong state policy, the capitalist system fosters increasing regional inequalities (Potter et al., 1999).

Cumulative causation theory holds that capitalist development is responsible by deepening spatial and personal income and welfare inequalities. The establishment of migration streams creates developing feedback mechanisms-the backwash effects-in sending societies and regions that make additional movements more likely. This theory suggests that migration sets in motion a vicious circle in which the backwash effects alter the system in such a way that productivity and wealth at the origin is further decreased. Migration, it suggests, undermines regional and local economies by depriving communities of their most valuable labour force, increasing dependence on the outside world, and stimulating subsequent out-migration. Historical structural and cumulative causation theories perceive migration as a process serving the interests of the receiving

nations in need of cheap immigrant labour, and which only seems to worsen underdevelopment at the origin

Marxist and neo-Marxists have not developed a migration theory as such, but perceive migration as a natural outgrowth of disruptions and dislocations that are intrinsic to the process of capitalist accumulation. They interpret migration as one of the many manifestations of capitalist penetration and the increasingly unequal terms of trade between developed and underdeveloped countries (Massey et al., 1998). Andre Gunder Frank (1966, 1969) was the frontrunner of the dependency theory and hypothesized that global capitalism contributed to the development of underdevelopment. The dependency school views migration not just as detrimental to the economies of underdeveloped countries but also as one of the very causes of underdevelopment, rather than as a path towards development. According to this view, migration ruins stable peasant societies, undermines their economies and uproots their populations.

Marxist and neo-Marxists have criticized neo-classical migration theory, stating that individuals do not have a free choice, because they are fundamentally constrained by structural forces. Rather than a matter of free choice, people are forced to move because traditional economic structures have been undermined as a result of their incorporation into the global political economic system. Through these processes, rural populations become increasingly deprived of their traditional livelihoods, and these uprooted populations become part of the urban proletariat to the benefit of those core areas that rely on cheap (immigrant) labour. Marxist and neo-Marxists views on migration have been criticized for being too determinist and rigid in their thinking in viewing individuals as victims or pawns that passively adapt to macro-forces, thereby largely ruling out individual agency (de Haas, 2010).

2.1.1.3 Transitional Migration Perspectives

Neo classical model of migration, which basically see migration as the outcome of spatial differentials in development levels between the origin and destination areas, seen in dichotomous terms, are generally inconsistent with much more complex empirically observed migration patterns and also tend to undervalue migrants' agency, perceptions

and aspirations. The Marxist and neo-Marxists ignored the role of individual agency in the migration process. Transitional perspective provides emphasis on migration in broader process of development, assuming reciprocal role of migration and changes in the character during course of development process.

2.1.1.3.1 The Mobility Transition

Zelinsky's (1971) hypothesis of the mobility transition links the vital transition to the mobility transition. Zelinsky argued that through the development of scientific knowledge, modern man had extended control over his own physiology in the form of death and birth control, resulting in the demographic transition. He distinguished five phases of the vital transition: (a) The pre-modern traditional society (high fertility and mortality, little natural increase if any); (b) The early transitional society (rapid decline in mortality, major population growth); (c) The late transitional society (major decline in fertility, significant but decelerating natural increase); (d) The advanced society (fertility and mortality stabilized at low levels, slight population increase if any); and (e) A future super advanced society (continuing low fertility and mortality). The core of his argument was that each of these phases was linked to distinct forms of mobility, in a process that Zelinsky coined as the mobility transition. Zelinsky (1971) argued that there has not only been a general and spectacular expansion of individual mobility in modernizing societies, but also that the specific character of migration processes tends to change over the course of this vital transition. This approach has conceived various functionally related forms of migration within a broader development perspective and also differentiates between various kinds of labour mobility, internal and international, long term as well as circular movement, and proposes to integrate them within one single analytical framework. It is also a diffusion model, which assumes that the migration experience tends to spread progressively from relatively developed zones to less developed zones.

Zelinsky's mobility transition is a universal model, as it assumes that all societies undergo the same kind of processes. Its universalistic pretensions are not only its strength, but also its main weakness. There is evidence that the sequence of mobility change proposed by Zelinsky on the basis of the European experience does not necessarily exactly apply to contemporary developing countries (Skeldon, 1992). Demographic transition and associated mortality and fertility declines have shown considerable diversity in different historical and geographical settings (Hirschman, 1994). Contemporary developing countries tend to experience much faster demographic transitions than was the case in northern Europe (Kirk, 1996). Mobility transition theory has also been criticized for its failure to specify the actual causal relation between demographic transitions and mobility change as well as its erroneous assumption of largely immobile traditional societies (Skeldon, 1997).

On the basis of Zelinsky's original model, Skeldon (1997) argued that there is a relationship between the level of economic development, state formation and the patterns of population mobility. He distinguished the following five development tiers: the (1) old and (2) new core countries (e.g., Western Europe, North America, Japan) characterized by immigration and internal decentralization; (3) the expanding core (e.g., eastern China, South- Africa, eastern Europe), where we find both immigration and out-migration and internal centralization (i.e., urbanization and rural-to-urban migration); (4) the labour frontier (e.g., Morocco, Egypt, Turkey, Mexico, the Philippines and, until recently, Spain and Portugal), which are dominated by out-migration and internal centralization; and the so-called (5) resource niche (e.g., many sub-Saharan African countries, parts of central Asia and Latin America) weaker forms of migration. Besides building upon Zelinsky's work, this regionalization can also be seen as a migration-specific application of centre periphery models and world system theory.

2.1.1.3.2 The Migration Hump

Economists have provided additional economic evidence for further refinement of the transitional migration perspective by uncovering the anatomy of the migration hump. Martin (1993) and Martin and Taylor and Wyatt (1996) argued that a temporary increase in migration has been an usual part of the process of economic development. In the early stages of development, an increase in wealth tends to lead to a rise in migration, since a certain threshold of wealth is necessary to enable people to assume the costs and risks of migrating. With increasing wealth and the establishment of migrant networks, an increasing proportion of the population is able to migrate, selectivity of migration tends to decrease, and this process of development initially tends to lead to an increasing

diffusion of migration across communities. Only at later stages of development, does emigration tend to decrease and do regions and countries tend to transform from net labour exporters to net labour importers (Bohning, 1994; Martin and Taylor, 1996; Olesen, 2002). Prior research seems to have indicated that emigration tends to decrease significantly if the income differential between sending and receiving countries reaches values between 1:3 and 1:4.5, provided that the emigration country is growing fast (Martin, 1993; Olesen, 2002).

2.1.1.4 Internal Dynamics and Feedbacks: Networks and Migration Systems

The idea that migration often leads to more migration is not new. The migration literature has particularly highlighted the migration-facilitating role of migrant networks. The idea is that once a critical number of migrants have settled at the destination, migration becomes self-perpetuating because it creates the social structure to sustain the process (Castles and Miller, 2003; Massey 1990; Massey et al., 1998). However, once a certain critical number of migrants have settled at the destination, other forces come into play. The deliberate or more ambiguous choices made by pioneer migrants, labour recruiters or others tend to have a great influence on the location choice of subsequent migrants, who tend to follow the 'beaten track'. Again, the idea that migration is a path-dependent process because inter-personal relations across space facilitate subsequent migration is anything but new in the migration literature (Franz, 1939; Lee; 1966, Petersen, 1958).

2.1.1.4.1 Social Capital, Chain Migration and Network Theory

The economic forces often play an important role as one of the root causes of migration, and people tend to move to places where the standards of living are better, this alone cannot explain the actual shape of migration patterns (Salt, 1987; Schoorl, 1998). Lee's (1966) argued that migration facilitates the flow of information back from the place of destination to the origin, which facilitates the passage for later migrants. Moreover, there is evidence that the already settled migrants function as bridgeheads (Bocker, 1994), reducing the risks as well as material and psychological costs of subsequent migration. Through the assistance of friends and relatives, new migrants may more easily be able to obtain information and receive active assistance in finding employment and a place to live, in arranging residence papers, or in finding a marriage partner. Therefore, the

formation of an established migrant community at one particular destination will increase the likelihood of subsequent migration to that particular place (Appleyard, 1992).

The term network migration has usually been used to describe this process of what used to be described as chain migration. Networks can be defined as sets of interpersonal ties that connect migrants, former migrants, and non migrants in origin and destination areas through bonds of kinship, friendship, and shared community origin (Massey et al., 1993). These social bonds and the feeling of being part of one community also explain why migrants tend to remit substantial amounts of money to non migrants. Massey (1989) argued that once the number of network connections in an origin area reaches a critical level, migration becomes self-perpetuating, because it creates the social structure to sustain the process (Applevard, 1992). Network effects explain the perpetuation of migration, often over formally closed borders, irrespective of its original causes (Waldorf, 1998). The facilitating role of such family and friends networks makes migration notoriously difficult for governments to control. Network connections are a form of social capital that people draw upon to gain access to employment abroad (Massey et al., 1993). Besides, material and human capital (education, skills, knowledge), social capital is a third, crucial migration resource in enabling and inspiring people to migrate.

The study of migration networks has become popular in the past two decades, but there is a tendency to accept the arguments of network theories too uncritically. Their weak point is that they do not offer insight into the mechanisms that eventually lead to the weakening and crumbling of networks and migration systems (Massey et al., 1998). They do not indicate what are the external, structural factors as well as internal processes that counteract the tendencies that lead to increasing migration through networks (Klaver, 1997).

The networks do play their ascribed migration facilitating and diffusion role. First, on the longer term labour migration movements do often tend to decrease or cease when the fundamental causes of migration disappear. Second, although migration is indeed difficult to control by government due to network effects, legal and physical barriers to migration can have an important influence on the magnitude and nature of migration,

although not necessarily in the intended direction. Third, there may also be internal forces, which may weaken networks over time. Migrants are not necessarily only bridgeheads facilitating subsequent migration, they may also become restrictive gatekeepers (Bocker, 1994; de Haas, 2003), being hesitant or unwilling to assist prospective migrants. Links with non migrant kin and friends might weaken over time. Furthermore, kinship networks are of great help in migrating, they also tend to be exclusionary for people not belonging to particular social or kinship groups, in particular in the context of restrictive immigration policies (de Haas, 2003).

2.1.1.4.2 Migration Systems Theory

Network theory is closely affiliated to another approach known as migration systems theory. The fundamental assumption of this theory is that migration alters the social, cultural, economic, and institutional conditions at both the sending and receiving ends the entire developmental space within which migration processes operate. Network theory mainly focuses on the vital role of personal relations between migrants and non migrants, and the way this social capital facilitates, perpetuates and transforms migration processes, migration systems theory goes beyond this point in stressing that migration not only affects and is affected by the direct social environment of migrants, but restructures the entire societal or developmental context of the concrete spaces in which migration takes place, both at the receiving and sending areas. Migration systems theory draws a two-way, reciprocal and dynamic link between migration and development.

Mabogunje (1970), founder of migration systems theory, defined a migration system as a set of places linked by flows and counter flows of people, goods, services, and information, which tend to facilitate further exchange, including migration, between the places. He focused on the role of information flows and feedback mechanisms in shaping migration systems. He stressed the importance of feedback mechanisms, through which information about the migrants' reception and progress at the destination is transmitted back to the place of origin. Favourable information would then encourage further migration and lead to situations of almost organized migratory flows from particular villages to particular cities. Migration systems link people, families, and communities over space in what we nowadays would refer to as transnational communities (Vertovec, 1999).

Fawcett (1989) stressed the relevance of both national and transnational networks, which tend to be closely interwoven, blurring the distinction between internal and international migration (Martin, 1992; McKee and Tisdell, 1988). The fact that the initial circumstances at both the receiving and sending areas are modified by the migration process implies that the causes and consequences of migration should not be studied separately. Migration simultaneously reshapes the socio-economic development context at both the origin and destination.

2.1.1.5 Pluralists Approaches on Migration

Social scientists, influenced by post-modernist thinking and structuration theory sought to harmonize actor and structure oriented approaches. Recognition of the relevance of both structure and agency seems essential for the migration process which enables us to better deal with the heterogeneity of migration impacts. In such a pluralist approach, the results of the structure-actor interactions allow for a greater variety of outcome than would have been allowed from either the single aggregation of individual decision making (Skeldon, 1997).

2.1.1.5.1 New Economics of Labour Migration (NELM)

In the 1980s and 1990s, the new economics of labour migration (NELM) emerged as a critical response to, and improvement of, neo-classical migration theory (Massey et al., 1993). Structural theory emphasizes that structures, rules, and norms emerge as outcomes of people's daily practices and actions. These structural forms subsequently shape people's actions, not by strict determination as structural approaches tend to assume but within a possibility of range. Although some individual action is routinized and mainly serves to reproduce structures, rules and institutions, other action has agency, serving to change the system and perhaps, in time, remake new rules (Giddens, 1984). Giddens refers to as the recursive nature of social life, in which structures are considered as both medium and outcome of the reproduction of human practices of the migration processes. This new approach has gradually turned out to be a viable alternative to not only neo-

classical but also to structuralist approaches, gaining increasing acceptance throughout the 1990s. Stark (1978, 1991) who revitalized thinking on migration in and from the developing world by placing the behavior of individual migrants in a wider societal context and by considering not the individual, but the family or the household as the most appropriate decision-making unit.

According NELM, migration is taken as a risk-sharing behavior of families or households. Better than individuals, households seem able to diversify their resources, such as labour, in order to minimize income risks (Stark and Levhari, 1982). The fundamental assumption is that people, households and families act not only to maximize income but also to minimize and spread risks. Internal and international migration is perceived as a household response to income risk, as migrant remittances provide income insurance for households of origin. Migration is not only perceived as household risk spreading strategy in order to stabilize income, but also as a strategy to overcome various market constraints. International remittances, migration can be a household strategy to overcome such market constraints, and may potentially enable households to invest in productive activities and to improve their livelihoods (Stark, 1980). Besides providing a radically different conceptualization of migration as a household strategy aiming at (a) diversifying the household's income portfolio; (b) increasing household income; and (c) overcoming constraints on economic activities and investments in the region of origin.

The new economics of labour migration also criticized the very methodological design of most prior migration research. Taylor et al. (1996) criticized the, prior work on migration as unduly pessimistic about the prospects for development as a result of international migration by its failure to take into account the complex, often indirect ways that migration and remittances influence the economic status of households and the communities that contain them. This pertains to criticism of the lack of analytical rigor, the prevalence of deductive reasoning over empirical testing, as well as the important methodological deficiencies of much prior empirical work.

2.1.1.5.2 Migration as a Household Livelihood Strategy

The livelihood approaches argued that the poor cannot only be seen as passive victims of global capitalist forces but try to actively improve their livelihoods within the constraining conditions. A livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources), and activities required for a means of living (Carney, 1998). A livelihood encompasses not only the households' income generating activities, but also the social institutions, intra-household relations, and mechanisms of access to resources through the life cycle (Ellis, 1998). For their livelihoods, people and households draw on five categories of assets (or capitals): natural, social, human, physical, and financial (Carney, 1998). A livelihood strategy can then be defined as a strategic or deliberate choice of a combination of activities by households and their individual members to maintain, secure, and improve their livelihoods. This particular choice is based on selective access to assets, perceptions of opportunities, as well as aspirations of actors. Since these differ from household to household and from individual to individual, this explains why livelihood strategies tend to be so heterogeneous. To cope with adverse circumstances of economic, political and environmental uncertainty and hardship to maintain their livelihoods not individually but within wider social contexts, such as households, village communities, and ethnic groups migration can be a better option. In this context, migration can be seen as one of the main elements of the strategies to diversify, secure, and, potentially, durably improve, rural households, which is often combined with other strategies, such as agricultural intensification and local nonfarm activities (Bebbington, 1999; Ellis, 2000; McDowell and de Haan, 1997; Scoones, 1998). It is increasingly recognized that labour migration is often more than a short-term survival or crisis coping strategy or a flight from misery. Rather, it is often a deliberate decision to improve livelihoods, enable investments (Bebbington, 1999), and help to reduce fluctuations in the family income that has been entirely dependent on climatic vagaries (de Haan et al., 2000; McDowell and de Haan, 1997). Migration can then be seen as a means to acquire a wider range of assets which ensure against future shocks and stresses (de Haan et al., 2000).

Two kinds of institutions have a significant impact on migration: migration networks and households' structure and management. These institutions determine the contribution migration can make to improving livelihoods, but this link is by no means direct or simple. The choice of the household as the primary unit of analysis can then be seen as a kind of optimum strategy or a compromise between actor and structure approaches. Household approaches seem particularly applicable in developing countries (Bauer and Zimmermann, 1998). Adverse circumstances combine with inadequate social support and livelihood security to make the poor highly vulnerable to food security and other adverse effects from risks, shocks and stress (Chambers, 1989). The poor are most likely to embrace migration for livelihood. The option of migration is not available to all poor people, least of all to the chronically and severely poor. The ability to adopt migration as a livelihood strategy is affected by the degree of social inclusion/exclusion, reflected in access to and control over resources (Waddington et al., 2003).

2.1.1.5.3 A Transnational Perspective on Migration

The rise of new economics and livelihood perspectives on migration and development have coincided with a third trend in migration studies, that is, the transnational turn in the study of the migration (Castles and Miller, 2003; Faist, 2004). There has been increasing recognition of the increased possibilities for migrants and their families to live transnationally to adopt transnational identities (Guarnizo, et al. 2003; Vertovec, 1999). This relates to the radically improved technical possibilities for migrants to foster links with their societies of origin through the telephone, fax, television and the internet, and to remit money through globalised banking systems or informal channels. This increasingly enables migrants and their families to foster double loyalties, to travel back and forth, to relate to people, and to work and to do business simultaneously in distant places (de Haas, 2005; Guarnizo et al., 2003). In other words, there is increasing scope for migrants and their families to pursue transnational livelihoods.

The enormous reduction in costs of transportation and communication have facilitated the closer integration of the countries and peoples of the world, and the breaking down of barriers that have facilitated the increasing flows of goods, services, capital, knowledge, ideas, and although perhaps to a lesser extent people across borders (Stiglitz, 2002). In

particular the recent transportation and telecommunication revolutions have dramatically expanded the opportunities for migrants and their families to maintain transnational ties, to maintain transnational livelihoods and to construct transnational identities.

This transnationalization of migrants' lives has also challenged assimilation models of migrant integration, as well as the modernist political construct of the nation-state and citizenship. The lives of migrants are increasingly characterized by circulation and simultaneous commitment to two or more societies (de Haas, 2005). This has fundamental implication for the study of migration process, because this implies that integration in receiving societies and commitment to origin societies are not necessarily substitutes, but can be complements. However, it has become increasingly clear that many migrant groups maintain strong transnational ties over sustained periods. Migrants' engagement with origin country development is not conditional on their return, but can be sustained through telecommunication, holiday visits and circular migration patterns. In this way, transnational ties can become trans-generational. This is exemplified by persistent and increasing remittances, transnational marriages and the involvement of diasporas group (such as home town associations), often belonging to second generations, in social, cultural, political and economic affairs of their origin countries. The transnational turn in the study of migrant communities corroborates with NELM and livelihood approaches, stressing the need to see international migration as an integral part of transnational livelihood strategies pursued by households and other social groups. Return visits and return migration, remittances, transnational business activities as well as investments and civil society involvement in origin countries are all expressions of the transnational character of migrants' life. The insight that migrants often maintain longterm ties with origin countries and that integration, casts doubt on the assumption by Marxist/ neo-Marxist theories of migration that the departure of migrants would automatically represent a loss in the form of a brain or brawn drain.

2.1.1.6 Main Theoretical Debates of Migration

The debates on migration theories can be broadly distinguished in two radically opposed approaches, that is, the classical/neo classical versus Marxist/ neo- Marxist approach. In a

strictly neo-classical world, the developmental role of migration is entirely realized through factor price equalization; expect migration to generate counter flows of capital and knowledge. According to Marxist and Neo-Marxist views migration is the outcome of unequal power and resources distribution among developed and underdeveloped countries. Unequal access to resources and that capitalist expansion has the tendency to reinforce these inequalities. Underdeveloped countries are trapped by their disadvantaged position within the global geopolitical structure. In general, this approach assumes migration process creates further underdevelopment of sending societies or countries (Table 2.2).

Classical/ Neo-classical	Marxist and Neo Marxist	
Functionalist	Structuralist	
Modernization	Disintegration	
Net North-South transfer	Net South-North transfer	
Brain gain	Brain drain	
More equality	More inequality	
Remittance investment	Consumption	
Development	Dependency	
Less migration	More migration	

Table 2.2: Opposing Views on Migration Theories

Source: de Hass, 2008.

Neo-classical approach has focused their views on the labour migration as an integral part of modernization, which was emphasized much more during the period of 1950s-1960s. The effect of development on migration and migration on development is considered as vice versa. Labour surplus at origin and their inflow of remittances was expected to improve productivity and incomes in the countries of origin. Countries like Philippines, Turkey and Morocco adopted this view, expecting that labour export would facilitate their economic development (Castles, 2008; Massey et al., 1998).

Contrasting with the neo-classical view, the neo-Marxist approach explained migration mainly as a way of mobilizing cheap labour for capital formation. According to this approach, underdevelopment was a legacy of European colonialism, exploiting the resources of poor countries to make the rich country richer. The penetration of multinational corporations into less developed economics accelerated rural change, leading to poverty, displacement of workers, rapid urbanization and the growth of informal economics. Core-periphery and semi-periphery division and dependency stimulated migration which increased dependency of poor countries resulting impoverishment and worsened income.

2.1.1.7 Main Assumptions, Propositions and Critiques of Migration Theories

This sub section summarizes migration theories discussed above on the basis of their assumptions, propositions and their critiques. The theories/approaches with their broader as well as specific classification helps to understand migration process, determinates and consequences much more clearly. It builds upon existing theories/approaches of migration with different causal mechanisms and at different levels of aggregation. There is no single theory, accepted widely to account for emergence and perpetuation of international migration. Fragmented set of theories developed in isolation from one another and usually segmented by disciplinary boundaries. Complex nature of migration requires a sophisticated theory that incorporates a variety of perspectives, levels and assumptions. Migration theories are hardly compatible but not contradictory (see Appendix 1).

2.2 Empirical Literature Review

This section highlights on the history of international migration, major flows, determinants and consequences of cross-border migration between countries in the world, and cross- border migration studies between Nepal and India.

2.2.1 Categorization of History of International Migration Phase

The history of international migration can be divided roughly into four periods which are mercantile period (1500-1800), industrial period (1800-1925), period of limited migration (1925-1960) and period of post industrial migration (1960 onwards). The Table (2.3) below summarizes the major trends and volume of international migration.

Period	Origin	Destination	Number	Factors of
				determinants
Mercantile	Europe	USA, Africa, Asia,	NA (sufficient to	Colonization and
period		Oceania	establish	Economic growth
(1500-1800)			Europe's	
			domination over	
			large parts of	
			world	
Industrial	Industrialized	USA, Argentina, Australia,	48 million	To spread
period	country of	Canada, New Zealand		industrialization in
(1800-1925)	Europe(Britain,			former colonies
	Italy, Norway,			
	Portugal, Spain,			
	Sweden)			
Period of	Return	Return migration, refugees	NA (small	Restrictive
limited	migration to	and displaced persons	amount)	immigration laws by
migration	origin, refugees			USA, Great depression
(1925-1960)	and displaced			of 1929 and second
	persons			world war
Period of	Developing	Canada, USA, Australia,	214 millions	Origin (labour surplus,
post	countries of the	New Zealand, Argentina,	(more than 3% of	wage differentials,
industrial	third world	Germany, France,	world total	unemployment, etc)
Migration	(Africa, Asia,	Belgium, Switzerland,	population(one	Destination (labour
(1960	Latin America)	Sweden, Netherlands,	Person in each 33	scarce,
onwards)		Italy, Spain Portugal, Gulf	person is	industrialization,
		region, Japan, Korea,	international	enough natural
		Taiwan, Hong Kong,	migrants)	resources etc)
		Singapore, Malaysia,		
		Thailand		

 Table 2.3: History of International Migration Phase

Source: Developed on the basis of Massey et al., 1998. NA= Not available.

The period of post-industrial migration emerged during the 1960s and constituted a sharp break with the past. Rather than being dominated by outflows from Europe to a handful of former colonies, immigration became a truly global phenomenon, as the number and variety of both sending and receiving countries steadily increased and the global supply of immigrants shifted from Europe to the developing countries of the Third World (Castles and Miller, 1993). Migration during the industrial era brought people from densely settled, rapidly industrializing areas to sparsely settled, rapidly industrializing regions. Whereas migration in the post industrial era brought people from densely settled countries in the earliest stages of industrialization to densely settled post-industrial societies. Despite a history of excluding certain groups of migrants, settlement countries like Canada, the United States, Australia, and New Zealand grant most migrants the right to settle permanently. Today, migrants from Asia in Canada, the United States, Australia and New Zealand, and from Latin America to the United States, have displaced earlier patterns of migration from Europe to the New World. The increases in international migration have been accompanied by a pronounced shift in immigrant origins away from historical sources in Europe towards new sources in Asia, Latin America, and the Caribbean.

Traditional immigrant- receiving nations also experienced a transformation in their migratory patterns after the mid-1960s. Not only did the number of immigrants rise sharply, but the sources shifted from Europe to Asia and Latin America (Massey et al., 1995). The migration movements within Europe during the 17th and 18th century (e.g., the emigration from the Netherlands and from France into Prussia) or the migration from Europe o America were intrinsic to the development and modernization process of the receiving countries. At the same time, the emigration of Europe's surplus population, Between 1850 and 1920, above 12 per cent of the European population or 50 million people emigrated) and played an important role in Europe's industrial revolution, contributing to its transformation from an agricultural society to a modern society (Massey et al., 1995).

2.2.2 Cross-border Migration of Mexican to USA

Migration between Mexico and the USA, the largest sustained flow of migrants in the contemporary world and also has been studied intensively. Between 1940 and 1992, some 1.2 million Mexicans were admitted into the USA as legal immigrants; another 4.6 million came temporarily as contract workers and a net figure of around 4 million entered without documents. Some 2.3 million of the latter were legalized under the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act (INS, 1992). As a result of the massive entry of migrants and their subsequent natural increase by 1990, people of Mexican origin comprised 6 per cent of the total population of USA. The incentives for migration

between Mexico and the USA are large. Average wage rates differ by a factor of five between the two countries; and even after adjusting for the costs of transpiration, entry, and foreign living most Mexican can except to earn three times what they would at home (Massey and Espinosa, 1997).

During the last twenty years, the number of legal and illegal Mexican migrants to the USA has increased dramatically. Mexican migrants now account for over half of the illegal immigrants in the USA (INS, 1998). Quinn (2001) analyzed that least deprived individuals are engaging in Mexico–USA migration and individuals repeatedly migrate to USA and accumulate consumer durables and increased housing. Those individuals that do not become part of this cycle become more relatively deprived. The cycle of Mexico-USA migration is more aimed at purchasing consumer durables and housing. Even policies that raised wages in the Mexican community would not have as powerful an impact because of the lower relative prices of consumer durables in USA as compared to Mexico. The analysis is based on Mexican Migration Project data collected on sample basis from different communities during the period 1987-1997.

Stark and Taylor (1991) analyzed that, if absolute income is controlled for, relatively deprived households are more likely to engage in international migration than are households more favorably situated in their village's income distribution. Both relative deprivation and absolute income are significant in explaining Mexico-USA migration. The result of Mexico-USA migration supports the relative deprivation hypothesis in the case where a reference group substitution is less likely. The study was carried out on the basis of random sample survey consisting of 61 selected households with 423 adults (13 years of age or older), at Patzcuaro region of Mexico.

Todaro and Maruszko (1987) analyzed individual's decision to migrate when legal migration is prohibited, to set forth the equilibrium conditions under which illegal migration would cease and to examine the quantitative effect of USA immigration law. The conclusion of study was undocumented Mexican immigrants had created a trouble in American labour market. The flow of illegal migrants into USA could be reduced through the imposition of employer penalties and through tight border control. Similarly, Bean et al. (1988) examined the effect of undocumented Mexican immigrants on the earnings of

other workers in different market, with the help of 1980 census of USA. Push factors in Mexico were stronger than pull factors in the USA in predicting the rate of out-migration. In Mexico, wages, commodity prices, farm productivity, and levels of investment in agriculture raised due to out-migration to the USA (Jenkins, 1977).

Employment opportunities for illegal immigrants to the United States are directly related to raise the rate of unemployment and tax penalty on immigrants in USA (Todaro et al., 1987). An increase in the supply of either legal or illegal Mexican immigrants in America have little numerical impact on the earnings of the native born labour force and induce very little reduction in their own earnings on average (Bean et al., 1988). In American economy, Mexican immigrants had been as a source of low-wage labour, particularly in agriculture and privately owned industries in South-West America (Vernon, 1975). Illegal Mexican immigrants are employed in unskilled occupation as either a farm or norfarm labour in the United States (Vernon, 1975).

2.2.3 Cross-border Migration of Canadian to USA

Comay (1972) pinpointed the determinants (salaries and employment opportunities) of human flow from Canada to the USA with the help of Canadian scientists and engineers survey of 1968. The finding of this study was that the salary differentials and employment opportunities played a small role in explaining migration of Canadian to USA. Policies in North America have moved in contradictory with respect to international migration. On the one hand, Canada, Mexico and USA have sought to integrate their markets more closely and are reaching out to other nations in the western hemisphere as possible partners in an expanded free trade agreement. The creation of an integrated market generally accelerates the economic factors with it, including labour. On the other hand, Canada and USA have sought to impose restrictive immigration policies with those countries with which they are integrating economically, notably Mexico (Brimelown, 1995).

2.2.4 Cross-border Migration of Croatian to Italy

International Organization of Migration (IOM) carried out a field survey to facilitate a deeper insight into the social and the economic problems of migrants' worker in shipbuilding factories from Croatia to Italy in 2005. IOM concluded that there are at least two basic migration patterns. One consists of the temporary departure to a foreign shipyard, in average duration between one and two years, while the other presupposes long-term migration for more than ten years, usually ending when fulfilling retirement conditions. According to the results of quantitative research, 56 per cent workers in Croatian shipyards that haven't worked abroad are thinking about leaving and 43 per cent have already received a job offer in a foreign shipyard. Approximately one quarter of the respondents is returnees (24%). Migrants are, as a rule, skilled and high-skilled workers at peak strength and with a lot of experience. They are rarely younger than 30 and are usually married with children. All respondents, the experts and workers, agree that migration is economically motivated and is caused almost exclusively by worsened economic conditions and the impossibility of solving existential problems in Croatia (push-factors), and higher salaries for the same deficient jobs in Italy (pull-factors). Labour migration of Croatian shipbuilding workers to Italy causes equally positive and negative consequences for both sides: predominantly negative for the Croatian shipbuilding industry, mostly positive for the Italian and combined consequences for the overall Croatian and Italian economies and labour markets as well as the migrants themselves.

In a wider context, the example of ship building sector points to another particularity of contemporary migration trends in Croatia, typical for a transition country. On the pull side, Croatia is facing the same demographic problems and lack of interest of young people in industrial professions, as Italy. At the same time the push factors are present, whereas the income differential is still important enough to stimulate larger scale movements towards Italy. As a consequence of simultaneous effect of push and pull factors, the parallel presence of emigration and immigration flows has been observed. The greatest migration wave from Croatian shipyards took place at the beginning of the 1990's, during the Croatian Homeland War when the core of the experienced and qualified labour force was lost. The drain of skilled workers continued in the years following this period and is still present following the established pattern (IOM, 2005).

2.2.5 Cross-border Migration of Vietnamese to China

Using the data collected by the International Organization of Migration (IOM) of 213 women (who were trafficked or migrated to China and had lived in for time and had returned to their origin community by the time of study in Ha Long city, Mong Cai town, and Yen Hung district of Quang Ninh province of Vietnam). Duong et al. (2005) analyzed the main motivating factor for Vietnamese women who go to China crossing the border is for finding a husband and having a child. This finding shifts the focus from purely economic reasons for migration to more complex sets of reasons including family, marriage, work and poverty. The deficit of women on the Chinese side of the China-Vietnam border is clearly creating a market for Vietnamese women.

Because of its proximity to China with convenient transportation and cross-border trade, the Vietnamese provinces have been important source and transit provinces for international migration to China in the past few years. The opening of the border since the late 1990s, facilitating economic exchange, have at the same time exposed populations from both sides to economic and social opportunities, including risks of trafficking, that are geographically dispersed but interlinked. Together with the flows of goods and capital are the cross-border movements of people. There were 105,000 within-a-day person-trips and 194,000 longer-term person-trips to other inland localities in Vietnam by the Chinese. From the opposite direction, 32,000 within-a-day person-trips to China were made by the Vietnamese through the border official gates. To cross the border, all needed is an ID card with a photo, a hand-written request, and VND25000 fee paid to Chinese border guards. There are, however, numerous illegal trips through informal routes (IOM, 2005).

In addition, the cross-bordermovements are for trade of cheap consumption goods produced in Chinn to Vietnam and of agricultural products from Vietnam to China. The trafficking in women from Vietnam is mostly for force marriage to Chinese and for force labour in the sex industry. Two key factors come to explain the demand for wives from Vietnam. The first factor is demographic, reflected in the important female deficit of the Chinese southern provinces. The second factor is economic, since the inflation of the bride price on the Chinese side, makes the marriage to a Vietnamese woman a lot cheaper. For some poor Chinese families, it is the only way to find a spouse for their son. Demand creates supply, and trafficking in women, including in young girls, from Vietnam is responsive to this wife market drive. According to a study conducted in two districts of the provinces (Hai Ha and Dong Trieu) of Quang Ninh by the International Labour Office (ILO), by the end of 2000, up to 1,188 women had left for China. Most of them are believed to have been trafficked for the purpose of marriage. A small percentage of them have returned home so far, but most still stay in China (legally and illegally), and little is known about them. Migration and trafficking tied to the sex work industry is better known in the region (Vu and Nguyen, 2002).

2.2.6 Cross-border Migration of Afghani People to Pakistan

Altai Consulting (2009) collected data by using random sampling method and analyzed to reflect the state of cross-border population movements between Afghanistan and Pakistan at the two main crossing points of Torkham (East) and Spin Boldak/ Chaman (South). The quantitative field work consisted of extensive interviews with 2,023 migrants and border counting exercises providing a real assessment of flows of cross-border movements. Economic motivations are the main decision making factors leading Afghans to travel to Pakistan in that 64.6 per cent of labor migrants cite the lack of work in Afghanistan as the factor leading them to Pakistan. Refugee movements have now largely given way to labour migration as well as continued social and cultural exchanges between the country of origin and the country of exile. This is facilitated by the presence of well-established transnational social networks on both sides of the border. Decades of war and conflict have resulted in a closely knit network of contacts that make it easier and more realistic to move between different countries. Movements are more varied and complex now than they were before the war (Altai, 2008).

The impact of the cross-border movement is therefore both economic and socio-cultural. The back and forth movement of Afghans residing on both sides of the border to the neighboring country maintains a way of life and a transnational routine at the heart of livelihood strategies and networking ties of communities divided by national borders. Population movements have reverted to a more familiar and normal pattern. They are now predominantly temporary and cyclical in nature. Maintaining a base in both countries to spread risk appears still to be a preferred option for many Afghans (UNHCR, 2009).

Indeed, 62.6 per cent of labor migrants cite the lack of work in Afghanistan as the push factor leading them to Pakistan. The construction sector in Pakistan is the main beneficiary of this incoming labor force (37.6%), followed by the wholesale and retail sector (24.2%), general service sector activities (7.3%) and agriculture (6.2%). The duration of their stay in Pakistan and the cyclical nature of the movement indicate that economic factors are not the only objectives sought and economic opportunities in Pakistan are limited and that the wage differentials are not always advantageous (Altai, 2008). The low skill and low wage nature of their jobs in the informal Pakistani economy does not allow them to grow or to amass a significant amount of wealth and savings that would alter their families and communities level of economic development.

The respondents mainly, going to Pakistan for work, 12.6 per cent planned to find work in service sector activities (accommodation, food service and other service activities), 18.1 per cent defined themselves as self-employed men working either as shopkeepers or as business going to Pakistan to further their activity (either by buying materials in Pakistan to bring back to Afghanistan or selling them in both countries). These businesses range from fruit and vegetable selling stores, grocery stores, to medical, metal or textile trade. Cross-border trade and imports are therefore an important livelihoods strategy for Afghans. With an average of 11.5 years spent in Pakistan, the interviewees have longstanding links to Pakistan: 43.3 per cent of them have family on both sides of the border (Altai, 2008).

The cost of migration is low, but so is its long term economic impact. This type of transnational living fits with a low risk, low cost strategy responding to immediate individual and family needs. Its development impact is limited as the levels of savings and remittances are low: only 5.9 per cent of migrants interviewed remit money back to Afghanistan and 19.3 per cent declare having brought back money from their last trip to Pakistan. Saving money and sending it back home is therefore not the priority of Afghans crossing the border into Pakistan. The temporary and cyclical travel movement therefore

does not allow for the improvement of the economic and financial situation of entire families or communities. The impact of the cross-border movement is therefore both economic and social and cultural.

2.3 Cross-border Migration Studies in Nepal

Weiner (1971) examined the implication of internal migration and Indian immigration in social and political affairs of Nepal. He also dealt the migration of Nepalese nationals to India. The regional disparities between Hills and Tarai were the basic reason of migration. Low per unit arable land in Hill, employment opportunities outside the Hills and malaria eradication in Tarai were main reasons. The vast majority of external migrants go to India in search of employment-both army and non-army to buy yearly needs in consumer goods, to supplement family incomes, to pay family debts, and to meet other cash needs (Macfarlane, 1976).

New Era (1981) analyzed the nature, extent, and impact of interregional migration relating to international migration in Nepal on the basis of censuses of 1952/54, 1961 and 1971. The study analyzed the process, patterns, causes and consequences of migration. The study concluded that the shortage of cultivated land, low per capita food grain production, unemployment and underemployment, low wage rate in the Hills were the main factors of migration to Tarai. The lesser economic growth and lack of employment opportunities within country there is excess volume of emigration than immigration. According to the census 1981, there were 591,000 absentees population in Nepal, out of them 32 per cent were internal and 68 per cent were external migrants. Almost 65 per cent of external migrants stated services including army jobs, watchman and other type's labour works almost all in India (CBS, 1987). Macfarlane (1976) concluded with the help of sample survey in Hills area that, the level of production in Hill area is not enough to finance consumption at normal rates and the gap is full filled by foreign wages and pensions. According to him over 80 per cent of sample households were dependent on cash coming from outside Nepal, mainly from India.

Scarcity of resources, environmental degradation, high population pressure, and lack of infrastructural development, unemployment and under employment were the main causes

of migration. The factors relating to the seasonal migration were due to lack of food and cash, trade and purchase of commodity, and these causes of seasonal migration also were potential for permanent migration. In addition, the pull factors of migration from Hills to plains were land ownership patterns in the Hills and Plains, forced emigration, fragmentation of land, malaria eradication in Tarai, and availability of land including resettlement programs in Tarai (Gurung et al., 1973).

Gurung et al. (1983) have examined the nature, volume and causes and impact of economic and other concerned sectors and national policies on internal and international migration. The study was based on field survey of 2,411 household in three towns of Kathmandu valley and 5,651 household head in ten districts of Tarai. Positive and negative impacts of international migration were also been evaluated.

Dahal (1978) analyzed the supply/ demand factors of Indian immigrants in Tarai region of Nepal. Based on sample survey of four different wards of Katahari VDC of Morang district, he examined immigrant's impact on socio-economic sector and lives of Nepalese citizens. According to his study, Indians were originally invited to settle in Nepal's Tarai region, as a result now, they have occupied business, construction, industrial and agricultural sectors of Nepal.

Kansakar (1982) described the historical perspectives of emigration of Nepalese people for recruitment in foreign armies since 1916 and the role of their remittances in development of Nepal. The study was based on sample of 250 households (incorporating 200 households with pensioner and 50 households with non pensioner) from Bharse and Panchamul VDCs of Gulmi and Syangja district of Nepal. High rate of school enrollment, large source of foreign earning/currency, improved living standard and consumption pattern were regarded the positive impact of remittances. He hinted on utilization of retired skill in the villages and warned emigration could not be a long- run solution to the surplus manpower of the country.

Movement of population across the international borders of Nepal has two components, which are Nepal- born population reported as absentees abroad and immigration or the foreign born population reported within Nepal (Gurung, 2002). Just as India was the

main destination of absentees abroad, it was also the main source of the foreign-born population. The international boundary between Nepal and India does not regulate human movement. Neither is there any physical restriction (Gurung, 2001). Excess volume of emigration against immigration was due to low level of economic growth and employment opportunities within country (New Era, 1981).

Majority of migrant's destination are either urban centers of Nepal or crossing the border to India. The Suguolli Treaty of 1816 AD and later on the Peace and Friendship Treaty of 1950 AD has opened the door of cross-border migration between Nepal and India (Gurung et al., 1983). Bhandari (2004) argued that the relative land deprivation is a consideration in household migration decision making. Compared to the reference category, relatively land deprived households were more likely to send individuals away for work in the context of Nepal.

According to the censuses 1952/54, 1981, 1991 and 2001 of Nepal respectively recorded 198,120, 402,977, 658, 290 and 762,181 absentee populations. Out of total absentee population, India shared the major destination of absentee population and recorded as 79 per cent in 1952/54, 93 per cent in 1981, 89 per cent in 1991 and 79 per cent in 2001 (CBS, 2003). The volume of cross-border migrants to India occupies major proportion among emigrants, but is in decreasing trends because of emerged trend of joining of Nepalese emigrants to the other countries, mainly to the Gulf region.

Central Department of Population Studies (CDPS) concluded that more than 84 per cent out of total 1,057 emigrants' destination was India. The major areas of works are agriculture wage labour (67.5%), students (16.5), service (4.5%), industries (2.7%), watchman (1.9%), non-agriculture labour (1.9%) and other sectors including dependent. Most of the emigrants to India were found illiterate or attained primary level of education. Very few proportion attained secondary level of education (KC et al., 1997).

TARU, NIDS & RMMRU (2011) revealed that remittance had played an important role accounting for about a fifth of the household income for migrant households and 70 per cent of migrant's households have received the remittances. There has been steady decrease of income from selling food grains, which either indicates the reduction in

production or reduction in distress sale of food grains to meet expenses. Over the course of the last ten years, the proportion of income drawn from food grains is higher among the non migrant households in Nepal as compared to migrant households. TARU, NIDS and RMMRU, 2011) reported that among migrant households in Nepal, 88 per cent crossed the border for economic reason followed by marriage (5%) education (3%) and conflict (2 %).

2.4 Conceptual Framework of the Study

The migration theories are based with different causal mechanisms and at different levels of aggregation, but they're not necessarily contradictory. It is not possible to explain determinants and consequences of migration only relying with a single approach or model. Indeed, while analyzing empirical migration data, the opposing views between classical/neo- classical and Marxist/neo- Marxist have made more difficult to conclude. Empirical and theoretical advances in the study of migration have challenged the unrealistic determinism of both Classical/neo-classical and Marxist/ neo Marxist perspectives. In order to create a single dynamic perspective of migration, linking between those theories is essential. The structure of the society, process, impact and transformation from individuals and households to changes in the general context to social, cultural, economic, and institutional changes in the local, regional and national development context are the factors associated with migration. The lack of theoretical base and largely descriptive nature of much empirical work has haunted the improvement of theories. As a result of the lack of a common theoretical thread, much empirical work remains isolated, scattered, and theoretically underexplored.

Pluralists approaches (The new economics of labour migration, livelihood as well as transnational approaches) towards migration can be situated within a broader paradigm shift in social theory towards approaches attempting to harmonize actor and structure approaches (de Hass, 2008). This has all led to a more optimistic assessment of the migration as well as the ability of individuals and households to overcome structural development constraints through the agency as embodied in their choice to migrate as a

strategy by households and other social groups to diversify, secure and improve their livelihoods.

The empirical literature review shows that there are no uniform and similar determining factors of people crossing the border. Mexican people cross the border due to wage differentials between Mexico and USA, and to accumulate consumer durables. Canadian crosses the border not due to wage differentials but in search of brighter future in USA. Due to worsened economic condition in Croatia and availability of high wages for the same work Croatian joins to work in Italy. Most of Vietnamese women cross the border to war in Afghanistan and to meet their livelihood for their family.

Nepalese people are joining to work in India since a long period of time; both the economic and non-economic factors are responsible in this process. Similar cultural, religious pattern and agricultural based economy of Nepal and India have made compatible to involve on cross-border migration to the people of these countries. In addition existing open boarder and lack of permanent, proper and effective border regulating policy the flow of cross-border migrants is in increasing trends, which may have create both positive and negative impacts in both sending and receiving countries. The Nepalese people migration to India mainly covers three dimensions; labour or work migration, recruitment in army/police and cross-border trafficking. This study covers only labour or work migration of Nepalese people to India. The existing open border with India may have far-reaching effects on demographic, social, cultural and political situation of not only within these two countries but also to this region.

On the basis of above discussed theoretical and empirical literatures, the present study proceeds with Pluralists approaches such as the new economics of labour migration, livelihood as well as transnational perspectives. This approach includes the border paradigm of social science and harmonizes the two extreme opposing views on migration i.e. classical/ neo-classical and Marxist/ neo-Marxist.

In this study the variables, household poverty (land ownership and size, income insufficiency and indebtedness), employment opportunities, household well being status,

level of social participation, role of open border and ancestors and household members participated in cross-border migration, education, skill trainings and established network are analyzed. On the basis of these variables the income or remittance and their main areas of investment as well as consequences at household level are analyzed.


Figure 2.1: Conceptual Framework of the Study

METHODS AND MATERIALS

The first section of this provides information about the study area, its selection and justification. The second section describes sample size and migration status of households in the study area. The third section provides survey instruments which were used to collect information from respondents. The fourth section describes operational definition of main variables used in the study. The fifth section explains hypotheses formulated in this study. The last section presents the detail of techniques of analysis and tools used in the study.

3.1. The Study Area

3.1.1 Introduction to Study Area

Kanchanpur district is located in Far-western development region of Nepal Tarai. It is bordered by the neighbouring districts of Kailali in the east and Dadeldhura in the north but in the south and west, it is contiguous to Uttar Pradesh and Uttaranchal provinces of India. The district has a total area of 1,610 sq km. of which 37 per cent is cultivable, 55 per cent covers forest and rivers and remaining eight 8 per cent is used for other purposes. It has one municipality and 19 Village Development Committees (VDCs) The elevation ranges from 160 meter to 1,528 meter from south to north of the district from the mean sea level. The district is divided into four election constituencies and eleven Ilakas (Kanchanpur District Profile, 2008).

3.1.2 Selection of the Study Area

Preliminary field observation and consultation meeting with Chief District Officer (CDO), Local Development Officer (LDO), police officer, local political leaders and other relevant Government and non-government officials was carried out during January, 2011 in the districts of Baitadi, Surkhet and Kanchanpur to select appropriate field site Daijee VDC for this study. There is no migration data at the VDC level. Daijee VDC is situated east of Mahendra Nagar Municipality as Mahendra Highway passes through it.

In addition Mahendra highway- Daijee – Jogbuda road (way to Dadeldhura) and Daijee-Chhela-Bagun road passes through this VDC. The Gadda Chowkki (transit point with India) lies near about 15 km. far from the study VDC. The area has a good transportation network to move within and outside the country. Majorities of population in the study VDC are Chhetri, Brahmin and Tharu respectively and also there is a significant proportion of Dalit population. Rehabilitation places for Kamaya "Mukti Sibir" are located in wards 1, 3 and 6 of Daijee VDC.



Fig 3.1: Origin of Households in the Study Area

3.1.3 Justification of the Study Area

The study aimed to carry out field survey in such VDCs of the district which has transit point, significant flow of cross-border migrants with heterogeneity in terms of caste, region and origin. Population in the study area is highly mobile with well developed transportation network to cross the border and return back in low cost through Gaddachowki transit point.

Daijee VDC is a destination of internal migrants mainly originated from all mountain and hill districts of Far-western region of Nepal. In addition, indigenous Tharu caste and other different caste groups are also living. The study site is found to be suitable for studying migration history among migrants and non-migrants households. Finally, the VDC

3.2 Sample Design and Size

Both primary and secondary sources of information are used to carry out this study. After selection of study VDC, consultation meeting with the VDC secretary and its staff was carried out to understand about wards boundaries and households size of each ward. In addition, the District profile of Kanchanpur published by District Development Committee, Kanchanpur (2008) was also used to collect background information of VDC before starting the field survey. On the basis of background information, about 50 per cent of households might have been involved in cross-border migration to India from the study VDC. A list of household heads was prepared with help of the local people to delineate the exact boundary of wards of Daijee VDC.

As the current study is not based on cluster sampling, a simple formula is used to determine the number of households for the study purpose (http://macorr.com/sample-size-methodology.htm, accessed on 28 February, 2011). This does not include design effect as the sample had to be drawn from a single VDC using systematic random sample technique):

$$SS = \frac{Z^2 \times p \times (1-p)}{C^2}$$

Where,

SS = Sample Size (Number of households to be selected for the study)

Z = Confidence level (i.e. 95 %, 99 % expressed in 1.96, 2.58 respectively)

p = Prevalence of cross-border migrants

C = Confidence interval, expressed as decimal (e.g. $0.04 = \pm 4$)

With this formula, the crude sample households for the study were, by assuming Z to be at 99 % confidence level (i.e. 2.58), p to be 50 % (i.e. 0.5) and C to be 4 (i.e. 0.04), as follows:

$$SS = \frac{Z^2 \times p \times (1-p)}{C^2} = \frac{2.58^2 \times 0.5 \times 0.5}{0.04^2} = \frac{1.6641}{0.0016} = 1040.06$$

Once the crude sample size was determined, it was further corrected for the finite households using the following formula:

Final SS =
$$\frac{SS}{1 + \frac{SS - 1}{HH}}$$

Where,

Final SS = Final Sample Size (Number of households to be selected for the study)HH = Total Households in the VDC

Final SS =
$$\frac{SS}{1 + \frac{SS - 1}{HH}} = \frac{1040.06}{1 + \frac{1040.06 - 1}{3712}} = \frac{1040.06}{1 + \frac{1039.06}{3712}} = \frac{1040.06}{\frac{3712 + 1039.06}{3712}} = \frac{1040.06}{1.28} = 812.54$$

Hence, Final SS \cong 813 while considering the crude sample size of 1040.06 and 3,712 households of the VDC as the sample frame from where 813 households were selected by systematic random sampling procedure. Final interviews were conducted for 809 households with four households in the sample were found to be vacant.

Out of the total interviewed households 423 (52.3%) were non-migrants, 231 (28.6%) were current migrants, 115 (14.2%) were return migrants and 40 (4.9%) were households having both current and return migrants (Table 3.1).

Migration Status	Ward Number								Total	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	TUTAL
Non Migrants	61	6	82	63	31	62	24	43	51	423
Current Migrants	16	15	32	50	22	45	18	15	18	231
Return Migrants	14	3	14	21	13	22	2	10	16	115
HH with Both										
(Return & Current	1	4	4	9	3	8	1	5	5	40
Migrants)										
Total	92	28	132	143	69	137	45	73	90	809

 Table 3.1: Ward Wise Distribution of Sample Households by Cross-border

 Migration Status

Source: Field Survey, 2011.

Figure 3.2 below shows the composition sample households in the study area. Out of total 809 sample households, 423 households were non-migrants and 386 households (231 current, 115 return and 40 both return and current migrants).



Figure 3.2: Migration Status of the Sample Households

Source: Field Survey, 2011 (Table 4.1)

3.3 Survey Instruments

For the purpose of data collection, a separate set of semi structured questionnaires for current migrants, returned migrants and non migrants. In addition, discussion guideline was developed to conduct focus group discussions (FGDs) with migrant and non-migrant households. To collect the views of cross-border migrants themselves and security, custom and immigration officers of both countries, a separate guideline was prepared to carry out Key Informants Interviews (KIIs).

3.3.1 Questionnaires

A detailed questionnaire comprising of various issues relating to socio-economic condition of households was administered on sample households with respect to the following characteristics (Appendix II).

- *Demographic and Social Characteristics*: Family size, age, sex and gender composition, family structure, marital status, educational attainment, employment and occupational status, and place of employment.
- *Economic Characteristics*: Household income, consumption and assets, size of land holdings, components of family expenditures, and family ownership of consumer durables and debt or loan situation.
- *Experience with cross-border Migration*: Migration status of family members, reasons for migration, process and channels of migration, and composition of cross-border migrants within the family, duration of migration, occupations abroad, income, expenditure and savings abroad, and frequency of visiting home, frequency of migration, and migration history of family members.
- *Importance and Use of Remittances*: Remittances received on average, importance of remittances to family income and consumption, and different uses of remittances and changes on household infrastructure, physical assets, health and sanitation, education, social, religious and political status before and after the cross-border migration.

- *Impact and Challenges of Migration*: Perceptions about various challenges engendered by the process of cross-border migration, empowerment of migrant families, underscoring existing social order, and changed relationship between migrant and non-migrant families future hope of migrants with their origin and destination.
- Knowledge on Migrants' rights and Nepal-India Friendship Treaty of 1950: Migration process and history, knowledge on salary, shelter, agreement with working agencies, migrants rights in the place of work, and knowledge and perceptions of migrants households about Nepal- India Friendship Treaty of 1950.
- Factors affecting in decision making process of cross-border migration: The factors affecting their decision making process push factors (poverty, unemployment, economic needs, conflict and insecurity), and pull factors (better employment opportunities in Pakistan, wage differentials, the existence of well established transnational social networks, access to social services),
- Major issues and problem faced in working place and during return back: The problems faced during the migration process including being migrants to India and returned back. The frequency of reported violation of migrant's rights, problems of adjustment, personal and family security,
- *Employment situation:* The employment situation of migrants while in India including the type of work, wages, working conditions, type of contract, skills and education, unemployment and underemployment, and job security.

3.3.2 Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)

Three FGDs with non-migrants and migrants households were carried out to understand the critical issues, process and dynamics of migration, perceptions as to the pros and cons of cross- border migration, and relative responsibilities of different toward making the most out of migration while minimizing any adverse consequences.

The focus group discussions have covered the issues like (a) historical perspective of cross-border migration from the family and the locality, (b) reasons for migration, (c) impact and potentiality of migration including role and main use of remittances (e)

relative roles of different stakeholders (f) Knowledge on migrants' rights, and perceptions on Nepal-India Friendship Treaty. The participants in each Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) were comprised of 8-12 participants from their respective households (FGD guideline Appendix III).

3.3.3 Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)

Altogether 10 KIIs, five each with Nepalese government authorities and Indian counterparts working at the transit point. Information about trend, process, and seasonal variation of cross-border migration including respondent's role and responsibilities and knowledge on migrants' rights were collected. A description of existing border management structures, processes and their views on existing open border between Nepal and India, the interviews were supposed to facilitate a deeper insight into the issues of cross-border migration (Appendix IV).

3.4 Operational Definition of Variables, Hypotheses and Techniques of Analysis

3.4.1 Cross-border Migrants and Migrant's Households

In this study, a cross-border migrant household is defined as the household from which its' members have worked or currently working in India during the period of last five years, irrespective of their frequencies and duration of work at their working place prior to the date of field survey.

Return migrants are those household members who already joined to work for more than once within the past five years in India but were present at home during the field survey.

Current migrants are those household members who were currently during past five years in India but were absent during the field survey. Some households represented both categories of migrants. In such condition, comparison of time duration prior to the survey between returned and current members was carried out.

3.4.2 Defining Poverty

According to United Nations, poverty is a denial of choices and opportunities and a violation of human dignity. It means lack of basic capacity to participate effectively in society, not having enough to feed and clothes in a family, not having a school or clinic to go to; not having the land on which to grow one's food or a job to earn one's living, and not having access to credit. It also means insecurity, powerlessness and exclusion of individuals, households and communities (UN, 2011). There is no single and well accepted definition of poverty based on broader social, cultural and historical contexts. The present study is based on income of households from both agricultural and non-agricultural sectors to sufficiently meet the needs of households for the whole year with household wealth index approach.

3.4.2.1 Income Sufficiency Approach to Poverty

Poverty measurement has been dominated by the income approach. From a conceptual perspective, the income indicators can, in fact, be based on expenditure or consumption data. Regardless of how this set of indicators is derived, it is expressed in money-metric terms. This approach to poverty measurement assumes that individuals and households are poor if their income or consumption falls below a certain threshold, usually defined as a minimum, socially acceptable level of well being by a population group. The classification categories are:

- Poorest = Income sufficiency to meet household's need up to three months
- Poorer = Income sufficiency to meet household's need up to seven months
- Poor = Income sufficiency to meet household's need up to eleven months
- Non-poor = Income sufficiency to meet household's need for twelve months or more

3.4.2.2 Household's Wealth Index Approach

The wealth index is a composite measure of a household's cumulative living standard. The wealth index is calculated using easy-to-collect data on a household's ownership of selected assets, such as televisions and bicycles; materials used for housing construction; and types of water access and sanitation facilities. The wealth index is particularly valuable in countries that lack reliable data on income and expenditures, which are the traditional indicators used to measure household economic status.

The household wealth index was generated from 20 indicators on household dwelling and assets such as flooring material, material for outer wall, roofing material, source of drinking water, toilet facility, possession of land, TV, electricity/ electric fan, telephone/ mobile, moped/ scooter/ motorcycle, cycle, tractor/ power tailor, cart, car/ van, bus/ truck, rickshaw, two wheeled horse driven vehicle, solar, push cart and refrigerator. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was then used to generate "Household Wealth Index". The index was subsequently classified into quintiles ranging from the poorest or the lowest quintile to the richest or the highest quintile).

3.4.3 Social Participation Index

The social participation index was developed to analyze the level of social participation among migrant and non-migrant households. Social participation index was constructed by using 15 variables such as water users group, community forest users group, small credit group, saving/ credit group, women/ mothers group, small hydropower users group, non government organizations, local clubs, community based organizations, political parties, ethnic organization, and local government such as Ward/ VDC/ municipality/ district, professional groups, cooperatives and agriculture groups on the basis of their participation. The variable was then trichotomized into low with participation in less than 5 groups/ organizations, medium with participation in 5 to 9 groups/ organizations, and high with participation in 10 to 15 groups/ organizations.

3.5 Hypotheses

3.5.1 Cross-border Migration (CBM) as Dependent variable

Cross-border migration (CBM) is considered as the voluntary migration of working age population to India. Human flows crossing the border from own country of origin to another neighboring country for the purpose of employment, trade, tourists, education, and entertainers including sex workers for long or short term period is defined as crossborder migration (Akaha, 2004). This study is confined to cross-border migration of Nepalese people to India mainly for the purpose of work or employment.

3.5.2 Independent Variables

Variable 1: Migrants Verses non-Migrants Households (MVNMH)

Crossing the border in search of employment may be the compulsion of those households that do not have or sufficient land size, lack of employment opportunities, being illiterate or having unskilled and low level of education. The households having lack of sufficient income from their own farming and at the same time not having other options to run their families means households are in vulnerable situation. To cope with this situation crossborder migration in search of work may be an immediate and better option for those households. Generally from the households with good economic environment; no person from such household crosses the border in search of work. Migration is much more common as a livelihood strategy for poor people and free and open border between Nepal and have made favourable environment. Ownership of economic assets such as land size and holding, employment, better income and savings are important determinants of whether an individual or household took decision to migrate or not. Therefore, the economic differences (land ownership and size, occupation, income, indebtedness) and social differences (educational attainment) between non-migrants and migrants households are compared on the basis of their participation in cross-border migration.

Hypothesis 1: Non-migrant households are better off in size of land holding, annual household income on selling food grains, household indebtedness, and years of schooling of household head than migrants households.

Variable 2: Income Sufficiency (INSUF)

Household poverty may stimulate the people to join cross-border migration. Migration is a coping strategy for survival or face with difficult livelihood of poor people. The poor, less educated, unskilled and unemployed people of countries Nepal and India are using open border to run their households. Poor people can involve on physical labour across the border, because they may not have better options at their origin. Migrants may join on typically 3-D jobs (dirty, dangerous and demeaning) at destination without any hesitation but for the same work they do not accept easily at their place of origin.

The annual income sources from both agriculture and non agriculture may or may not be sufficient to run household expenses during a year. A question, "from your all sources of annual income for how many months you can cover your family expenses?" was asked to all sampled households. On this basis the households are categorized as; poorest with income sufficiency for less than 3 months, poorer with income sufficiency up to 7 months, poor with income sufficiency up to 11 months, and non-poor with (income sufficiency for 12 months or more.

Hypothesis 2: The volume of cross-border migration increases with decrease in the annual household income sufficiency.

Variable 3: Ownership of Land (OLAND)

Land is considered as an important asset to survive and run household activities, mostly in agrarian society. In the context of Nepal, the agricultural sector has not been modernized needing more manual labour force to carry out agriculture related activities. Households having large size of land holding need more manpower mainly from their own households. The working age family members can earn at least more than working in India during agricultural season. In addition, households having more or enough land can have other non-agricultural activities to generate household income.

On the basis of cultivable land of households, the following five categories are devised. Landless, land size having less than 5 Kattha, land size having 5- 9.99 Kattha, land size having 10 - 19.99 Kattha and land size having 20 and 20+ Kattha. (1 Kattha = 0.03386 Hector).

Hypothesis 3: Volume of cross-border migration increases with the decrease in ownership of cultivable land holding the size.

Variable 4: Lack of Employment opportunities (LEO)

Cross-border migration is generally defined as a movement of people for purposes of employment in a foreign country (IOM, 2000). However, there is no universally accepted definition of migration for work. Classification of migration for work is usually based on the duration of activities as well as on the distinction made by receiving countries in their regulatory. The concept and definition of labour migration often reflects current national policy perspectives and varies between countries and over time. The forms of migration for work are very much determined by the jobs which migrants can find in the destination country. Cross-border migration has moved to the top of the policy agenda in the world. There are about 80 million migrant workers around the world (IOM, 2000). A large proportion of labour migration occurs in an irregular manner. Cross-border migration has become even more widespread, larger in volume and more unregulated. Migration for work has become especially significant in developing countries of Africa, Asia, Ocean and Latin America. Lack of employment opportunity at the study area was the dominant reason of cross-border migration to India.

More than two-third 289 (67.8%) cross-border migrants reported that their reason behind cross-border migration to India was lack of employment opportunity at their place of origin.

Hypothesis 4: The volume of cross-border migration increases with the lack of employment opportunities at migrants' place of origin.

Variable 5: Indebtedness of Households (INDEBT)

Indebtedness of household and migration are frequently used in migration literature. The situation of indebtedness occurs due to lack of income sufficiency of households. To repay the loan amount migration has been considered an important cause. Therefore, indebted households are more likely to migrate. In the study area, out of 809 households, 467 (57.7%) were indebted. Among the indebted households, 254 (54.4%) were from migrant households. The amount of debt ranged from less than Rs. 15,000 to more than Rs. 80,000.

Hypothesis 5: The volume of cross-border migration increases with increase in the household indebtedness.

Variable 6: Participation of Ancestors (PAAN)

Parents, grandparents as well as forefathers of migrants who participated in cross-border migration are expected influence the role of current and future generation. Among the total 426 cross-border migrants; 172 (40.4%) migrant's ancestors have joined in cross-border migration to work in India. Among these migrants 23(13.3%) were continued before the time of grand farther, 67 (39%) during the time of grandfather and 82(47.7%) during the time of father and it tends to increase further.

The economic activities of current household may influence economic activities performed by their father, grandfather or forefathers. Ancestors' economic activities and experiences directly and indirectly influence those of new and coming generation. The current household or new generation may have no other alternative except to follow the economic activities performed by their ancestors mainly to those households having lack of education, skills, employment and better opportunities with compared to their past generation. Therefore, ancestors who have joined cross-border migration for employment during their life, such households can adopt the cross-border migration as their household tradition of culture. Therefore, ancestors crossing the border can be assumed as a decisively inheriting factor of cross-border migration.

Hypothesis 6: *The volume of cross-border migration increases with the ancestors' participation in cross-border migration.*

Variable 7: Migrants' own Experience (MOE)

If someone has joined the cross-border migration for the first time in his/her life, the participant gains experience, which may be both positive and negative. The negative experience gained by migrants at destination does not work positively at the place of origin until the probabilities of employment opportunities are more or less similar between origin and destination. There may be a condition of migrants' own experience being helpful in increasing the frequencies of migrants themselves crossing the border for the purpose of employment. In case of lack of opportunities at place of origin, the household can adopt again and again the experiences of its' own members to participate

in cross-border migration. In addition, household member's socio-economic environment, personal capabilities and unfavorable government policies at his place of origin makes him further hopeless about his place of origin. Only 62 (14.5%) of total (426) migrants have joined first time in cross-border migration and rest 364 (85.5%) have joined in cross-border migration from 2 to more than 11 times. The cross-border migrants who have participated multiple times influence the frequencies of further cross-border migration.

Hypothesis 7: *The volume of cross-border migration increases with increased frequencies of cross-border migration.*

Variable 8: Migrants' Networks (MNET)

While a person from a household participates in cross-border migration for work for the first time in his life, he may have been supported by his friends, relatives and brokers (Meith). He may have surrounded by a migration networks which contribute to increased frequency of cross-border migration in his life. The flow of migration is directed in well defined territories. There may be various means to communicate about well defined territories at the origin of migrants but established network has been considered as an effective and reliable mechanism to increase the volume of migration. The networks are helpful to obtain employment and adjustment at the place of destination for migrants. The network may be more helpful especially to illiterate, less educated and unemployed working age people at place of origin. Any person who joins migration through networks at the place of destination, it is likely that he himself can develop network to his friends, relatives and household members at his place of origin. This process gradually increases the volume of migration.

Network of migrants is likely to reduce risks, obtaining employment at place of destination and also in reducing the cost of migration. Networks are helpful not only for encouraging people to participate in migration but also for exchanging information between migrants and their family members for sending remittances at migrants' place of origin. Out of total migrants, 169 (39.7%) have obtained the information on their working place by themselves and rest 257 (60.3%) have obtained information about their working

place by their networks. Only 153 (35.9%) migrants have joined at their working place alone and rest 253 (64.1%) have joined work with the help of friends, relatives, family members and Meith.

In this study the role of motivation by family members, including migrants' ancestors, friends, relatives and manpower agency/agent/Meith for joining cross-border migration to a migrant are included to influence the role of networks in cross-border migration.

Hypothesis 8: *The volume of cross-border migration increases with increase in the migrants' established networks.*

Variable 9: Off Farming Season (OFFASE)

Nepal being an agricultural country, most of the working age population is related with agricultural work. The farming system in Nepal is based on traditional method, which is mainly carried out by manual labour. The illiterate and unskilled people can obtain daily wage work in their own home village and it may be economically difficult to employ labour for small and medium size land holding household during the time of cultivation and harvesting. Different kinds of payment for labour like daily wage, exchange of labour, share crop system have been practiced in Nepal. Therefore, to get wage labour work, to accomplish own household agricultural activities and to join with their family members and relatives, most of the working age people may return back at their place of origin during agricultural seasons. After joining the work of cultivation or harvesting, they may cross the border to join or search for work in India. The season/time of cross-border migrants joined from their households was 197 (51%) households during agricultural off seasons at their place of origin.

Hypothesis 9: The volume of cross-border migration increases with off farming duration or seasons (after cultivation/ after harvesting).

Variable 10: Consequences: Migrants' Duration of Stay (MNDOS)

After crossing the border, the migrants analyze their earnings comparing with his place of origin including availability of employment. The income at place of destination may be

helpful to take the decision of staying/ duration of migrants in their working place. In case of having earning more with good working condition, migrants can send sufficient amount of remittances to run their households as well as to employ other persons to carry out their household work. In a situation of earning fewer amounts at the working place, t migrants cannot send enough remittance amounts to run their household and employ other persons. Migrants may have no other alternatives but to return frequently in short duration of time to join their household activities at their place of origin. The existing open border between two countries encourages the people to cross the border or return back to Nepal with low cost. Therefore, duration of stay at the place of destination depends upon economic gain by migrants.

Duration of stay of migrants at their place of destination is categorized as less than 4 months, 4-6 months, 7-11 months, and 12 months and above.

Hypothesis 10: The duration of stay at the migrants' workplace increases with the increase in the income receiving at the workplace. More income longer the stay or less income shorter the stay at destination or workplace

Variable 11: Consequences: Household Consumption (HOCON)

Remittance is one of the most important output or contribution of migrants. The people who involve in cross-border migration are illiterate, less educated and unemployed, working age people and their involvement at working place would be for low paid jobs. Therefore, most of the share of remittance amount may be used for household consumptions. There are various sectors of investment of remittances/income earned by migrants' household but main area of its use is on household consumption such as food, cloth, celebration of festivals, customs and religious functions. According to the characteristics of migrants, nature of work available and income gained in India, the main area of use of remittance is for household consumption. The expenditure on food, shelter and cloth from remittances amount are included in household consumption of migrants' households.

Among the migrants households, 197 (51%) reported that their main areas of use of remittances was to fulfill basic needs.

Hypothesis 11: Household consumption increases with increase in the household remittances.

Variable 12: Consequences: Education of Children (EDCHI)

Education to children is being a more common area of investment of household because the governmental, non-governmental, international non-governmental and civil societies have given more emphasis on education sector. Parents who were deprived of education in their lives are realizing that due to not having education, they remained in backward position in the society. Remittances may have important role in providing education to the children of the migrants' households. The expenditure on education of children from remittances is considered as investment on education of children of migrants households. Out of migrant households (386), 231(59.8%) were able to improve their children's education.

Hypothesis12: There is a positive correlation between education of children and household remittance.

Variable 13: Consequences: Loan/debt Repay (LORE)

Remittances emerge as the most important source of income for families and contribute to more household earnings. Uses of remittances from overseas and their implications for development have become a focal point of ongoing debate concerning costs and benefits of international migration. This is because regardless of the country, empirical evidence overwhelmingly indicates that bulk of remittances is spent on consumption, debt repayment, and housing and consumer durables with little being devoted towards productive investment.

In case of emigration having been financed through debt, family members of these migrants living in India utilized the remittances for 3-4 years just to repay the debt after meeting their essential living expenses. Thus, indebtedness at the time of emigration has

negative effect on remittance uses, as debt becomes first charge on resources, leaving less scope for other uses, given the meager remittances sent by the migrants (IUSSP, 2005). Further, it is argued that repayment of debt taken for financing emigration trip is actually part of family's investment strategy for future income generation for the family. Similarly, remittance utilization for furthering migration of close family members is also a strategy by migrant families for future income generation, especially when employment prospects and earning potential at home are bleak. Among the migrant households, the third priority of the use of remittances was to repay debts 38 (9.8%).

Hypothesis 13: There is positive correlation between loan/debt pay and remittances.

Variable 14: Consequences: Family Health (FAHE)

It has been difficult to achieve health services for those households having low level of income. Generally, illiteracy, lack of food sufficiency and knowledge on sanitation are common characteristics of such households. As a result, illness and other health related problems arise among their family members. In addition, mostly people from low income households cross the border in search of employment in India. Therefore, the significant amount of migrants' remittances was used to maintain the health status of their family members. The expenditure on health of family members from remittances amount is considered as investment. In the study area, among the total migrant's households (386), 203 (52.6%) households reported that their health service capacity has been enhanced, and 182 (47.1%) households have no any change on their family health.

Hypothesis 14: The health and sanitation condition of a household improves with the increase in the amount of remittance sent by cross-border migrants.

Variable 15: Consequences: Physical Properties (PPRO)

Among the cross-border migrants some of them may be well educated, skilled and holding good and permanent jobs at their place of destination with high income. They can save a substantial amount of their earnings even after using for their household consumption. The saving could be invested to buy land, buy or construct house and other physical properties. The remittances amount used to buy land and buying or constructing house has been taken as investment to add physical properties of migrants' households. Out of total (386) only 101 (26.2%) households or out of improved on economic saving of 193 households, 101 (52.3%) households have invested their remittances primarily on buying land, construction of households, electrification and construction of latrine.

Hypothesis 15: Physical properties such as land and house earned by household increases with the increase in the household remittance.

Variable 16: Consequences: Income of Migrants (INMI)

Income of migrants depends upon on the level of education and skill training achieved by migrants. Skill training and education are considered as an important and effective component of human capital which helps to gain more income including employment opportunities at destination of migrants. There are various components of human capital but this study has analyzed only acquired skilled training and level of educational component of cross-border migrants. Any types of acquired skilled training and educational attainment of migrants have been considered in contributing to increase the income of migrants at their working place.

Migrants without any training have earned on an average NRs. 6,454 and NRs. 6,833 respectively by return and current migrants. Migrants having any type of training had earned Rs. 6,500 to NRs. 32,000 and NRs 7,700 to NRs 18,800 per month respectively by return and current migrants.

The variation of mean monthly income by literacy status and level of education attained among migrants has positive relationship. Migrants who were illiterate have earned on an average NRs. 6,557 and NRs. 6,633 respectively by return and current migrants. The average monthly income was observed more than NRs. 7,000 among migrants had attained primary and some secondary level of education. The migrants who had attained SLC and above level of education had earned in an average monthly income NRs. 12,778 and NRs. 10, 560 respectively by return and current migrants.

- *Hypothesis 16(a): Income of cross-border migrants increases at the work-place with the training received by migrants before migrating.*
- *Hypothesis 16(b): Income of cross-border migrants increases at their working place with their level of education before migrating.*

Variable 17: Consequences: Improvement in Cash Saving (IICS)

Remittances are largely personal transactions from migrants to their friends and families; they tend to be well targeted to the needs of their recipients. Their ability to reduce poverty and to promote human development is well documented and often reported as beneficial to overall development. Remittances directly augment the income of recipient households. Among the migrant's households of study area, out of 386 households, 193 (50%) households were able to improve cash savings with the help of remittances. 183 (47.4%) households mentioned they have no change in their cash saving or remained as usual status. Ten (2.6%) households reported that, their economic condition have been worsened than their previous economic status.

Hypothesis 17: There is a positive correlation between improvements in cash saving and remittances from cross-border migration.

3.6. Techniques of Analysis

Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) version 13 was used for analyzing the quantitative data in-order to accomplish the statistical tests and hypothesis set for the study.

Binary logistic regression was undertaken to assess the characteristics of migrants who were likely to migrate from the sampled household. Logistic regression is multiple regression but with an outcome variable that is categorical dichotomy and predictor variables that are continuous or categorical (Field, 2009). Mathematically, it can be expressed as:

$$P(Y) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(b_0 + b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2 + \dots + b_n X_n + \varepsilon_i)}}$$

Where,

P(Y) is the probability of Y occurringe is the base of natural logarithmsb₀ is the constant

 X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n are the predictor variables (independent variables)

b₁, b₂, ... b_n are the coefficient (or weight) attached to that predictor variables

 ε_i is a variable commonly known as the error term (but also known as "residual" or "remainder" term) in a statistical and/ or mathematical model.

Besides, while testing hypothesis statistical tools viz. the independent sampled T test, the Pearson Correlation Coefficients and the Bi serial Correlation Coefficients were used. A test using the t-statistic that establishes whether two means collected from independent samples differ significantly (Field, 2009).

Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient (its full name) is a standardized measure of the strength of relationship between two variables. It can take any value from -1 (as one variable changes, the other changes in the opposite direction by the same amount), through 0 (as one variable changes the other doesn't change at all), to +1 (as one variable changes, the other changes in the same direction by the same amount) (Field, 2009).

The point Bi-serial correlation coefficient is a statistic used to estimate the degree of relationship between a naturally occurring dichotomous nominal scale and an interval (or ratio) scale (Brown, 2001; Field, 2009). More precisely, it is used when one variable is a discrete dichotomy, whereas the Bi-serial correlation coefficient (rb) is used when one variable is a continuous dichotomy. The term "Bi-serial" refers to the fact that there are two groups of persons (X= 0, 1) being observed on the continuous variable (Y) (Yount, 2006).

Mathematically, the independent sampled T test is expressed as:

$$t = \frac{(\overline{x_1} - \overline{x_2}) - (\mu_1 - \mu_2)}{S_{\overline{x_1 - x_2}}}$$

Where,

t is the independent sampled T test

 $(\overline{x_1} - \overline{x_2})$ is the difference between the two samples

 $(\mu_1 - \mu_2)$ is the difference between the two populations

 $S_{\overline{x_1-x_2}}$ is the estimated standard error using the sample standard deviation or variance Mathematically, Pearson Correlation Coefficients is expressed as:

$$r = \frac{\sum (x_i - \overline{x})(y_i - \overline{y})}{(N - 1)s_x s_y}$$

Where,

r is the Pearson Correlation Coefficients

- x_i is the data point in the x variable
- $\frac{1}{x}$ is the mean sample in the x variable
- y_i is the data point in the y variable
- \overline{y} is the mean sample in the y variable
- N is the number of observations
- S_x is the standard deviation of the x variable
- s_y is the standard deviation of the y variable

The Bi serial correlation coefficient cannot be calculated directly in SPSS. The point Bi-serial correlation coefficient is a statistic used to estimate the degree of relationship between a naturally occurring dichotomous nominal scale and an interval (or ratio) scale (Brown, 2001; Field, 2009). More precisely, it is used when one variable is a discrete dichotomy, whereas the Bi-serial correlation coefficient (rb) is used when one variable is a continuous dichotomy. The term "Bi-serial" refers to the fact that there are two groups of persons (X= 0, 1) being observed on the continuous variable (Y) (Yount, 2006).

Hence, first the point–Bi serial correlation coefficient is calculated and then only the bi serial correlation coefficient is calculated using the equation provided below to adjust the figure. Mathematically, Bi serial Correlation Coefficient is expressed as:

$$r_{b} = \frac{r_{pb}\sqrt{pq}}{y}$$

Where,

 r_b = Bi serial Correlation Coefficient

 r_{pb} = Point Bi-serial Correlation Coefficient

p = p is the proportion of cases that fell into the largest category

q = q is the proportion of cases that fell into the smallest category

y = Ordinate value

CHAPTER IV

DEMOGRAPHIC AND ETHNIC CHARACTERISTICS

The first section provides the information on population composition of district as a whole and the study area. The second section includes information on migration status of study households and the third section provides information on origin and destination of cross-border migrants crossing the Gadda Chowki transit point.

4.1 Population Composition

According to 2001 census 60.1 per cent (72.8% males and 47.2% females) of population is literate with agriculture as the main occupation in the district. The total population of district is 3 77,899 (1, 99,327 male and 1, 78,572 female) with sex ratio of 111. Out of total population 21.3 per cent are living in urban area (Bhimdatta Municipality) and 78.7 per cent are living in rural (19 VDCs) area of the district. The total households in the district are 60,158 with average family size 6.3 persons per household, and population density of the district is 235 persons per square kilometer (Kanchanpur District Profile, 2008).

The population of the district is composed of nearly 42 per cent, 5 per cent and 53 per cent of child population (0-14years), old age population (60 years and above) and working age (15-59 years) respectively (Table 4.1).

Age group	Male	Female	Total	Per cent
o-4	26,585	23,192	49,777	13.2
5-9	29,799	26,003	55,802	14.8
10-14	27,953	24,485	52,438	13.9
15-19	21,714	20,215	41,929	11.1
20-24	18,648	18,155	36,803	9.7
25-29	14,686	14,045	28,731	7.6

Table 4.1: Population Distribution of the Study Area by Age and Sex

30-34	12,178	11,363	23,541	6.2
35-39	10,667	97,17	20,384	5.4
40-44	8,614	7,540	16,154	4.3
45-49	7,139	6,306	13,445	3.6
50-54	6,196	5,136	11,332	3.0
55-59	4,847	3,602	8,449	2.2
60-64	4,000	3,399	7,399	1.9
65-69	2,481	2,088	4,569	1.2
70-74	1,894	1,481	3,375	0.9
75 and +	1,926	1,845	3,771	1.0
Total	199,327	178,572	377,899	100.0

Source: Kanchanpur District Profile, 2008.

Figure 4.1:	Population	Pvramid o	f Study	District
		•/	•/	



Source: Table 4.1.

The population pyramid (Fig. 4.1) is broad based and is similar to that of the country. About 97 per cent of the population in Kanchanpur district is Hindus (Table 4.2).

Religion	Number of Households	Population	Per cent
Hindu	58,517	3,68,670	97.55
Buddha	752	4,897	1.30
Christian	506	3,590	0.95
Islam	341	386	0.10
Others	42	356	0.10
Total	60,158	3,77,899	100.00

Table 4.2: Religious Composition of Household and Population in the Study District

Source: DDC of Kanchanpur District, 2008.

According to the caste/ethnic composition of population, in the district, Chhetri, Tharu, Brahmin and Dalits population holds first, second, third and fourth position in number. Urau, Raute and Raji ethnic groups are also present (Table 4.3).

 Table 4.3: Caste/ Ethnic Composition of Household and Population in the Study

 District

Caste/Ethnicity	Number of Households	Population	Per cent
Chhetri	17,656	110,880	29.4
Tharu	12,255	76,961	20.4
Brahmin	10,160	63,850	17.0
Dalit	8,667	54,429	14.4
Thakuri	3,248	20,397	5.4
Raji	24	119	0.03
Raute	8	46	0.01
Sunaha	60	313	0.08
Urau	41	132	0.03
Others	8,087	51,053	13.5
Total	60,158	377,899	100.0

Source: Kanchanpur District Profile, 2008.

4.2 Population Composition of Study VDC and Sample Households

4.2.1 Population, Family Size, Sex Ratio, Ageing Index and Dependency Ratio

According to district profile, the total population of VDC was 22,681 (11,578 males and 11,103 females) with a total of 3,712 households with sex ratio of 104 and an average family size of 6.1(Kanchanpur District Profile, 2008).

The present study covered 809 households and includes 5,492 persons (2,919 males and 2,573 females). The average family size of the study household is 6.8 persons, more than the district level average of 6.3 and 1.4 persons more than national average family size of 5.4 in 2001 (Table 4.4).

Variahles	Male	Female	Total
Population	2,919 (53.2%)	2,573 (46.8%)	5,492 (100.0%)
Family size per household	3.6	3.2	6.8
Sex ratio	-	-	113
% of Population aged 0-14 Years	18.45	17.40	34.25
% of Population aged 15-59 Years	30.85	27.70	58.50
% of Population aged 60+ Yrs	3.85	3.35	7.25
Ageing index ¹	20.8	21.2	21.0
Dependency ratio ²	72.2	69.3	70.8
Child dependency ratio ³	59.8	57.2	58.5
Aged dependency ratio ⁴	12.4	12.1	12.3

Table 4.4: Characteristics of the Study Population

Source: Field Survey, 2011

*Note:*¹*The number of aged (60+) per hundred children (0-14years).*

²The number of children (0-14 years) and aged persons (60+ years) per hundred people of working age (15-59 years).

³*The number of children (0-14yeras) per hundred people of working age (15-59 years).*

⁴*The number of aged people (60+years) per hundred of working age (15-59 years).*

Among the total sample population, children of 0-14 years constituted34.3 per cent, population 15-59 years was 58.5 per cent and those above 60 years were 7.3 per cent. The child dependency, aged (old) dependency ad total dependency ratio in the study

population was respectively calculated as 58.5, 12.3 and 70.8. The total index of ageing of study population was 21 years, more than the national level of 16.5 years in 2001. The sex ratio of 113 in the study area may be due to male in-migrant population (Table 4.5).

Age Croup	M	ale	Fen	nale	To	tal	Soy Datio
Age Group	Ν	%	n	%	Ν	%	Sex Katio
0-4	287	9.8	258	10.0	545	9.9	111.2
5-9	333	11.4	296	11.5	629	11.5	112.5
10-14	393	13.5	315	12.2	708	12.9	124.8
15-19	365	12.5	310	12.0	675	12.3	117.7
20-24	318	10.9	288	11.2	606	11.0	110.4
25-29	239	8.2	218	8.5	457	8.3	109.6
30-34	213	7.3	185	7.2	398	7.2	115.1
35-39	157	5.4	146	5.7	303	5.5	107.5
40-44	129	4.4	118	4.6	247	4.5	109.3
45-49	111	3.8	107	4.2	218	4.0	103.7
50-54	86	2.9	91	3.5	177	3.2	94.5
55-59	77	2.6	57	2.2	134	2.4	135.1
60-64	74	2.5	79	3.1	153	2.8	93.7
65-69	59	2.0	51	2.0	110	2.0	115.7
70-74	37	1.3	22	0.9	59	1.1	168.2
75+	41	1.4	32	1.2	73	1.3	128.1
Total	2919	100.0	2573	100.0	5492	100.0	113.4

Table 4.5: Age-Sex Distribution of the Study Population

Source: Field Survey, 2011.



Figure 4.2: Population pyramid of the the Study Population

The population pyramid depicted in figure 4.2 might be due to decreasing fertility with commensurate increase of the adolescent population going to schools and colleges.

4.2.2 Caste/ Ethnic Composition

Household composition of the study area has been presented in Appendix III, which shows the dominance of Chhetri caste 294 (36.3%), followed by Tharu 165 (20.4%), Brahmin 129 (16%), Lohar 40 (5%), Kami 34 (4.2%), Sarki 32 (4%), Thakuri 29 (3.6%), Dami/Dholi 26 (3.2%), Magar 19 (2.3%), Sonar 15 (1.9%) and Sanyasi 14 (1.7%) respectively. The presence of Dhanuk, Gurung, Sunwar, Dom, Tatma, Haluwai and Muslim is noticeable (Table 4.6 and Figure 4.3).

Caste/Ethnicity	Ward Number								Total	
Caste/Etimetty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10141
Chhetri	33	8	37	65	31	36	39	32	13	294
Tharu	22	-	55	-	3	41	-	6	38	165
Brahmin	20	5	19	30	5	21	2	18	9	129
Lohar	1	3	6	13	6	5	-	2	4	40
Kami	6	3	6	2	1	6	2	1	7	34
Sarki	5	4	2	1	4	5	-	4	7	32
Thakuri	2	-	1	8	12	4	-	2	-	29
Damai/ Dholi	1	3	3	4	3	8	1	2	1	26
Magar	-	-	3	12	-	4	-	-	-	19
Sonar	1	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	10	15
Sanyasi	-	-	-	3	3	3	1	4	-	14
Dhanuk	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	3
Gurung	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	2
Sunwar	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	2
Dom	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	2
Tatma	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Haluwai	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Muslim (Churoute)	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Total	92	28	132	143	69	137	45	73	90	809

 Table 4.6: Ward-Wise Distribution of Sample Household by Caste/ Ethnicity

Source: Field Survey, 2011.



Figure 4.3: Per cent of Sample Households by caste/Ethnicity

Source: Table 4.6.

Box 4.1: Tharu Community: A New Test of Cross-border Migration

Every year migrants work in India for the period of 8-9 months during agricultural off farming season/duration. Most of them return back from work during festivals mainly in Dashain and Bisu (New Year).

Among Tharu community, migration to work in India is newly started since the current youth generation. In the past, their agricultural land was enough but now they do not have enough land size to run the family. Tharu migrants earn an average of 1500-3000 IC per month spent for livelihood and education of children.

The persons already working in India, advice of family members and household economic condition plays important role in cross-border migration.

Problems of pocketing and rubbery while crossing the border are common. Most migrants have to pay IC 200-400 or some time captured at transit point while returning from working place at the transit point of Indian side. Migrants have no knowledge on migrant's rights and Nepal-India Friendship Treaty of 1950. Employment opportunities and wages depend upon education as well as skilled training gained by migrants.

4.2.2.3 Mother Tongue and Religion Composition of Study Households

The highest proportion of the households 634 (78.4%) reported Nepali language as their mother tongue, followed by Tharu 165 (20.4%) and few households reported Magar, Bhojpuri and Maithili as their mother tongue (Table 4.7 and Figure 4.4)).

Mother Tongue	Ward Number								Total	
Wother Tongue	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Nepali	70	28	75	137	66	95	45	66	52	634
Tharu	22	-	55	-	3	41	-	6	38	165
Magar	-	-	-	6	-	1	-	-	-	7
Bhojpuri	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Maithili	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Total	92	28	132	143	69	137	45	73	90	809

 Table 4.7: Ward wise Distribution of Sampled Household by Mother Tongue

Source: Field Survey, 2011.



Figure 4.4: Distribution of Sample Households by Mother Tongue

Source: Table 4.7.

Regarding religious composition in the study area 795 (98.3%) household follow Hindu religion and rest follow Buddhism 4 (0.5%) and Christianity 10 (1.2%), (Table 4.8 and Figure 4.5).

Deligion	Ward Number								Total	
Kengion	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	TUTAL
Hindu	90	28	126	143	69	131	45	73	90	795
Christianity	2	-	5	-	-	3	-	-	-	10
Buddhism	-	-	1	-	-	3	-	-	-	4
Total	92	28	132	143	69	137	45	73	90	809

Table 4.8: Ward-wise Distribution of Sample Household by Religion

Source: Field Survey, 2011.





Source: Table 4.8.

4.3 Migration Status of Sample Households

About 80 per cent of household heads were born in districts other than their present place of residence (Table 4.9). About 94 per cent of them originated from Baitadi, Doti, Dadeldhura, Bhajang, Bajura, Accham, Dharchula and Kailali. Many households have experience of work and networking with migrants already in India.

Districts of origin	Number of Households	Per cent					
Other districts	641	79.6					
Same district(Kanchanpur)	168	20.4					
Total	Total 809						
Other Regio	ns/ districts of birth/ origin						
Far-West Development Region							
Baitadi	177	27.5					

Table 4.9:	Distribution	of Head o	f Household	s According	to Place o	f Birth/	Origin				
	Distribution	of ficau o	i mouschoid	is Accor unig	IU I IACC U		Origin				
Dadeldhura	151	23.4									
-----------------------------	----------------------	------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Bajhang	105	16.3									
Achham	89	13.8									
Darchula	36	5.6									
Kailali	20	3.1									
Bajura	12	1.9									
Doti	11	1.7									
Mid-West Development Region											
Dang	27	4.2									
Dailekh	9	1.4									
Jajarkot	1	0.2									
Kalikot	1	0.2									
Humla	1	0.2									
Wester	n Development Region										
Baglung	1	0.2									
Total	641	100									





Source: Table 4.9.

4.4. Transit Point (Gadda Chowki as the Transit Point for Cross-border Migrants)

Kanchanpur district is one of the districts of Far west region of Nepal with having transit point (Gadda Chowki) with India. Mainly, People from Kalikot, Mugu, Accham,

Bajhang, Jumla, Humla, Dadeldhura, Surkhet, Dang, Kailali and Kanchanpur districts Cross the border from Gadda Chowki transit point. In addition, people from other districts of Nepal also go to work in Laddakh, Simla and Nainital of India by using this transit point. Therefore, this transit point has been used by the people from various districts of Nepal.

Three year before, Migrant Counseling Centre (MCC) was established in 2009 by International Nepal Fellowship (INF) for providing migrants about information on migrants' rights as well as rescuing migrants who have lost their money due to robbery, theft, and misbehavior of border security and custom officers. MCC has maintained the monthly record of the main origin and destination districts of Nepalese migrants to India through Gadda Chowki transit point (Table 4.10).

Nepalese return (Inco	ming) Migrants in %	Nepalese current (O	utgoing) Migrants in %
Himanchal	51	Kailali	23
Punjab	15	Kanchanpur	16
Uttarakhand	5	Bajhang	11
UttarPradesh	2	Dailekh	4
Haryana	18	Doti	9
-	-	Kalikot	10
-	-	Accham	7
-	-	Bajura	8
-	-	Surkhet	7
Others	9	Others	5
Total	100	Total	100

Table 4.10: Percentage of Incoming and outgoing Nepalese Cross-border migrantsfrom Gadda Chowki in the Month of December, 2010

Source: Migrant Counseling Centre, 2011.



Figure 4.7: Main Origin Districts and Destination of Migrants at Gadda Chowki Transit Point

Source: Table 4.10.

The main destinations of Nepalese cross-border migrants through Gadda Chowki were Himanachhal (51%) and followed by Haryana (18%). The main source districts were Kailali (23%) followed by Kanchanpur (16%).

CHAPTER V

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERSTICS OF SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS

This chapter describes social and economic characteristics of sample households on the basis of three migrant categories such as current, return and households with both current and returned migrants. Non-migrant households are also included for comparison with migrant households. Social characteristics included literacy status and educational attainment and social participation of household heads. Economic characteristics included land ownership and size, main occupation, indebtedness, income sufficiency and wealth status. Migration status of households belonging to the origin of sample households is also analyzed.

5.1 Social Characteristics

It is important to consider social characteristics of an individual migrant to examine how he is responding to the migration process. Socio-centric, or collectivistic societies stress on cohesiveness, strong ties between individuals, group solidarity, emotional interdependence, traditionalism and a collective identity. Good social environment as well as opportunities of participation across all section of the society without any discrimination can play an important role in reducing the volume of migration.

5.1.1 Literacy Status and Educational Attainment

The level of education of head of household can be considered as an important component in decision making of the migration process. In the sample households of the study area, out of total 423 non-migrant's heads of household, 217 (51.3%) were illiterate, and 72 (17.0%), 84 (19.9%) and 50 (11.8%) heads of household attained primary education, some secondary and SLC and above respectively. Among the total of 386 migrant households of 386, category, 57.8 per cent were illiterate, followed by those with primary education (19.6%), some secondary education (18.9%) and SLC and above (3%).

Migrant households have lower level of education while non-migrant households have higher level of education. This indicates that higher level of education reduces the likelihood of cross-border migration to India (Table 5.1, Figure 5.1).

Literacy Status and Level of Education	Non- Migrants HH		Return Migrants HH		Current Migrants HH		Both Migrants HH		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
Illiterate	217	51.3	64	55.7	131	56.7	28	70.0	440	54.4
Primary education including NFE*	72	17.0	22	19.1	48	20.8	6	15.0	148	18.3
Some secondary (6- 10)	84	19.9	25	21.7	42	18.2	6	15.0	157	19.4
SLC and above	50	11.8	4	3.5	10	4.3	-	-	64	7.9
Total	423	100.0	115	100.0	231	100.0	40	100.0	809	100.0

Table 5.1: Distribution of Educational Attainment of Heads of Sample Households

* NFE = Non Formal Education, Source: Field Survey, 2011.

Figure 5.1: Per cent Distrbuton of Head of Househol	ds by	y Litercay
Status and level of Educational Attainment		



Source: Table 5.1.

5.1.2 Sex Composition of Household Heads

Male headed households among non-migrants constituted 89.1 per cent while the female headed households were reported to be only 10.9 per cent (Table 5.2). Female headed households slightly exceeds (14%) among migrant households than non-migrant households (10.9%).

Head of Households	Non		Return		Current		Both		Total	
ficau of fiouscholus	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Male	377	89.1	104	90.4	192	83.1	36	90.0	709	87.6
Female	46	10.9	11	9.6	39	16.9	4	10.0	100	12.4
Total	423	100.0	115	100.0	231	100.0	40	100.0	809	100.0

Table 5.2: Distribution of Sex of Head of Sample Households

Source: Field Survey, 2011.

5.1.3 Social Participation of Households Members

Participation of household members in local social organizations makes households members responsible towards their own communities and societies. This also influences the magnitude of cross-border migration.

Among the non-migrants households (423), social participation was recorded as low (27.4%), medium (52.7%) and high (19.9%). Among migrant households (386), social participation was recorded as low (36%), medium (46.4%) and high (17.6%). Higher the social participation at the local level, lower the extent cross-border migration and vice versa reported in the study area (Table 5.3, Figure 5.2)).

Social Participation	Non		Ret	Return		Current		Both	Total	
Level	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Low	116	27.4	44	38.3	79	34.2	16	40.0	255	31.5
Medium	223	52.7	57	49.6	101	43.7	21	52.5	402	49.7
High	84	19.9	14	12.1	51	22.1	3	7.5	152	18.8
Total	423	100.0	115	100.0	231	100.0	40	100.0	809	100.0

Table 5.3: Distribution of Sample Household by Social Participation



Figure 5.2: Per cent of Sample Households by Social Participation Level

Source: Table 5.3.

5.2 Economic Characteristics

Household's economic condition is an important cause of migration and non-migration. This sub-section examines major occupation of households, ownership of land, food and income sufficiency to run households throughout the year.

5.2.1 Agriculture as Main Income Source of Households

Of the total number of households in the study area, more than 50 per cent (51.2%) reported to have self employment in agriculture followed by agricultural labour (17.3%), foreign employment (13.2%), non-agriculture labour (8.5%), regular salary (7.5%) and self employment on non-agriculture (2.3%).

Among non-migrant households, (423), main sources of income were self employment in agriculture (54.8%), agriculture labour (16.5%), non-agriculture labour (12.5%), regular salary (12.8%) and self-employment in non-agriculture (3.4%). Main sources of income of migrant households were reported as self employment in agriculture 182(47%), agriculture labour (18%), non-agriculture labour (4%), regular salary (2.4%) and self

employment in non-agriculture (1%). Foreign employment was considered the second main income source of (27.6%) migrant households Table 5.4, Figure 5.3).

Major Source of Income	Non Migrants HH		Return Migrants HH		Current Migrants HH		Both Migrants HH		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Self employment in agriculture	232	54.8	50	43.5	113	48.9	19	47.5	414	51.2
Agriculture labour	70	16.5	24	20.9	40	17.3	6	15.0	140	17.3
Foreign employment	-	-	27	23.5	67	29.0	13	32.5	107	13.2
Non-agriculture labour	53	12.5	10	8.7	6	2.6	-	-	69	8.5
Regular salary	54	12.8	2	3.3	4	1.7	1	2.5	61	7.5
Self employment in non-agriculture	14	3.4	2	1.7	1	0.4	1	2.5	18	2.3
Total	423	100.0	115	100.0	231	100.0	40	100.0	809	100.0

Table 5.4: Distribution of Main Source of Income of Sample Household

Source: Field Survey, 2011.







5.2.2 Land Ownership and Size of Land

Out of the total study households, only eight did not have land (Table 5.5).

Land Status	Non Migrants HH		Return Migrants HH		Current Migrants HH		Both Migrants HH		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Yes	420	99.3	113	98.3	228	98.7	40	100.0	801	99.0
No	3	0.7	2	1.7	3	1.3	-	-	8	1.0
Total	423	100.0	115	100.0	231	100.0	40	100.0	809	100.0

Table 5.5: Distribution of Households by Ownership of Land

Of the total number of households of both migrants and non-migrants, 11.4 per cent have land. less than 5 Kattha of land followed by 32.9 per cent followed by those with 5-10 Kattha (32.9%), 10-20 Kattha (26.5%) and more than 20 Kattha (28.2%). Generally, more non-migrant households possess larger size of land than migrant households (Table 5.6, Figure 5.4).

Table 5.6: Distribution of Households by Size of Land Holding (in *Kattha***)

Land Holding Size	Non Migrants		Return Migrants		Current Migrants		Both Migrants		Total	
Land Holding Size	HH		HH		HH		HH			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
<5.00	38	9.0	18	15.7	31	13.4	6	15.0	93	11.4
5.00 - 9.99	145	34.5	42	36.5	68	29.5	11	27.5	266	32.9
10.00 - 19.99	97	22.9	29	25.2	73	31.6	15	37.5	214	26.5
20.00+	140	33.4	24	20.9	56	24.2	8	20.0	228	28.2
NA*	3	0.7	2	1.7	3	1.3	-	-	8	1.0
Total	423	100.0	115	14.2	231	100.0	40	100.0	809	100.0

*NA= No land. ** 1Katta=0.03386 Hectare (Appendix III), Source: Field Survey, 2011.



Figure 5.4: Per cent of Sample Households by Land Holding Pattern

Source: Table 5.6.

5.2.3 Situation of Indebtedness and Debt Amount

Migration is an increasingly important aspect of livelihoods of poor people. The social experience and consequences of migration are far from uniform, but shaped by class and gender. For poor households, migration offers positive opportunities for saving, investment and meeting contingencies. Furthermore, for the poorer majority, migration is a defensive coping strategy covering existing debts and extreme economic vulnerability. In combining unequal and individualized income accrual with the need for joint livelihood strategies, migration has a major impact on intra-household relations.

Among the sample (809) households, 57.7 per cent were found indebted. Out of 423 nonmigrant households, 50.3 per cent) were found indebted and 49.7 per cent were without debt. Of the total migrant households, 65.8 per cent were indebted and 34.2 per cent did not incur debt. A much higher percentage of migrant household trapped in debt than the non-migrant households justifies why migrants go to India for employment to pay for the debt also (Table 5.7, Figure 5.5).

Having Debt	Non Migrants HH		Return Migrants HH		Current Migrants HH		Both Migrants HH		Total		
	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	n	%	Ν	%	
Yes	213	50.3	74	64.3	149	64.5	31	77.5	467	57.7	
No	210	49.7	41	35.7	82	34.5	9	22.5	342	42.3	
Total	423	100.0	115	100.0	231	100.0	40	100.0	809	100.0	

Table 5.7: Distribution of Households by Indebtedness Status



Figure 5.5: Per cent of Sample Households by Indentedness

Migrant households also have larger amount of dept than the non-migrant households. Among non-migrant households, debt ranges from about Rs. 15, 00 to about 80,000. The percentage distribution in each category of debt is almost uniform. A much higher percentage of migrant households have reported to have much higher amount of debt than non-migrant households (Table 5.8).

Table 5.8: Distribution of Households by Amount of Indebtedness (in NRs.)

Debt Amount	Non Migrants HH		Return Migrants HH		Current Migrants HH		Both Migrants HH		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
<15,000	52	12.3	16	13.9	36	15.6	5	12.5	109	13.5
15,000- 39,999	56	13.2	28	24.3	34	14.7	5	12.5	123	15.1

Source: Table 5.7.

40,000- 79,999	49	11.6	18	15.6	40	17.3	11	27.5	118	14.6
80,000+	56	13.2	12	10.4	39	16.9	10	25.0	117	14.5
NA*	210	49.7	41	35.7	82	35.5	9	22.5	342	42.3
Total	423	100.0	115	100.0	231	100.0	40	100.0	809	100.0

*NA= No debts. Source: Field Survey, 2011.

5.2.4 Situation of Household Income Sufficiency

Among the sample households 53.6 per cent reported having sufficient income considered to be generally non-poor, 33.4 per cent were poor followed by poorer (9.6%) and poorest (3.5%). 57 per cent reported to be non-poor followed by 32.1 per cent poor, 7.9 per cent poorer and 3.1 per cent poorest. Among migrant households, 50 per cent were non-poor followed by 34.7 poor, 11.4 per cent poorer and 3.9 per cent poorest. The data in Table 5.9 show that non-migrant households are generally better off in income sufficiency than migrant households.

Income Sufficiency (In Months)	l Mi l	Non igrant HHs	HH re mig	I with HH eturn curr grants migr		with rent rants	HH with both (current & return) migrants		Т	otal
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
0-3 months (poorest)	13	3.1	8	7.0	7	3.0	-	-	28	3.5
4-7 months (Poorer)	33	7.8	20	17.4	20	8.7	4	10.0	77	9.5
8-11 months (Poor)	136	32.1	40	34.8	74	32.0	20	50.0	270	33.4
12+months(non-poor)	241	57.0	47	40.8	130	56.3	16	40.0	434	53.6
Total	423	100.0	115	100.0	231	100.0	40	100.0	809	100.0

Table 5.9: Distribution of Sample Households by Income Sufficiency



Figure 5.6: Per cent Distribution of Sample Households According to Income Sufficiency

5.2.4 Situation of Wealth Status

Household's abundance of valuable materials possessions or resources can help to understand the state of being rich. Among both non-migrant and migrant households, 19.6 per cent belonged to the poorest categories in terms of wealth index followed by 20 per cent each in each category of the Among non-migrant households, more than 25 per cent belonged to the richest category with other categories falling between 16 and 20 per cent. The rich category among migrant households was reported to be almost 11 percentage point less than that of non-migrant households. More than 56 per cent of migrant households belonged to the poorest, poor and middle categories of wealth index (Table 5.10, Figure 5.7). Non-migrant's households are comparatively better in wealth status index than migrant's households in the study area.

Table 5.10: Distribution of Households by Wealth Status

Wealth	Non Migrants HH		Return Migrants HH		Current Migrants HH		Both Migrants HH		Total	
Status muex	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Poorest	79	18.6	21	18.3	48	20.8	10	25.0	158	19.5

Source: Table 5.9.

Poor	73	17.3	32	27.8	48	20.8	12	30.0	165	20.5
Middle	86	20.3	27	23.5	40	17.3	9	22.5	162	20.0
Rich	79	18.5	23	20.0	53	22.9	7	17.5	162	20.0
Richest	106	25.3	12	10.4	42	18.2	2	5.0	162	20.0
Total	423	100.0	115	100.0	231	100.0	40	100.0	809	100.0

Figure 5.7: Per cent of Sample Households According to Wealth Status Index



Source: Table 5.10.

5.3 Current Migration Status of Sample Households with Place of Origin

The place of origin of migrant's households and their distribution at current place of residence is an important aspect in migration studies. Migrants are attracted by pleasant climates and favorable economic conditions than their place of origin. Most of the households in the study area are originated from Far-western and mid-western remote districts of hills and mountain of Nepal.

Among 641 households having different place of origin in the study area, Almost 52 per cent were involved in cross-border migration. It showed 56 (33.3%) out of 168 non-

migrants households of study area have participated in cross-border migration. Districts of origin of households are Baitadi 97(23%) and 80(20.7%), Dadheldhura 86(20.3%) and 65(16.8%), Bajhang 39(9.2%) and 66(17.1%), Achham 21(5.0%) and 68(17.6%), Darchula 22(5.2%) and 14(3.6%), Gulmi 20(4.7%) and 7(1.8%), Kailai 15(3.5%) and 5(1.3%), Bajura 3(0.7%) and 9(2.3%), Doti 2(0.5%) and 9(2.3%) and Dailekh 5(1.2%). Table 5.11 and figure 5.8 show the distribution of households by migration status with their districts of origin.

Place of	N	on	Ret	urn	Cur	rent	Bo	oth	Та	tal
Origin	Migra	nts HH	10	เลา						
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Baitadi	97	23.0	23	20.0	52	22.5	5	12.5	177	21.9
Dadheldhura	86	20.3	27	23.5	33	14.3	5	12.5	151	18.7
Bajhang	39	9.2	19	16.5	39	16.9	8	20.6	105	13.0
Achham	21	5.0	10	8.7	46	19.9	12	30.0	89	11.0
Darchula	22	5.2	3	2.6	9	3.9	2	5.0	36	4.4
Gulmi	20	4.7	4	3.5	3	1.3	-	-	27	3.3
Kailali	15	3.5	2	1.7	3	1.3	-	-	20	2.5
Bajura	3	0.7	3	2.6	5	2.2	1	2.5	12	1.5
Doti	2	0.5	4	3.5	5	2.2	-	-	11	1.4
Dailekh	5	1.2	1	0.9	2	0.9	1	2.5	9	1.1
Baglung	1	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.1
Jajarkot	-	-	-	-	1	0.4	-	-	1	0.1
Kalikot	-	-	-	-	1	0.4	-	-	1	0.1
Humla	-	-	-	-	1	0.4	-	-	1	0.1
Non Migrants	112	26.5	19	16.5	31	13.4	6	15.0	168	20.8
Total	423	100.0	115	100.0	231	100.0	40	100.0	809	100.0

Table 5.11: Distribution of Household by Migration Status with Place of Origin



Figure 5.8: Per cent of Sample Households According to their Place of Origin

Source: Table 5.11.

CHAPTER VI

SOCIAL, DEMOGRAPHIC AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRANTS

This chapter analyzes social, demographic and economic characteristics of both current return cross-border migrants. These characteristics play important roles for migrants' decision making for migration to India. Out of 809 households in the study area, 47.7 per cent were involved in cross-border migration. Out of this, 426 persons were cross-border migrants. Current migrants constituted 63.6 per cent and 36.4 per cent return migrants.

6.1 Social Characteristics of Cross-border Migrants

This section describes the level of educational attainment, caste, religion, and mother tongue of cross-border migrants.

6.1.1 Educational Attainment of Cross-border Migrants

Among cross-border migrants, 23 per cent were illiterate followed by 26.5 per cent with primary level of education including non-formal education, 42.5 per cent with some secondary level of education and 8 per cent with SLC and above (Figure 6.1).



Figure 6.1: Per cent Distribution of Literacy Status and Educational Attainment of Migrants

Among return migrants, 28.4 per cent were illiterate. Illiteracy among current migrants was 20 per cent. Table 6.1 presents number of proportion of both return and current migrants by various levels of educational attainment (Table 6.1). Current migrants reported to have slightly more levels of educational attainments than the return migrants.

Educational Attainment	Return Migrants		Current N	Migrants	Total Migrants		
	n	%	n	%	N	%	
Illiterate	44	28.4	54	19.9	98	23.0	
Primary education including NFE	42	27.1	71	26.2	113	26.5	
Some secondary (6-10)	60	38.7	121	44.7	181	42.5	
SLC and above	9	5.8	25	9.2	34	8.0	
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0	

Table 6.1: Distribution of Educational Attainment of Cross-border Migrants

Source: Field Survey, 2011.

6.1.2 Types of Skill Training Received by Cross-border Migrants

Out of total cross-border migrants only 18.8 per cent have received one or the other types of training. Of this 57.5 per cent were current migrants and 42.5 per cent were return migrants. Over four fifth of cross-border migrants of both categories did have any kind

Source: Table 6.1

of training but were involved in physical labor or unskilled work with low level of earning at their working place (Table 6.2 and Figure 6.2).

	Ret	turn	Cu	rrent	Total	
Having any kind of Training	Mig	rants	Mig	rants	Mi	grants
	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Yes	34	21.9	46	17.0	80	18.8
No	121	78.1	225	83.0	346	81.2
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0
If yes what type of training have you rece	ived?					
Cook/ bakery	8	5.2	12	4.4	20	4.7
Driving	6	3.9	8	2.9	14	3.3
Sewing/ knitting	3	1.9	8	2.9	11	2.6
Wood/ furniture/ bamboo materials	3	1.9	6	2.2	9	2.1
Computer	5	3.2	4	1.5	9	2.1
Security guard	3	1.9	5	1.8	8	1.9
Agriculture	3	1.9	-	-	3	0.7
Making dolls	-	-	2	0.7	2	0.4
Welding	-	-	1	0.3	1	0.2
Bicycle repair	1	0.6	-	-	1	0.2
Painting	1	0.6	-	-	1	0.2
Sub overseer	1	0.6	-	-	1	0.2
No training	121	78.1	225	83.0	346	81.2
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0

Table 6.2: Distribution of Cross-border Migrants by Received Training and Types

Source: Field Survey, 2011.

Among the total training receivers (80) cross-border migrants, 25 per cent have received cook/bakery training, 17.6 per cent received driving, 13.8 per cent received sewing/knitting, 11.3 per cent received wood/furniture/bamboo goods and materials, 11.3 per cent received computer training and 10% received security guard trainings. Only 3.8 and 2.5 per cent received training related to agriculture and doll making (Table 6.2).



Figure 6.2: per cent and Number of Migrants according to their Received Training and Types

Source: Table 6.2.

6.1.3 Mother Tongue of Cross-border Migrants

Overwhelmingly 89.2 per cent of cross-border migrants have Nepali language as their mother tongue (Table 6.3). About 10 per cent of cross-border migrants have Tharus as their mother tongue (Figure 6.3).

	Retu	rn	Current Migrants		Total	
Mother Tongue	Migra	nts			Migrants	
	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Nepali	131	85.5	249	91.9	380	89.2
Tharu	21	13.5	21	7.7	42	9.9
Magar	3	1.9	1	0.4	4	0.9
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0

Table 6.3: Distribution of Mother Tongue of Cross-border Migrants



Figure 6.3: Per cent of Migrants According to their Mother Tongue

Source: Table 6.3.

6.1.4 Caste/Ethnicity of Cross-border Migrants

About one third of cross-border migrants are Chhetris followed by 14.6 per cent Brahmin and 10 per cent Tharus (Table 6.4). This is followed by Thakuri (4%), Magar (3.3%) and Sanyasi (1.6%). Dalits (Lohar, Sarki, Kami, Damai/Dholi, Dom and Sonar) represents 33.6 per cent among cross-border migrants (Figure 6.4).

	Re	eturn	Cu	rrent	Т	otal
Caste/ ethnicity	Migrants		Mig	rants	Migrants	
	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Chhetri	41	26.4	100	36.9	141	33.1
Brahmin	21	13.5	41	15.1	62	14.6
Tharu	21	13.5	21	7.7	42	9.9
Lohar	17	11.0	19	7.0	36	8.5
Sarki	17	11.0	17	6.3	34	8.0
Kami	10	8.7	19	7.0	29	6.8
Damai/ Dholi	9	5.8	14	5.2	23	5.4
Thakuri	3	1.9	14	5.2	17	4.0
Sonar	6	3.9	13	4.8	19	4.5
Magar	3	1.9	7	2.6	10	2.3

Table 6.4: Distribution of Cross-border Migrant's by Caste/Ethnicity

Sanyasi	4	2.6	3	1.1	7	1.6
Dhanuk	1	0.6	1	0.4	2	0.5
Dom	1	0.6	1	0.4	2	0.5
Haluwai	1	0.6	-	-	1	0.2
Churoute	-	-	1	0.4	1	0.2
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0

Figure 6.4: Per cent of Migrants According to Caste/Ethnicity



Source: Table 6.4.

6.1.5 Level of Social Participation

The level of social participation of cross-border migrants or from their households at their place of origin affects volume of cross-border migration. Among the total migrants (both return and current) 155 (36.4%) were from low level of social participation index. Similarly, 200 (47%) and 71 (16.6%) cross-border migrants were from medium and high level of social participation index. This shows that, more cross-border migrants were from medium and less from high level social participation index. A higher social participation index is inversely related with cross-border migration, which is positively correlated with and low level (Table 6.5 and Figure 6.5).

 Table 6.5: Distribution of Cross-border Migrants by the Level of Social

Participation Index

Social Participation Index	Return	Current	Total Migrants

	Migrants		Mig	rants		
	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Low	60	38.7	95	35.0	155	36.4
Medium	78	50.3	122	45.0	200	46.9
High	17	11.0	54	20.0	71	16.7
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2011





Source: Table 6.5).

6.1.7 Cross-border Migrants and Affiliation with any Organization

The social ties or participation of cross-border migrants in any organization (social, economic and political) were observed to be low. Only slightly less than 10 per cent of cross-border migrants have ties with any other organization (Figure 6.6b). Out of those with ties, 75 per cent of them have association with the social sectors such as users group, management committee and club. Affiliation with professional or employment oriented, political organizations, religious and financial/cooperatives were found to be very low. This indicates that nine out of ten migrants were without any affiliation with social, economic and political organizations indication social, economic and political exclusion study area (Table 6.6).

Affiliation to any organization	Ret Mig	urn rants	Cur Migi	rent rants	Total Migrants		
	n	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	
Yes	20	12.9	20	7.4	40	9.4	
No	135	87.1	251	92.9	386	90.6	
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0	
If yes, what type of organizations are	you affili	ated to?					
Social (users group, management committee, club, etc.)	15	75.0	15	75.0	30	75.0	
Professional/ employment oriented organizations	2	10.0	1	5.0	3	7.5	
Political (party member, VDC/ DDC representatives)	2	10.0	1	5.0	3	7.5	
Religious (Guthi and religious organizations)	-	-	2	10.0	2	5.0	
Financial (co-operatives, saving etc.)	1	5.0	-	-	1	2.5	
Organizations based in ethnicity	-	-	1	5.0	1	2.5	
Total	20	100.0	20	50.0	40	100.0	

Table 6.6: Distribution of Cross-border Migrants by Affiliation to any organizations

and Types

Source: Field Survey, 2011.

6.1. 7 Cross-border Migrants and Knowledge on Migrant's Workers Rights

Human rights campaigners acknowledge that the right to work in a foreign country does not equate with immediate access to the full benefits of citizenship. Their efforts focus on establishing minimum standards of working and living conditions consistent with the principles of international human rights law.

The initial step towards this goal was achieved in 1990 with the International Convention adopted by the UN on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, also known as the Migrant Workers Convention. Right to freedom of movement to and from their countries of origin, right to life, right to freedom from torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, right to freedom from slavery, servitude or forced compulsory labor, right to freedom of thought, expression, conscience and religion, right to privacy, right to property, right of equal treatment with nationals in respect to remuneration and other conditions of work such as overtime, holidays, right to join freely any trade union, right to enjoy the same treatment as nationals regarding social security benefits in so far as they fulfill the legislation requirements and right to emergency medical care are the main human and employment rights of cross-border migrants (UN, 1990).

Among the total cross-border migrants, only 16 (3.8%) have knowledge on rights of migrants workers (Figure 6.6a). Equal wages with native labour, right to work in equal basis, joining to any organization, receiving identity cards, rights to expression, provision of security, guarantee of work, provision of insurance, right to health and right to hold trade and professions were the provisions of migrant's workers rights mentioned by cross-border migrants. More than 95 per cent of cross-border migrants were without having knowledge of their rights at their working place in India. Due to the lack of knowledge about migrant's rights, cross-border migrant workers have to work without basic human rights in exploitative environment at their working place (Table 6.7).

Knowledge on Migrants workers Rights	Re Mig	turn grants	Cur Migi	rent rants	Total Migrants		
Rights	n	%	n	%	Ν	%	
Yes	8	5.2	8	3.0	16	3.8	
No	147	94.8	263	97.0	410	92.2	
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0	
If yes, what are the provisions of Mig	ants Wo	rkers Righ	ets?*				
Equal wages/salary	4	50.0	2	25.0	6	37.5	
Right to work on equal basis	4	50.0	2	25.0	6	37.5	
Establishing/ joining to organization	3	37.5	4	50.0	7	43.7	
Receiving identity cards	2	25.0	2	25.0	4	25.0	
Right to expression	1	12.5	2	25.0	3	18.7	
Provision of security	-	-	2	25.0	2	12.5	
Right to work with guarantee	-	-	2	25.0	2	12.5	
Provision of Insurance	-	-	1	12.5	1	6.2	
Right to health and treatment	-	-	1	12.5	1	6.2	
Right to hold trade and professions	-	-	1	12.5	1	6.2	
Total	8	100.0	8	100.0	16	100.0 *	

Table 6.7: Distribution of Cross-border Migrants by Knowledge on MigrantsWorkers Rights

*: Per centage total exceeded 100 due to multiple responses.

Figure 6.6: Per cent of Migrants According to Knowledge on Rights of Migrants Workers and Organizational Affiliation



Source: Table, 6. 6 and 6.7.

6.1.8 Knowledge and Perceptions about Nepal-India Friendship Treaty of 1950

Among the cross-border migrants, only 8 (1.9%) have knowledge of Nepal-India friendship treaty of 1950. This shows that more than 98 per cent of migrants have no knowledge about provision made in the treaty between Nepal and India. Provision of open border, open trade and ban on smuggling of weapons were the provisions mentioned in treaty by migrants and their households.

6.2 Demographic Characteristics of Cross-border Migrants

This section analyzes the current age and sex, family structure, and marital status while crossing the border the first time.

6.2.1 Age and Sex of Cross-border Migrants

Table 6.8 and Figure 6.7a show that more than 50 per cent of cross-border migrants are less than 30 years of age. Current and return migrants more than 30 years constituted 56.1

per cent and 45.4 per cent respectively. Less than 20 years among return migrants is less (3.2%) than current migrants (8.5%). More than two fifth of the both categories of migrations belonged to the age group 20-30 years. Current migrants are obviously younger than return migrants.

Age group (in Years)	Return Migrants		Current Migrants		Total Migrants	
	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
<20	5	3.2	31	11.4	36	8.4
20-30	63	40.6	117	43.2	180	42.3
>30	87	56.1	123	45.4	210	49.3
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0

Table 6.8: Distribution of Age of Cross-border Migrants

Source: Field Survey, 2011.

The age of migrants at their cross-border migration shows that more than 57 per cent of them were between the ages 15 to 22 years (Table 6.9, Figure 6.7b). Male migration from the border is essentially a male phenomenon (98.1%).

Table 6.9: Distribution of Age of Cross-border Migrants at the time their firstmigration to India

Age (in Years)	Return Migrants		Cur Mig	rent rants	Total Migrants		
	n	%	n	%	Ν	%	
<15	24	15.5	54	20.0	78	18.3	
15 - 17	39	25.2	78	28.8	117	27.5	
18-22	50	32.3	79	29.1	129	30.3	
23+	42	27.0	60	22.1	102	23.9	
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0	



Figure 6.7: Per cent of Migrants According to their Current and First time Involvement Age in Cross-border Migration

6.2.2 Marital Status of Cross-border Migrants

Among cross-border migrants of both categories, 84.2 per cent were currently married and 14.8 per cent were unmarried (Figure 6.8a). The proportion of unmarried among current migrants was 20.3 per cent for current migrants and only 5.3 per cent for return migrants. It was because relatively younger age group of current migrants than return migrants justifies this (Table 6.10).

	Dotum Mignonts		Curre	ent	Total	
Marital Status	Keturn Migrants		Migra	nts	Migrants	
	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Currently Married	146	94.2	213	78.6	359	84.2
Divorced/ Separated	-	-	2	0.7	2	0.5
Widow/ widower	1	0.6	1	0.4	2	0.5
Unmarried	8	5.2	55	20.3	63	14.8
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0

Table 6.10: Distribution of Marital Status of Cross-border Migrants

Source: Field Survey, 2011.

About three fifths of migrants were unmarried against two fifths who were married at the time of their first cross-border migration (Table 11, Figure 6.8b).

Source: Table 6.8 and 6.9.

Cross-border migration appears to be a license for the young unmarried migrants to India for reason of employment and earning and the remittance they bring back home.

 Table 6.11: Distribution of Marital Status According to their first time participation in Cross-border Migration

Marital Status	Return Migrants		Cur Migi	rent rants	Total Migrants		
	n	%	n	%	Ν	%	
Never married	90	58.1	163	60.1	253	59.4	
Married	63	40.7	107	39.5	170	39.9	
Widower/ widow	1	0.6	-	-	1	0.2	
Divorced/ separated	1	0.6	1	0.4	2	0.5	
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0	

Source: Field Survey, 2011.

Figure 6.8: Per cent of Migrants According to their Marital Status (Current and First time Involvement in Cross-border Migration)



Source: Table 6.10 and 6.11

6.2.3 Family Structure of Cross-border Migrants

Almost 70 per cent of cross-border migrants lived in joint family and 30.3 per cent in nuclear family (Figure 6.9). About 71 per cent of current migrants lived in joint family

against 68.4 per cent of return migrants. The proportion of both categories of migrants belonging to either joint or nuclear is fantastically similar, differing only in a matter of degree given the type of society they live in (6.12).

Return Migrants Current Migrants Total Migrants Family Structure % % Ν % n n 49 29.5 Nuclear 31.6 80 129 30.3 Joint 106 68.4 191 70.5 297 69.7 Total 155 100.0 271 100.0 426 100.0

Table 6.12: Distribution of f Cross-border Migrant's by Family Structure

Source: Field Survey, 2011.

Figure 6.9: Per cent of Households According to Types of Family



Source: Table 6.12.

6.2.4 Frequencies of crossing the border by Migrants

About 37 per cent of cross-border migrants crossed the border 2-5 times followed by 25 per cent more than 11 times, 23.5 per cent 6-10 times and 14.6 per cent for the first time (Table 13 and Figure 6.10). This shows that cross-border migration has been a part of life for sustaining their family at home.

Examples of Crossing harder to	Retu	rn	Current		Total	
Work	Migrants		Migrants		Migrants	
W OF R	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Once/ first time	17	11.0	45	16.6	62	14.6
2-5 times	56	36.1	101	37.3	157	36.9
6-10 times	32	20.6	68	25.1	100	23.5
11+ times	50	32.3	57	21.0	107	25.0
Total	155	36.4	271	63.6	426	100.0

Table 6.13: Distribution of Cross-border Migrants According to their Frequencies of
Crossing the Border to Join Work

Figure 6.10: Per cent of Migrants According to Frequency of Crossborder Migration



Source: Table 6.13.

6.2.5 Duration of Stay of Cross-border Migrants at the Working Place

Duration of stay of cross-border migrants in India varies according to the nature of work, employment opportunities, and their household condition in the place of origin. Out of total migrants, nearly one third 134 (31.4%) stayed for less than four months at their working place, 112 (26.3%) migrants stayed for four to six months. More than one-fourth 109 (25.6%) of total migrants were working at the work place in destination for more than 12 months (Table 6.14 and Figure 6.11).Longer duration of stay at the work place in the destination is positively correlated with the level of income.

Duration of Star at Working Place (In	Return		Current		Total	
Duration of Stay at Working Place (In months)*	Migrants		Migrants		Migrants	
montasy	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
<4	29	18.7	105	38.7	134	31.5
4-6	48	31.0	64	23.6	112	26.3
7 – 11	31	20.0	40	14.8	71	16.7
12+	47	30.3	62	22.9	109	25.5
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0

 Table 6.15: Distribution of Cross-border Migrants According to their Duration of Stay at Working Place, India (In Months)

* = For the return migrants, how long they stayed at working place during last visit and for current migrants duration of absentees of latest time crossing the border to joined work.

Figure 6.11: Per cent of Migrants According to Duration of Stayed at their Destination



Source: Table 6.15.

6.2.6 Place of Work of Cross-border Migrants in India

There are 28 states and 7 union territories in India. Nepalese are found in 18 of these States. The main destination States were Karnataka - 92 (21.8%), Maharashtra- 90 (21.1%), Haryana- 74 (17.4%), Uttar Pradesh- 50 (11.7%), Uttarakhanda- 35 (8.2%), Punjab-26 (6.1%) and Gujarat- 16 (3.8%). Other destinations were Goa, Kerala,

Himachal Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Arunachal Pradesh, Rajasthan, Andra Pradesh, Assam, Madhya Pradesh, Jammu Kashmir and West Bengal (Appendix III).

Nepalese cross-border migrants have high concentration in the States of Karnataka, Maharashtra, Haryana Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Punjab, Gujarat, Goa and Kerala. Out of total migrants (426), 183 (43%) migrant's destination was Karnataka and Maharashtra absorbed about 43 per cent of Nepalese cross-border migrants. The volume of migration was influenced by employment opportunities rather than distance (Table 6.16 and Figure 6.12).

Table 6.16: Distribution of Cross-border Migrants according to their Destination ofWork Place in India

	Ret	urn	Cur	rent	Total Migrants	
Working/ worked place	Mig	rants	Mig	rants	I Utal IV	ngrants
	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Karnataka	29	18.7	64	23.6	93	21.8
Maharashtra	27	17.4	63	23.2	90	21.1
Haryana	26	16.8	48	17.7	74	17.4
Uttar Pradesh	20	12.9	30	11.1	50	11.7
Uttarakhand	16	10.3	19	7.0	35	8.2
Punjab	10	6.5	16	5.9	26	6.1
Gujarat	8	5.2	8	3.0	16	3.8
Goa	5	3.2	3	1.1	8	1.9
Kerala	2	1.3	6	2.2	8	1.9
Himachal Pradesh	4	2.6	1	0.3	5	1.2
Tamil Nadu	1	0.6	3	1.1	4	0.9
Arunachal Pradesh	2	1.3	1	0.3	3	0.7
Rajasthan	-	-	3	1.1	3	0.7
Andra Pradesh	2	1.3	-	-	2	0.4
Assam	1	0.6	1	0.3	2	0.4
Madhya Pradesh	1	0.6	1	0.3	2	0.4
Jammu and Kashmir	-	-	1	0.3	1	0.2
West Bengal	1	0.6	-	-	1	0.2
Don't know	-	-	3	1.1	3	0.3
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0



Figure 6.12: Per cent Distribution of Migrants According to their Destination (working/Worked Places)

Source: Table 6.16.

6.3 Economic Characteristics of Cross-border Migrants

6.3.1 Land Size Holding

Among the total cross-border migrants, 99 per cent had some land. Slightly less than one third of cross-border migrants, both return and current had land between 5 and 10 Kattha each.. Cross-border migrants having the land size more than 20 Kattha and less than 5 Kattha represent lower proportion of cross-border migrants (Table 6.17 and Figure 6.13). The plausible explanation may the fact that migrants with small land holding may work locally and that those with relatively large size may have to engage in their own work in the place of origin. More than 62 per cent of cross-border migrants in both categories possessed land between 5-20 Kattha.

Land size Status	Return Migrants		Cur Migi	rent rants	Total Migrants		
	n	%	n	%	Ν	%	
Yes	153	98.7	268	98.9	421	98.8	
No	2	1.3	3	1.1	5	1.2	
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0	
If yes, the size of land holding?							
<5.00	24	15.7	37	13.8	61	14.4	
5.00 - 9.99	53	34.6	79	29.5	132	31.4	
10.00 - 19.99	44	28.8	88	32.8	132	31.4	
20.00+	32	20.9	64	23.9	96	22.8	
Total	153	100.0	268	63.7	421	100.0	

 Table 6.17: Distribution of Cross-border Migrants by their Size of land holding (in Kattha**)

1Kattha=0.03386 Hectare

Figure 6.13. Per cent of Migrants According to their Land Holdng Patterns



Source: Table 6.17.

6.3.2 Income Sufficiency of Cross-border Migrants

Almost 50 per cent of cross-border migrants have income sufficiency for 12 and more months. This means that another 50 per cent have insufficient income to sustain their households (Table 6.18).

Income Sufficiency (In Months)	Return Migrants		Cur Mig	rent rants	Total Migrants		
	n	%	n	%	Ν	%	
0-3 months	8	5.2	7	2.6	15	3.5	
4-7 months	24	15.5	24	8.8	48	11.3	
8-11 months	60	38.7	94	34.7	154	36.2	
12+ months	63	40.6	146	53.9	209	49.0	
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0	

Table 6.18: Distribution of Cross-border Migrants According to their IncomeSufficiency

Source: Field Survey, 2011.

6.3.3 Cross-border Migrants and their Household Indebtedness

About 67 per cent of cross-border migrants were indebted and the rest were without the debt (Table 19 and Figure 6.14). Indebted situation of migrants of these households may increase the vulnerability of cross- border migration.

Table 6.19: Distribution of Cross-border Migrants by their Household Indebtedness

Indebtedness	Return Migrants		Cur Mig	rent rants	Total Migrants		
	n	%	n	%	Ν	%	
Yes	105	67.7	180	66.4	285	66.9	
No	50	32.3	91	33.6	141	33.1	
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0	


Figure 6.14: Per cent of Migrants According to Indebtedness

Source: Field Survey, 2011(Table 6.21).

6.3.4 Cross-border Migrants and Wealth Status of their Households

The household's wealth status can play an important role either to increase or decrease the volume of cross-border migrants. Lowest number of cross-border migrants, 58 (13.6%) were from richest wealth status category and second lowest number 85 (19.9%) from middle level wealth status. This showed that comparatively less numbers of cross-border migrants in the study area are originated from richest and middle class categories in wealth status. About 43 per cent of cross-border migrants were from poor and poorest category (Table 6.20).

Table 6.20: Distribution of Cross-border Migrants with their Household WealthStatus

Wealth Status of Migrants	Ret Migi	urn rants	Cur Migi	rent rants	Total Migrants	
Households	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Poorest	31	20.0	58	21.4	89	20.9
Poor	44	28.4	60	22.2	104	24.4
Middle	36	23.2	49	18.1	85	20.0
Rich	30	19.4	60	22.1	90	21.1
Richest	14	9.0	44	16.2	58	13.6
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2011.

6.3.5 Types of Labour Force Participation at the Work Place in Destination

The labour force participation on the basis of its types shows the capabilities and income earned by cross-border migrants at their working place. From the study area, more than two thirds worked in category of physical or unskilled type of labour at their place of destination. High illiteracy, low level of education, low income and irregular jobs characterise this group. About one third of cross-border migrants were involved in semi skilled and skilled types of labour at their working place (Table 6.21 and Figure 6.15).

Table 6.21: Distribution of Cross-border Migrants According to their Labour ForceParticipation in India

Types of Labour Force	Ret Mig	urn rants	Cur Migi	rent rants	Total Migrants		
	n %		n	%	Ν	%	
Physical/ unskilled labour	100	64.4	183	67.5	283	66.4	
Semi skilled labour	45	29.1	75	27.7	120	28.2	
Skilled labour	10	6.5	13	4.8	23	5.4	
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0	

Source: Field Survey, 2011.

Figure 6.15: Per cent of Migrants Acroording to type of Labour at Destination



Source: Table 6.21.

6.3.6 Monthly Income of Cross-border Migrants at their Working Place

More than one third 156 (36.6%) of cross-border migrants in the study area have earned more than Rs. 8,000 per month. More than one fourth 127 (29.8%) of total migrants monthly income was in the range of Rs. 4,800-6,399, nearly one fifth 77 (18.1%) received less than Rs. 4,800 and 66 (15.5%) received Rs.6, 400- 7,900 per month. The Proportion of return and current migrants on the basis of their monthly income range is presented in Table 6.22 and Figure 6.16).

 Table 6.22: Distribution of Cross-border Migrants According to their Monthly

 Income at Working Place, India (In NRS)

Monthly Income Range	ReturnMigrantsn		Cur Mig	rent rants	Total Migrants		
			n	%	Ν	%	
<4800	28	18.1	49	18.1	77	18.1	
4800 - 6399	45	29.0	82	30.3	127	29.8	
6400 - 7999	27	17.4	39	14.4	66	15.5	
8000+	55	35.5	101	37.2	156	36.6	
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0	

Source: Field Survey, 2011

Figure 6.16: Per cent of Migrants According to their Monthly Income at their worked/working places (In NRs)



Source: (Table 6.22.

6.3.7 Duration Stay and Monthly Income of Cross-border Migrants at their Working Place

The variation in monthly income of cross-border migrants at their work place in destination was obtained on the basis of duration of their stay. For duration of stay less than four months, in both return migrants and current migrants, their monthly income was in the range of Rs.4, 800-6,399, while for duration of stay of four to six months, more migrants earned Rs. 8,000 per month by both current and return migrants (Table 6.23). Longer duration of stay of cross-border migrants leads to increase in their income also.

Duration of Stay (In	< <u>4800</u> 4800 - 6399		00 - 399	6400 - 7999		8000+		Total		
montusj	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Return Migrant										
<4	4	13.8	11	37.9	6	20.7	8	27.6	29	100.0
4-6	9	18.8	14	29.2	10	20.8	15	31.3	48	100.0
7-11	5	16.1	12	38.7	4	12.9	10	32.3	31	100.0
12+	10	21.3	8	17.0	7	14.9	22	46.8	47	100.0
Total	28	18.1	45	29.0	27	17.4	55	35.5	155	100.0
Current Migrant										
<4	20	19.0	39	37.1	13	12.4	33	31.4	105	100.0
4-6	11	17.2	19	29.7	8	12.5	26	40.6	64	100.0
7-11	5	12.5	10	25.0	7	17.5	18	45.0	40	100.0
12+	13	21.0	14	22.6	11	17.7	24	38.7	62	100.0
Total	49	18.1	82	30.3	39	14.4	101	37.3	271	100.0

 Table 6.23: Distribution of Cross-border Migrants According to their Duration of Stav and Monthly Income (In NRs)

Source: Field Survey, 2011.

6.3.8 Migrant's Destination and Monthly Average Income

Among the cross-border migrants, variation on average monthly income was observed on the basis of their working place or destination. The average monthly income was between Rs. 4,000 and 10,920 for return and current cross-border migrants (Table 6.24). The general trend of average monthly income showed that the migrants who crossed long distance from their place of origin have earned more monthly income than migrants with short distance.

Table 6.24: Distribution of Cross-border migrants According to their AverageMonthly Income at their Destination

Destination of Return Current			
	Destination of	Return	Current

Migrants	Migrants		Μ	igrants
	Ν	Mean Income	Ν	Mean Income
Andra Pradesh	2	5,600.0	-	-
Arunachal Pradesh	2	7,700.0	1	6,400.0
Assam	1	10,000.0	1	20,000.0
Goa	5	10,920.0	3	8,000.0
Gujarat	8	4,812.5	8	6,950.0
Haryana	26	6,103.8	48	6,479.2
Himachal Pradesh	4	4,950.0	1	11,200.0
Jammu & Kashmir	-	-	1	8,000.0
Karnataka	29	7,096.6	64	7,781.3
Kerala	2	5,000.0	6	8,433.3
Madhya Pradesh	1	5,000.0	1	5,000.0
Maharashtra	27	9,563.0	63	6,990.5
Punjab	10	6,380.0	16	6,162.5
Rajasthan	-	-	3	4,600.0
Tamil Nadu	1	6,400.0	3	6,933.3
Uttar Pradesh	20	7,070.0	30	7,603.3
Uttarakhand	16	6,637.5	19	8,978.9
West Bengal	1	4,000.0	-	-
Don't Know	-	-	3	5333.3
Total	155	7,154.8	271	7,299.3

6.4 Interrelationships between Migrant Households and Individual Migrants

In-order to assess who migrates from the sampled household, binary logistic regression was applied to predict the characteristics of migrants who were likely to migrate. Multicollinearity among the predictor variables was tested before running the binary logistic regression model in order to get a valid result. Hence, statistics such as the tolerance¹ and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF)² was examined assuming that the tolerance

² Mathematically, VIF is denoted as: VIF= $(1 - R^{2}_{i})^{-1}$ Where,

¹ Mathematically, Tolerance is denoted as:

Tolerance=1-R²_i

Where,

 R^{2}_{i} is the coefficient of multiple determinations that is obtained when a particular independent variable is regressed against the other independent variables in the equation.

value less than .1 indicates a serious co linearity problem and VIF value greater than 10 is a cause for concern regarding the same (Multi co-linearity table present in the Appendix V).

The Table 6.25 provides B (Beta), S.E., Sig., Exp(B) and 95.0 % C.I. for EXP(B) of migrant households by selected independent variables (viz. age, sex, caste/ ethnicity, mother tongue, religion, marital status, educational attainment, sex of the household head, family structure, family size, wealth quintile and social participation index). Among these selected explanatory variables age, sex, caste/ ethnicity, mother tongue, religion, marital status, educational attainment, mother tongue, religion, marital status, educational participation index).

Table 6.25 also illustrates that those belonging to the economically active age group of 15-59 years were nearly 44 times more likely (OR 44.037, 95% CI 24.324 to 79.727) to migrate when compared to those from the dependent age group of 0-14 years. Age is one of the important factors for motivating migration.

It was observed that females were 97.2 per cent less likely (OR 0.028, 95% CI 0.018 to 0.041) to migrate when compared to males. This may be due to the taboo prevailing in Nepal that women should look after her house and her family and for this reason she should not migrate.

While regarding caste/ ethnicity, it was observed that other caste groups were 1.5 times more likely (OR 1.488, 95% CI 1.161 to 1.908) to migrate when compared to upper caste groups. This may be due to the fact that the upper caste groups occupy a crucial post and status in the society which does not bind them to work in India.

Those having mother tongue other than Nepali were 79.9 per cent less likely (OR 0.201, 95% CI 0.145 to 0.280) to migrate than those with Nepali language as the mother tongue. This may have been related to the ease of communication using Nepali alphabet in the destination.

 R_i^2 is the coefficient of multiple determinations that is obtained when a particular independent variable is regressed against the other independent variables in the equation.

Non-Hindus were nearly 3 times more likely (OR 3.120, 95% CI 1.373 to 7.092) to migrate than Hindus in the form of labor migrants.

Those ever-married were nearly 2 times more likely to migrate (OR 2.030, 95% CI 1.580 to 2.608) than never married. This may be due to the family pressure as well as family responsibility seen after marriage in Nepal.

Those with primary education were 2.5 times more likely (OR 2.561, 95% CI 1.878 to 3.492) to migrate than illiterates. Those having some secondary were 1.9 times more likely (OR 1.963, 95% CI 1.457 to 2.645) to migrate compared to the same group without this level of education. Illiterates are less migratory than literates.

Those living in a joint family were 1.4 times more likely (OR 1.378, 95% CI 1.030 to 1.842) to migrate than those living in a nuclear family. This may be due to the fact that people living in a joint family are compelled to look after their family and fulfill their large families' desires when compared to a people living in a small family where the desires in a small family may be less.

Regarding wealth quintile, it was found that those belonging to the third, fourth and fifth quintiles were 34.5 per cent, 40.6 per cent and 45.0 per cent less likely to migrate when compared to the first quintile (OR 0.655, 95% CI 0.465 to 0.922), (OR 0.594, 95% CI 0.421 to 0.839) and (OR 0.550, 95% CI 0.379 to 0.797) respectively. This may be due to the fact that persons from wealthier households are less migratory than from the poorer households. Persons from the poorer households migrate with economic motives.

It was also found that household members belonging to the middle category of social participation index were 22.6 per cent less likely (OR 0.774, 95% CI 0.618 to 0.969) to migrate when compared with household members belonging to the low category.

 Table 6.25: B (Beta), S.E., Sig., Exp (B) and 95.0 % C.I. for EXP (B) of Migrant

 Households by Selected Independent Variables

Independent Variables	В	S.E.	Sig.	Exp(B)	95.0% EX	C.I. for P(B)
-					Lower	Upper
Age						

0-14 Years (Ref)						
15-59 Years	3.785	.303	.000	44.037	24.324	79.727
60+ Years	.818	.491	.095	2.267	.866	5.932
Sex						
Male (Ref)						
Female	-3.593	.206	.000	.028	.018	.041
Caste/ ethnicity						
Upper caste group (Ref)						
Other caste group	.398	.127	.002	1.488	1.161	1.908
Mother tongue						
Nepali (Ref)						
Other	-1.603	.168	.000	.201	.145	.280
Religion						
Hindu (Ref)						
Non Hindu	1.138	.419	.007	3.120	1.373	7.092
Marital status						
Never Married (Ref)						
Ever Married	.708	.128	.000	2.030	1.580	2.608
Educational attainment						
Illiterate (Ref)						
Primary	.940	.158	.000	2.561	1.878	3.492
Some secondary	.675	.152	.000	1.963	1.457	2.645
SLC +	.111	.193	.564	1.117	.766	1.630
Sex of the HH head						
Male (Ref)						
Female	.071	.164	.665	1.074	.778	1.481
Family structure						
Nuclear (Ref)						
Joint	.320	.148	.031	1.378	1.030	1.842
Family size						
<5 (Ref)						
5-6	121	.192	.529	.886	.608	1.292
7+	.008	.208	.968	1.008	.671	1.516
Wealth quintile						
First (Ref)						
Second	278	.170	.103	.758	.543	1.058
Third	423	.175	.015	.655	.465	.922

Fourth	520	.176	.003	.594	.421	.839
Fifth	599	.190	.002	.550	.379	.797
Social participation index						
Low (Ref)						
Middle	256	.114	.025	.774	.618	.969
High	137	.150	.362	.872	.650	1.171
Constant	-4.867	.370	.000	.008		

Note: (Model $\chi^2(20)$ =1616.97, p < 0.001), -2 Log likelihood=2457.98, Cox & Snell R²=.260, Nagelkerke R²=.489

CHAPTER VII

DETERMINANTS AND CONSEQUENCES OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION

This chapter analyzes the determinants and consequences of cross-border migration. The determining factors of migration are associated with the region of origin and also with the factors associated with destination.

The first section of this chapter describes the migration process of cross-border migrants. The determinants of migration are analyzed in second section and the third section analyzes consequences of cross-border migration.

7.1 Migration Process of Cross-border Migrants

The migration process involves networks that include relatives, neighbours and friends with migration experience, and informal and formal recruitment agents. In addition, ancestors and senior household members who have participated in cross-border migration in the past can be catalysts for migrants to take decision on cross-border migration process.

7.1.1 Involvement of Ancestors in Cross-border Migration

Out of total 426 cross-border migrants, 172 (40.4%) migrant's ancestors were found participating in cross-border migration to India, which composed 62 (36%), and 110 (64%) return and current migrants (Figure 7.1a).

Among the total of 172 migrants' ancestors, 13.4 per cent had participated in cross-border migration since the time before grandfathers, 39 per cent participated since the time of grandfather, and 48 per cent from the time if their fathers (Table 7.1, Figure 7.1b and Box 7.1).

More than two thirds of migrant's ancestors participating in cross-border migration are indicative of high degree of continuity of cross-border migrants through generations. This represents the inter-generational transmission of negative and positive experiences of cross-border migration. Many migrant sending households have a migration 'tradition' which is passed from one generation to the next.

Douticipation of Anasstans in Cusse hander	Ret	urn	Curr	ent	Total		
Migration	Mig	rants	Migra	ants	Migrants		
Migration	n	%	n	%	Ν	%	
Yes	62	40.0	110	40.6	172	40.4	
No	93	60.0	161	59.4	254	59.6	
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0	
If Yes, Since When?						·	
Before my grandfather's time	9	14.5	14	12.7	23	13.4	
During my grandfather's time	25	40.3	42	38.2	67	39.0	
From my father's time	28	45.2	54	49.1	82	47.6	
Total	62	100.0	110	100.0	172	100.0	

Table 7.1: Distribution of Migrants According to their Ancestors Participated in
Cross-Border Migration

Source: Field Survey, 2011.

Figure 7.1: Per cent of Migrant According to their Ancestors involvement in cross-border Migration



Source: Table 7.1.



Ancestor's Participation and Satisfaction

Migration is a continuation of the work of our past generation. It started since the period of forefathers for searching employment from my home district/locality. I have involved supplying labour for construction work in Laddakh. I worked for 8 hours per day and earned IC 250 per month.

Most of the investment of remittances goes for household expenditure and repaying the debt. The workers of Nuwakot and Sindhupalchowk are found skillful in constructing walls, bridges and houses. Usually migrants stay 6 months in working place and return back earning IC 25,000-40,000. The wage rate is per the agreement made between contractors and employers.

Usually one month's salary (wage) of each worker is taken by contractor. Lack of employment opportunity in Nepal is one of the main determinants of cross-border migration. I am happy and satisfied because "my own village's unemployed youths are getting opportunity of work by which their household expenditure is meeting well and they are gaining skills of work and will earn more in the days to come.

7.1.2 Source of Information of Cross-border Migrants

The social process of network growth helps to explain the migration. Migrant networks are about 40 per cent of cross-border migrants, friends were their source of information followed by family members (26.5%), relatives, and about 9 per cent of previous migrants (Table 7.2 and Figure 7.2). The sources of information also were from Meith who receives commission from both employers and migrants.

Social networks create the transferability of social capital to incoming migrants and yield a better circulation of necessary information, which fosters mobility (Massey et al, 1994). Such network effects can result in either benefits (positive externality) or costs (negative externality) for the host country and its citizens (Massey et al, 1993). Positive externalities imply that the utility of the migrant will be larger in the host country, when social networks of peers are well-developed and maintained. Migration networks are an influential factor in the migration decision (Fawcett, 1989). Migration networks serve to reduce the costs and risks of migration, making it a more attractive option (Wilpert, 1992). Networks further facilitate migration by giving assistance before, during and after the migration, not only by giving information, but also by, for instance, financing travel costs or helping to find housing or a job (Hugo, 1981). In this way networks make international migration attractive as a strategy for survival or to improve one's situation (Massey et al., 1993).

Return Current Total Sources of Information of Cross-border Migrants **Migrants Migrants Migrants** n % n % Ν % Friends 62 40.0 107 39.5 169 39.7 Family members 28 18.1 85 31.4 113 26.5 25 16.1 26.9 98 23.0 Relatives 73 Worked there before 23.2 36 36 8.5 --4 9 Meith 2.6 5 1.8 2.1 0.4 1 Manpower/ agent 1 0.2 _ -Total 155 100.0 271 100.0 426 100.0

Table 7.2: Distribution of Cross-border Migrants According to their Sources ofInformation

Source: Field Survey, 2011





Source: (Table 7.2.

7.1.3 Cross-border Migrants and their Fellows while Joining Work

Migration is a process of social change where an individual, alone or accompanied by others, because of one or more reasons of economic betterment, political upheaval, education or other purposes, leaves one geographical area for prolonged stay or permanent settlement in another geographical area. Family, friendship and community networks underlie much of recent migration study. Networks accompany the development of migration system and the growing awareness of determinants of migration.

Out of total 426 total migrants, about 36 per cent reported that they joined alone in their working place in India, 31 per cent were accompanied by friends, 17 per cent accompanied by relatives, 15 per cent accompanied by family members and only two per cent by Meiths (Table 7.3 and Figure 7.3. This shows that about two thirds of cross-border migrants used available network to work in India.

 Table 7.3: Distribution of Cross-border Migrants According to their Accompanies while Joining to Work in India

Accompanies of Cuese hander Missante	Ret	turn	Cu	rrent	Total	
Accompanies of Cross-Dorder Migrants While Joining to Work	Mig	rants	Mig	grants	Migrants	
while Johning to work	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Alone	53	34.2	100	36.9	153	35.9
Friends	56	36.1	75	27.7	131	30.8
Relatives	24	15.5	48	17.7	72	16.9
Family members	17	11.0	45	16.6	62	14.5
Meith	5	3.2	3	1.1	8	1.9
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2011



Figure 7.3: Per cent of Migrants According to Accompany while Crossing the border

7.1.4 Decision Makers of Cross-border Migrants while Joining Work

Demographic attributes, life- cycle stage, attachment to place, social capital and environmental values, drive migration decisions. An individual moves with an expectation for being better off elsewhere. Family is the decision-making unit because household income rather than individual income is the appropriate concept for studying income influences on migration.

Cross-border migrants themselves are mainly responsible to carry out decision in migration process. Out of total cross-border migrants, almost two thirds made their own decision to migrate for work in India. Parents and spouse together account for about one third of the cross-border migrants to decide to migrate to India for work (Table 7.4 and Figure 7.4).

Table 7.4: Distribution of Decision Maker of Cross-border Migrants in MigrationProcess

Decision Makers of Migrants	Ret	turn	Current		Total	
	Mig	rants	Migrants		Migrants	
	n	%	Ν	%	Ν	%

Source: Table 7.3.

Self	98	63.2	185	68.3	283	66.4
Parents	34	21.9	60	22.1	94	22.1
Spouse	23	14.8	20	7.4	43	10.1
Friends/ accompanies	-	-	4	1.5	4	0.9
Seniors/ respected persons of community	-	-	2	0.7	2	0.5
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0

Figure 7.4: Per cent Distribution of Main Decision Maker in Migration Process



Source: Table 7.4.

7.2 Determinants of Cross-border Migration

Various factors such as employment opportunities, wage levels, land ownership, transport and communication, kinship ties, inheritance system, community facilities, and ethnic composition influence the decision of cross-border migration going to India for work. Personal and household characteristics are also important determinants of cross-border migration. Migration can result from poverty, but it is not always the poorest who migrate, because of the costs and opportunities involved (World Bank, 2005). All major studies on migration agree that economic disparities between developing and developed countries continue to be the key determinant of cross-border movements for poor countries (UNDP, 2005).

7.2.1 Reasons for Choosing India as the Destination

In the study area, 27.7 per cent of decided to go to India for they did not need passport and visa followed by easy to work (23.7%), presence of family members (17.1%), presence of neighbors/friends, (16.2%) and ancestral flow (14.8%). The composition of return and current migrants' reasons of choosing India are presented in Table 7.5 and Figure 7.5.

	Ret	urn	Cur	rent	Total	
Reasons for Choosing India	Mig	rants	Mig	rants	Migrants	
	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Less administrative problems (no need of nassport & visas)	46	29.7	72	26.7	118	27.7
Chaop process (apply to work	20	24.5	62	22.2	101	22.7
Cheap process/ easy to work	30	24.3	05	23.2	101	23.1
Presence of family members and relatives	19	12.3	54	19.9	73	17.1
Presence of neighbours/ friends	25	16.1	44	16.2	69	16.2
Ancestral flow (cross-border migration)	25	16.1	38	14.0	63	14.8
Prior information available	2	1.3	-	-	2	0.5
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0

Table 7.5: Distribution of Cross-border Migrants by Reasons for Choosing India

Source: Field Survey, 2011.

Figure 7.5: Per cent of Migrants According to Reasons for choosing India



Source: Table 7.5.

Box 7.2: Key informant Interview with Activist of Emigration Counseling Center

Low Risk and Investment, Similar Cultural and Religious Factors

Crossing the border to join work in India has comparatively less risk and investment. No need of any documents including educational qualification. Nepalese Migrants workers in India generally draw 6000 NRs per month. The wage of night security guard is high where as wage of other labour is low. Other additional facilities and income depends upon the role of Meith/ contractor. Some time Contractor escapes by taking migrants wages from employers.

Most of migrants have no knowledge on migrants' right at their working place. Poverty, lack of employment opportunities and decreasing agricultural land size at the place of origin are the main determinants of migration. Availability of work, similar cultural, religious factors and ancestor's participation in cross-border migration are other factors of determining migration to India.

7.2.2 Lack of Employment and Household Poverty

Lack of employment opportunity in the study area was the dominant reason for crossborder migration to India. More than two-third 289 (67.8%) cross-border migrants reported that their reason behind cross-border migration to India was lack of employment opportunity in their place of residence. This was followed by debt (13.6%), to increase household income (7.7%), and friends and accompany (6.3%). Other reasons are relatively less important (Table 7.6 and figure 7.6).

Reasons of Cross-border	Ret Mig	urn rants	Cur Mig	rent rants	Total Migrants	
inigration	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Lack of employment (here)	99	63.9	190	70.1	289	67.8
Due to debt	20	12.9	38	14.0	58	13.6
To increase household income	16	10.3	17	6.3	33	7.7
Friends accompany	11	7.1	16	5.9	27	6.3
Employment opportunities (India)	5	0.3	3	1.1	8	1.9
For child's Education	1	0.6	6	2.2	7	1.6
Due to conflict/ political instability	2	13	1	0.3	3	0.7
(here)	2	1.5	1	0.5	5	0.7
Generational (ancestors) practice	1	0.6	-	-	1	0.2
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0

 Table 7.6: Distribution of Cross-border Migrants According to their Reasons for

 Migration

Source: Field Survey, 2011.



Figure 7.6: Per cent of Migrants with Reasons for Cross-border Migration

Source: Table 7.6.

Out of total of 386 migrant households, almost 90 per cent expressed no alternative to cross-border migration, mainly because of poverty of the household in the origin (74.4%) and lack of employment opportunity at home (24.1%). Expression of the reasons for cross-border migration by their family members is presented in Table 7.7 and Box 7.2.

Box: 7.3: Key Informant Interview with Labour Contractor/ Meith

Poverty and Unemployment: Main Causes of Cross-border Migration

Mostly youths from Dalits and Tharu communities participate in cross-border migration to India. The migration flow generally starts in February and ends in May. During this period, a migrant earns about IC 20,000-30,000 depending upon the nature of work, experience, level of education and previous training. Hill originated migrants from Nepal work in hill areas of India in construction of road, hydropower dam and buildings, while Tarai originated migrants work in warm places in (Punjab, Delhi and Bangalore mainly in industrial sectors. Contractor provides advance money to run household's expenses of migrants and gets the money back from income of migrants' working places. In addition, contractor draws one month income/salary from each migrant who has joined work through him. Main causes of cross-border migration to India are poverty, unemployment and lack of infrastructural development at the place of origin.

A Contractor/Meith from Kailali

Having no Alternatives of Cross- border Migration	HH with return migrants		HH cur mig	HH with current migrants		th both ent & ırn) cants	Total		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	Ν	%	
Yes	94	81.7	211	91.3	39	97.5	344	89.1	
No	21	18.3	20	8.7	1	2.5	42	10.9	
Total	115	100.0	231	100.0	40	100.0	386	100.0	
If Compulsion what are	the reaso	ons behin	d it?						
Poverty	68	72.3	157	74.4	31	79.5	256	74.4	
Unemployment	24	25.6	51	24.2	8	20.5	83	24.1	
Had to earn for family members education	2	2.1	1	0.5	-	-	3	0.9	
Political conflict	-	-	2	1.0	-	-	2	0.8	
Total	94	100.0	211	10.0	39	100.0	344	100.0	

 Table 7.7: Distribution of Households Expressing the Reasons for Cross-border

 Migration of their Family Members

Source: Field Survey, 2011.

7.2.3 Low Income

Sawhill et al. (1988) discussed how income and needs are affected by short-term economic factors such as employment availability and wage levels; long-term economic factors such as education and training; demographic factors such as marriage, fertility, and migration; and programmatic factors such as tax rates and public assistance. A drop in income leads to a relatively large contemporaneous reduction in consumption due to abject poverty and food deficit.

7.2.4 Land Holding Size

Land is the most important source of income and economic asset in underdeveloped society indicating an ability to earn income (VanWey, 2005). Income from agriculture is not sufficient for marginal and small land holders. The volume of cross-border migrants in the study area was low among landless and small land owners with less than 5 Kattha of land. The volume of migrants was high among land size holders 5 to less than 10 and 10 to less than 20 Kattha of land size. The volume of migrants decreased to households having land size more than 20 Kattha of land.

The relationship between land and cost of migration (Winters et al, 2001), indicates an ability to finance migration regardless of the distance and the destination. The cost of migration constrains the decision to migrate for landless and marginal land holders.

Different income groups also have different propensities to migrate. There seems to be theoretical and empirical regularity that the poorest are less capable of migrating due to burdens of costs and risks (de Haas et al., 2009).

7.2.5 Indebtedness

Among the study population, about 14 per cent were indebted. Rural households are extremely under the pressure of debt and structural adjustment (Bryceson, 1995). Ahlburg and Brown (1998) hypothesized that remittance receiving households maintained the migrant's social ties, connections and standing in the home community. Many times the migrant is in debt to the household to which it remits; these implicit loans could have resulted from the household paying for an education or the cost to migrate.

7.2.6 Frequency of Migrants Crossing the Border

About 15 per cent of migrants crossed the border for the first time; 35.7 per cent crossed for 2-5 times; 23.5 per cent crossed for 6-10 times, and 25.1 per cent crossed the border for more than 11 times. This shows that individual's history of past mobility has developed social networks in several geographical locations. They know how to build and maintain social networks. For these people, the psychosocial costs of mobility are likely to be lower and have better information based on personal experience concerning the various cost-aspects of migration, and are consequently better able to evaluate the costs and benefits of mobility.

The reason for past mobility also represents an important factor. People who moved for demographic reasons, such as marriage, have invested in long -term relationships. They have increased their stock of social capital in the current place of residence, which makes them less likely to move again in the future. On the contrary, people who moved for job-related reasons are not primarily investing in long-term relationships. They are more aware of their employment opportunities, and how to optimize work and income conditions. If better opportunities arise, they may change employers again. Therefore, people who moved for work-related reasons are more likely expected to express the intention to move again, while people who moved for demographic or family reasons are less likely to express such intentions.

7.2.7 Off Farming Duration

The season/time of joining their working place by crossing the border from migrant's households showed that 51 per cent of households left their homes during the agriculturally off seasons at their place of origin. Another 48 per cent, however, remain at home by giving priority to their own agricultural work. The decision of households to migrate is also influenced by availability of work at their destination (Table 7.8 and Figure 7.8)

Season/ Time of Participation	HH retu migr	with urn °ants	HH with current migrants		HH wi (curr retu migi	th both ent & ırn) °ants	Te	otal
	n	%	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
During agriculture off season	69	60.0	104	45.0	24	60.0	197	51.0
Unsure/ in all seasons	45	39.1	124	53.7	16	4.0	185	47.9
During time of cultivation/ harvesting	1	0.9	3	1.3	-	-	4	1.1
Total	115	100.0	231	100.0	40	100.0	386	100.0

 Table 7.8: Distribution of Households according to their Season/Time of

 Participation in Cross-border migration

Figure 7.7: Per cent of Households according to Season/Time of Migration



Source: (Table 7.8.

7.3 Consequences of Cross-border Migration

Labor migration has become a persistent and accelerating reality in many developing countries. How this impacts on family members including intergenerational solidarity is a matter of considerable debate (Knodel et al., 2007). A critical issue in order to determine

the consequences of migration to the source country is how the remittances are used. Remittances are mostly used purchasing food and clothes to meet the family's basic needs. The second priority for the use of remittances is to improve living conditions, which is likely to imply the building of a new house or improving on the old one, acquisition of domestic appliances and so forth and the third priority for reducing the debts (King et al. 2003). However, it is not self-evident that, for instance, a household with low rates of consumption of clothes and food and higher expenditure for other purposes is necessarily better off than a household with a high rate of consumption of basic necessities. This is because it is conceivable that different consumption patterns are hidden within the consumption category.

Remittances play a different role in each country, depending on the given economic situation and the time frame in question. Benefits of remittances to the countries of origin are numerous. Remittances may improve income distribution and quality of life beyond what other available development approaches could deliver, especially if the poor, unskilled labour emigrated. Most studies about remittance uses found that remittances are spent on current consumption, health, and education, leading thus, to improve standards of living for emigrant households compared to non-emigrant households (El Sakka, 2004). For many migrants, sending remittances to support their family is a moral and social obligation. Remittances also enhance migrants' social status, and enable them to maintain a foothold in their home area, so that they will be welcome upon their return (Tacoli, 2002).

Factors affecting the amount and frequency of remittances include the level of migrant's earnings, migrant's legal position in the destination country (regular/irregular), the length of the stay abroad, migrant's marital/family status (e.g. whether he/she has children in the destination country), migrant's desire to return, exchange rates, political risk, access to facilities for transferring funds, and the nature of the relationship between the migrant and family back home (Kabki et al., 2003).

Once remittances are repatriated to the country of origin, emigrants and their families make key decisions as to how these resources are to be used. In general, emigrants choose between consumption and investment. This does not mean however, that these decisions are purely personal. In fact government policies can play a significant role in directing remittances towards specific uses. The issue of remittance uses by emigrants or their households has been the most debatable issue concerning the net benefit of the countries of origin out of remittance inflows. Remittances do not appear to be an outright benefit as they are supposed to be for the countries of origin. Some argue that remittances are used primarily for non-productive uses, and concluded that remittances do little to stimulate development in the countries of origin. The relatively few studies carried about the uses of remittances indicate that savings generated by remittances are often directed to purchases of non-productive assets. Evidences from microeconomic surveys show that purchase of land, housing and other real assets, are the most common uses of remittances in the country of origin. In some cases this resulted in skyrocketing prices of these real assets. The remainder is used for debt repayment and financing future emigration (El Sakka, 2004).

7.3.1 Duration of Stay and Income of Cross-border Migrants

The average monthly earnings of cross-border migrants varied on the basis of duration of stay at their working places in India. Table 7.9 shows the average monthly income of migrants reflects that as the duration of stay increases, migrants' monthly average income also increases among both return and current migrants.

The positive contribution of longer stay abroad may be attributed to the fact that it contributed towards improvement in salary package through periodical increment. The longer stay may also lead to the improvement in skill and experience which consequently contributes to the improvement of income. The determinants of duration of stay of cross-border migrants depend on relative deprivation at their working place. This is corroborated by econometric evidence and migrants which are positively selected on education, networks are insignificant determinants of duration of stay (Huber and Nowotny, 2009).

Duration of Stay (in months)	Return Migrants	Current Migrants
<4	6,227.6	6,806.7
4-6	7,312.5	6,846.9
7 – 11	7,461.3	8,005.0
12+	7,627.7	8,248.4
Total	7,154.8	7,299.3

Table 7.9: Duration of Stay at Working Place and Mean Income of Cross-borderMigrants

7.3.2 Remittances and Household's Consumption

Among the migrants' households, the main areas of the use of remittances was to fulfill basic needs (food and clothes) for 197 (51.0%), children's education 45 (11.7%), repay debts 38 (9.8%), to add properties 24 (6.2%), construct or renovate house 22 (5.7%), celebration of customs/festivals 4 (1%) and health care and treatment 3 (0.8%). In the study area, 53 (13.7%) migrant's households did not receive any income or remittances from cross-border migration of their family members (Table 7.10 and Figure 7.10).

The use of remittances in migrants' households depends upon household's wealth status. A non-poor family might, for instance, choose to buy expensive ready-to-wear clothing or imported goods where as a poor family may give priority to meet daily or basic needs of households. Household's goods build or repair house, pay off debt, education, health and agriculture. Remittances may help improve economic growth, especially if used for financing children's education or health expenses. Even when they are used for consumption, remittances generate multiplier effects, especially in the countries with high unemployment (WB, 2009).

In this context, labour migration generates a relatively stable source of income that contributes to the support of migrant workers' family members back home, enabling them to invest in education, health and housing, thus improving household living conditions and reducing vulnerability of family members, especially women and children. Remittances, therefore, constitute a steady source of poverty reduction (IOM, 2009). Kule et al., (2002) suggests that over 50 per cent of the remittance sent to Albania was

used for consumption, and 30% was invested. Up to 80 per cent of remittances are used for basic household consumption and 5-10 per cent is used to invest in human capital such as education, health, and better nutrition (Sanders 2003a and Suro, 2003).

Main area of Use of remittances	HH with return migrants		HH curi migi	with rent ·ants	HH with both (current & return) migrants		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Basic needs (food, cloth)	60	52.2	115	49.8	22	55.0	197	51.0
Children's education	13	11.3	27	11.7	5	12.5	45	11.7
Repay debts	13	11.3	20	8.7	5	12.5	38	9.8
Add household properties	9	7.8	12	5.2	3	7.5	24	6.2
Construct/ reconstruct house	3	2.6	16	6.9	3	7.5	22	5.7
Celebrate customs/ festival/ marriage	-	-	3	1.3	1	2.5	4	1.0
Health care/ treatment	-	-	2	0.8	1	2.5	3	0.8
No income from foreign migration	17	14.8	36	15.6	-	-	53	13.7
Total	115	100.0	231	100.0	40	100.0	386	100.0

Table 7.10: Distribution of Households by Main Area of Use of Remittances

Source: Field Survey, 2011.



Figure 7.8: Per cent of Households with Main area of Investment of Remittance

Source: Table 7.10.

7.3.3 Improvement in Human Capital

Human resource can be transformed into human capital with effective inputs of education, health and moral values. The transformation of raw human resource into highly productive human resource with these inputs is the process of human capital formation. Human capital is the stock of competencies, knowledge, social and personality attributes, including creativity, embodied in the ability to perform labour so as to produce economic value. First, migration prospects can influence the education decision of both migrants and stayers (Stark et al., 1997, 1998; Beine et al., 2001). Second, when migrants remit part of their earnings back to their households, they can affect the consumption, investment and employment decisions of the recipients. Also, the decision to increase human capital investments by recipient households generates a job creation externality on non recipient households (Kugler, 2005). Hence, migration fosters human capital formation provided that not too many educated individuals emigrate out of the country. In this case, remittances are a financial arrangement to make possible the materialization of the brain gain brought about by migration prospects.

7.3.4 Improvement on Education of Children

Among the total cross-border migrants households (386), 231(59.8%) households were able in improving their children's education, 5 (1.3%) household's children education was negatively affected and 150 (38.9%) household's children were found without any change in their field of education after and before households members joined the cross-border migration. Education to family members, quality education, higher education and education of their children in India were mentioned the main activities in the field of education among migrant's households (Table 7.11 and Figure 7.9).

The literature finds a close positive relation between remittances and education. Different studies conclude that remittances improve educational indicators, increasing human capital. Others, in the line of Hanson and Woodruff (2003) and Whaba (1996) maintained that migration of the household head can have disruptive effects on family life and have a negative impact on the children's school performance. But given the limited amount of empirical studies on this subject, this hypothesis cannot be proved so well (UNICEF, 2007). In the Philippines remittances buffered the impact of the Asian financial crisis of the late nineties; remittances increased, improving school attendance, while reducing young children's work hours (Yang, 2004). Bryant (2005) argues that in the Philippines remittances were used to send children to private schools, considered better than public schools. He suggests that children in left behind households have a higher probability of attending private schools, and that on average they got better grades than non-migrant children.

Education of Children	HH retu migr	with urn •ants	HH cur migi	with rent cants	HH with both (current & returned) migrants		Te	otal
	n	%	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Yes, improved	69	60.0	137	59.3	25	62.5	231	59.8
No any change	44	38.3	93	40.3	13	32.5	150	38.9
Worse than before	2	1.7	1	0.4	2	5.0	5	1.3
Total	115	100.0	231	100.0	40	100.0	386	100.0

Table 7.11: Distribution of Households According to Improvement in Education of
Children

If improved or worsened that	If improved or worsened than previous what were happened?										
Education to son/ daughter/	16	64.8	85	61.6	17	63.0	1/18	62.7			
sister/ brother	40	04.0	85	01.0	1 /	05.0	140	02.7			
Children education in	15	21.1	40	20.0	5	18.5	60	25 4			
private boarding school	15	21.1	40	29.0	5	10.5	00	23.4			
Achieved higher education	4	5.6	4	2.9	-	-	8	3.4			
Children education in India	2	2.8	4	2.9	2	7.4	8	3.4			
Tuition for children	1	1.4	4	2.9	1	3.7	6	2.5			
Managed cost for own	1	1.4					1	0.4			
education	1	1.4	-	-	-	-	1	0.4			
After I went to India,	2	28	1	0.7	2	7.4	5	2.1			
Children leave school	2	2.0	1	0.7	2	/.4	5	2.1			
Total	71	100.0	138	100.0	27	100.0	236	100.0			

Figure 7.9: Per cent of Households According to Impact of Remittance on Education of Children



Source: Table 7.11.

7.3.5 Improvement in Health Status of Family

In the study area, among the total migrant's households (386), 203 (52.6%) households reported that their health service capacity has been enhanced, 182 (47.1%) households have not any change on their health status after or before involvement of their family member in cross-border migration and only one household mentioned the negative effect

on health service capacity after migration of family member to India. Timely check up, nutritional and balanced diet, immunization and decreased dependency with witchdoctor were major improvements in health sector (Table 7.12 and Figure 7.10).

There are few studies linking remittances with health, particularly in communities of origin, the majority concentrating on the Mexican case. Migration can affect health and mortality in different ways: by changing individuals' and communities' resources and investment patterns, altering social and family networks, and also providing information about health and life styles. Given that remittances do not bring immediate changes in health, most studies use maternal and child mortality rates as the first key indicator to be evaluated. This makes sense, due to the multidimensional relationship between migration and health. In this line, Lopez (2005) found that in Mexico remittances reduced child mortality in every region. Duryea et al. (2005) suggests that remittances have a positive impact on infants surviving beyond their first month of life. Likewise, remittances affect mortality indirectly as households invest in improvements in their living conditions or better housing).

Kana'iaupuni and Donato (1999) examined how village migration patterns affected infant survival outcomes. Their study shows that remittance recipient households and children have improved their living standards, although it also points at negative effects of family disruption on children's general health during the first period of their parent's migration. In a second stage, remittances are able to improve children's access to health-care facilities, compensating the initial negative impacts. In the same line, Frank and Hummer (2002) analyzed the impact of the processes of international migration on the risk of low weight births, showing that belonging to a migrant household provides protection against the risk of low weight at birth, primarily due to remittance receipts.

Health Service/ capacity	HH ret migi	with urn °ants	1 HH with current s migrants		HH wi (curr retu migi	th both ent & ned) ants	Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Improved	56	48.7	114	49.4	33	82.5	203	52.6
No any change	58	50.4	117	50.6	7	17.5	182	47.2
Worsened than previous	1	0.9	-	-	-	-	1	0.2
Total	115	100.0	231	100.0	40	100.0	386	100.0
If Health Service/ Capac	ty Impro	oved or W	Vorsened	than Pre	vious wh	at were h	appened	?
Health check-up and treatment on timely	33	57.9	78	68.4	21	63.7	132	64.7
Joined to private hospital/ clinic/ medical shop	16	28.1	29	25.4	10	30.3	55	27.0
Dependent with witch doctor decreased	5	8.8	3	2.6	1	3.0	9	4.4
Regular diet/ health improvement	1	1.8	4	3.5	1	3.0	6	2.9
Immunization for children	1	1.8	-	-	-	-	1	0.5
Unable to carry out treatment	1	1.8	-	-	-	-	1	0.5
Total	57	100.0	114	100.0	33	100.0	204	100.0

Table 7.12: Distribution of Households According to Improvement on Health Services/ Capacity)

Source: Field Survey, 2011.



Figure 7.10: Per cent of Migrants According to Health Status After Migration

Significant improvement on sanitation was observed among the migrant's households. Among the total households, 219 (56.7%) households reported that their sanitation and health condition had been improved, 162 (42%) households had not any change in sanitation and health condition 5 (1.3%) households informed that their households member (who crossed the border) health condition had been deteriorated due to HIV/AIDS infections (Table 7.13).

Sanitation and Health Condition	HH ret migi	with urn cants	HH curi migr	with rent °ants	HH with both (current & returned) migrants		To	otal
	n	%	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Improved	68	59.1	126	54.5	25	62.5	219	56.7
No any change	43	37.4	104	45.0	15	37.5	162	42.0
Worsened than previous	4	3.5	1	0.5	-	-	5	1.3
Total	115	100.0	231	100.0	40	100.0	386	100.0
If Improved or Worsened	Improved or Worsened than Previous what were happened?							
Improvement on	66	95.8	120	94.5	24	96.0	210	95.0

 Table 7.13: Distribution of Households According to Improvement on Sanitation and Health Condition

Source: (Table 7. 12)

sanitation condition								
Learned to manage	1	14	2	16	_	_	3	14
waste	1	1.1	4	1.0			5	1.1
Conduct medical	_	_	2	16	_	_	2	0.9
treatment	-	-	2	1.0	-	-	2	0.7
HIV/ AIDS infected	1	1.4	3	2.3	1	4.0	5	2.3
Use of soap after	1	1 /					1	0.4
toileting	1	1.4	-	-	-	-	1	0.4
Total	69	100.0	127	100.0	25	100.0	221	100.0

Out of total migrant's households, 24 (6.2%) households members (migrated to India) have suffered from various communicable disease. Migration can encourage the spread of communicable disease as people carry viruses over long distances, and migrant populations tend to be vulnerable due to lack of health services and, in the case of HIV/AIDS, greater likelihood of risky sexual behavior (Table 7.14 and Figure 7.11).

Suffered by Diseases	HH with return migrants		HH with current migrants		HH with both (current & return) migrants		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Yes	8	7.0	11	4.8	5	12.5	24	6.2
No	107	93.0	220	95.2	35	87.5	362	93.8
Total	115	100.0	231	100.0	40	100.0	386	100.0
If suffered from any disease what were those diseases?								
Jaundice	2	25.0	4	36.4	1	20.0	7	29.2
Tuberculosis	3	37.5	3	27.3	-	-	6	25.0
HIV/ AIDs	1	12.5	3	27.3	1	20.0	5	20.8
Malaria	1	12.5	1	9.0	1	20.0	3	12.5
Typhoid	1	12.5	-	-	1	20.0	2	8.3
Diarrhea	-	-	-	-	1	20.0	1	4.2
Total	8	100.0	11	100.0	5	100.0	24	100.0

 Table 7.14: Distribution of Households According to Diseases Suffered by their

 Migrants Members

Source: Field Survey, 2011.



Figure 7.11: Number of Households According to Types of Diseases Suffered by Their Migrants Household Member

Source: Field Survey, 2011 (Table 7.14).

7.3.6 Improvement in Food Consumption, Quantity and Quality of Clothes of Household's Member

Among the cross-border migrants households 207 (53.6%) household reported their improvement on household's food consumption and 179 (46.4%) households had not any change (positive or negative) on food consumption. Availability of food sufficiency, nutrient contained food, fresh vegetable and fruit were the improved situation on food consumption among the migrant's households (Table 7.15).

UN- INSTRAW (2008), in a study on gender, remittances and development in the Philippines found that remittances contribute to improvement in food security of receiving households. Besides, the study also found a significant change in food consumption patterns – leading to increased consumption of quality foods and food away from home. Econometric analyses show that remittance income contributes to improved calorie supply at the household level. (Babatunde and Martinetti, 2011).

HH with Household's returned Consumption migrants		with rned cants	HH with current migrants		HH with both (current & returned) migrants		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Improved	64	55.7	116	50.2	27	67.5	207	53.6
No any change	51	44.3	115	49.8	13	32.5	179	46.4
Total	115	100.0	231	100.0	40	100.0	386	100.0
If Improved, What Improvements were Carried out?								
Food sufficiency	31	48.4	53	45.7	14	51.9	98	47.3
Consumption of Meat/ fish/ protein	27	42.2	50	43.1	9	33.3	86	41.5
Fresh vegetables	4	6.2	6	5.2	3	11.1	13	6.3
Consumption of milk/ curd	1	1.6	5	4.3	1	3.7	7	3.4
Fruits consumption	1	1.6	2	1.7	-	-	3	1.5
Total	64	100.0	116	100.0	27	100.0	207	100.0

 Table 7.15: Distribution of Households According to Improvement on Households

 Consumption

The situation of quantity and quality of clothes among members of migrant's households has improved significantly. Among the migrant's households 237 (61.4%) households experienced improvement of quantity and quality of clothes used by their family members and 149 (38.6%) households have not any experiences of changes on quantity and quality of clothes due to cross-border migration. New clothes at least twice a year, new and nice clothes were the main experienced by the households' members on quality and quantity of clothes (Table 7.16).

Table 7.16: Distribution of Households According to Improvement on Quantity and
Quality of Clothes for family Members

Quantity and Quality of Clothes	HH with return migrants		HH with current migrants		HH with both (current & return) migrants		Total				
	n	%	n	%	n	%	Ν	%			
Improved	68	59.1	138	59.7	31	77.5	237	61.4			
No any change	47	40.9	93	40.3	9	22.5	149	38.6			
Total	115	100.0	231	100.0	40	100.0	386	100.0			
If Improved, How does it happened?											
---------------------------------------	----	------	-----	-------	----	-------	-----	-------	--	--	--
At least two times a year new clothes	35	51.5	70	50.7	15	48.4	120	50.6			
Wearing of new and nice cloth	32	47.0	66	47.8	15	48.4	113	47.7			
No problem of clothes	1	1.5	2	1.5	1	3.2	4	1.7			
Total	68	28.7	138	100.0	31	100.0	237	100.0			

Source: Field Survey, 2011.

7.3.7 Role of Education

The variation of mean monthly income by literacy and level of education was observed among on both return and current migrants. Table 7.17 shows that, as the level of education had increased the monthly average income of migrants had also increased significantly. Education played vital role in human capital formation. Quality education, skills and competency increase the worker's efficiency as well as productivity. Furthermore, education also produces the efficient and skilled labour force. The workers with higher education may be able to get better income and more secured job as compared to those with low education or illiterate. Messinis and Cheng (2009) made an effort to examine the impact of education and job training on labour income for migrant workers in China. The study concluded that education and work experience play an important role to determine labour income. Lower middle school and higher education enhance wages by 12.1% and 10.3% respectively, and training also raises income by about 4.5 per cent.

Table 7.17: Distribution of Level of Educational Attainment and Mean MonthlyIncome of Cross-border Migrants (in NRs)

Literacy Status and Educational Attainment	Return Migrants	Current Migrants		
Illiterate	6,556.8	6,633.3		
Primary education including NFE	7,092.9	7,687.3		
Some secondary (6-10)	7,493.3	6,695.0		
SLC and above	12,777.8	10,560.0		
Total	7,154.8	7,299.3		

7.3.8 Role of Training

There has been variation on average income among any type of training received and not received by migrants for both return and current migrants. Table 7.18 shows that migrants without any training have earned on an average NRs 6,454 and NRs 6,833 respectively by return and current migrants. Whereas, the migrants having any type of training had earned NRs 6500 to NRs 32000 and NRs7700 to NRs 18,800 per month by return and current migrants respectively. This can help to conclude that the training received by migrants has been beneficial to increase their income at their working places. The effectiveness of workers' training programs depends on the quality and the relevance of the training provided as well the motivations from the migrant workers to receive the training, and employers' incentives to provide training. On average, a migrant worker reaches the peak of her income around 15-20 years of work experience and the returns to migrant work experience are considerable. The returns to job training are significant at about to increase 4.5 per cent of the wage distribution. Work experience as a migrant associated with substantial returns which provide again, to increase 10 per cent of the income distribution. (Messinis and Cheng, 2009)

Types of Tusining Dessived	Average Mo	nthly Income
Types of Training Received	Return Migrants	Current Migrants
Cook/ bakery	6,725.0	9,900.0
Driving	10,100.0	7,700.0
Sewing/ knitting	9,600.0	8,775.0
Wood/ furniture/ bamboo materials	6,500.0	7,533.3
Computer	14,240.0	18,800.0
Security guard	8,266.7	8,240.0
Agriculture	8,533.3	-
Dolls making	-	10,200.0
Welding	-	16,000.0
Bicycle maintenance	7,000.0	-
Painting	9,600.0	-
Sub overseer	32,000.0	-
No training	6,454.5	6,833.3
Total	7,154.8	7, 299.3

 Table 7.18: Distribution of Types and Training Received by Cross-border Migrants and their Average Monthly Income Sent at Home (In NRs.)

7.3. 9 Saving, Investment in Physical Properties and Cash Accumulation

Among the migrants households of study area, out of 386 households, 193 (50%) households were able to improve economic savings with the help of remittances. 183 (47.4%) households mentioned they have not any change in their economic saving or remained as usual status. 10 (2.6%) households reported their economic condition had worsened than their previous economic status i.e. before joining cross-border migration (Table 7.19 and Figure 7.12).

Remittances are used primarily for consumption and investment in human capital (education, health, better nutrition). Investment in land, livestock, and housing is also relatively common but secondary to satisfying daily needs and meeting expenses related to human capital (de Haan, 2000). A significant portion of remittances sent to households is spent on housing investment and purchase of land. Kenyan households invest 55.3 per cent of remittances received from outside Africa and 47 per cent of remittances from other African countries in land purchases, building houses, businesses, improving the farm, agricultural equipment and other investments In many other countries, a large part of remittances are invested in real estate, reflecting both a desire of migrants to provide housing to families left behind, and a lack of other investment instruments in the recipient community. Whether remittances are used for consumption or buying houses, or for other investments, they generate positive effects on the economy by stimulating demand for other goods and services (WB, 2010).

Economic Status	Return Migrants		Current Migrants		Both Migrants		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Improve on economic saving	50	43.5	115	49.8	28	70.0	193	50.0
No change/ as usual	62	53.9	111	48.0	10	25.0	183	47.4
Worsened than previous	3	2.6	5	2.2	2	5.0	10	2.6
Total	115	100.0	231	100.0	40	100.0	386	100.0

 Table 7.19: Distribution of Households According to Economic Status after Involvement in Cross-border Migration



Figure 7.12:. Per cent of Migrant's Household according to Economic Status After Migration of Household Member

Out of total migrants households (386) only 101 (26.2%) or out of improved on economic saving of 193 households, 101 (52.3%) households have invested their remittances primarily in buying land, construction of house, electrification and construction of latrine. Nearly three fourth migrants household's have not any achievement of accumulation of physical properties (Table 7.20).

Improvement on Physical	Returned		Current		Bo	oth	Total			
Proportios	Migrants		Migrants		Migrants		I otai			
Toperties	n	%	n	%	n	%	Ν	%		
Yes	24	20.9	64	27.7	13	32.5	101	26.2		
No	91	79.1	167	72.3	27	67.5	285	73.8		
Total	115	100.0	231	100.0	40	100.0	386	100.0		
If yes, what are the areas of investment and mean amount (in NRs)										
Buy land	375,	500.0	295,667.7		254,333.3		303,480.0			
Construction of house	107,2	294.1	237,133.3		198,500.0		201,111.1			
Electric fitting	40,000.0		-		-		40,000.0			
Toilet construction	19,000.0		10,000.0		-		16,000.0			
Total (N)	2	4	64		13		101			

 Table 7.20: Distribution of Households According to Improvement on Physical

 Properties and areas of investment after Cross-border Migration

Source: Table 7.19

Among the cross-border migrants households only 30 (7.8%) households have been able to accumulate cash properties with the help remittances procured from cross-border migration and 3 (0.7%) households have negative effect on their cash properties due to being unable to pay loan with interest. There have been not any changes in cash properties for 353 (91.5%) households. These showed that cross-border migration of Nepalese people to India have not been fruitful to accumulate cash properties among the migrant households of the study area (Table 7.21).

Cash Properties	HH with return migrants		HH with current migrants		HH with both (current & return) migrants		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Improved	10	8.7	17	7.4	3	7.5	30	7.8
No any change	103	89.6	213	92.2	37	92.5	353	91.5
Worsened than	2	17	1	0.4			2	0.7
previous	2	1./	1	0.4	-	-	5	0.7
Total	115	100.0	231	100.0	40	100.0	386	100.0
If, Earned Cash propert	ies or Wo	orsened th	han Previ	ous Situd	tion wha	ut were ho	appened?	•
Bank balance	9	75.0	15	83.2	2	66.7	26	78.8
Free from debt	1	8.3	1	5.6	1	33.3	3	9.1
Difficult to pay interest	2	16.7	1	5.6	-	-	3	9.1
Life insurance	-	-	1	5.6	-	-	1	3.0
Total	12	100.0	18	100.0	3	100.0	33	100.0

 Table 7.21: Distribution of Households According to Accumulated Cash Properties after Cross-border Migration

Source: Field Survey, 2011,

7.3.10 Relationship within Family Members, Neighborhood and Participation in Religious and Cultural Activities

Among the migrants households 210 (54.4%) households have not any change in relationship within family members and their neighborhood and they are living with as usual environment before and after cross-border migration of their household members. In the study area, 167 (43.3%) households experience was found improved in the situation of relationship within family members and neighborhood and 9 (2.3%) households' experience was found worsening relationship within family members and

neighborhood after cross-border migration of their family members. Enabling to receive debt, good relationship and cooperation within family members and with neighborhood was the factors help feel the improved relationship. Jealous behavior of neighborhood and difficult to obtain debt were main factors the worsening relationship (Table 7.22).

Table 7.22: Distribution of Households According to Improvement of Relationship
within family members and Neighborhood after Cross-border Migration
of Households Members

Relationship within family members and Neighborhood	HH with return migrants		HH with current migrants		HH with both (current & return) migrants		Total				
	n	%	n	%	n	%	Ν	%			
Improved	50	43.5	91	39.4	26	65.0	167	43.3			
No any change	60	52.2	136	58.9	14	35.0	210	54.4			
Worsened than previous	5	4.3	4	1.7	-	-	9	2.3			
Total	115	100.0	231	100.0	40	100.0	386	100.0			
If, Relationship Improved or Worsened than before what were those factors?											
Being easier to receive debt	35	63.6	55	57.9	19	73.1	109	61.9			
Good relationship and cooperation	15	27.3	35	36.8	7	26.9	57	32.4			
Jealous behavior of neighbor	3	5.5	4	4.2	-	-	7	4.0			
Difficult to obtain debt	2	3.6	-	-	-	-	2	1.1			
Release from dominating environment	-	-	1	1.1	-	-	1	0.6			
Total	55	100.0	95	100.0	26	100.0	176	100.0			

Source: Field Survey, 2011.

Among the sample households of study area 211 (54.7%) households have not any changes in participation in religious and cultural activities due to involvement of their family members in cross-border migration process, where as 173 (44.8%) reported that their participation in social and cultural activities has been increased after participated in cross-border migration from their family. Only 2 (0.5%) household's participation has been reduced than previous. Consumption of meat, well dress up, enjoyment with friends and use of imitation while participating in religious and cultural activities were the main

feeling of their improvement of participation. The feeling of loneliness due to absence of their family members was the only one cause mentioned by households with having worsened participation than previous on their religious and cultural activities (Table 7.23).

Religious and Cultural Activities	HH with return migrants		HH with current migrants		HH with both (current & return) migrants		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Participation increased	54	47.0	96	41.6	23	57.5	173	44.8
No any change	61	53.0	133	57.6	17	42.5	211	54.7
Worsened than previous	-	-	2	0.8	-	-	2	0.5
Total	115	100.0	231	100.0	40	100.0	386	100.0
If Improved or Worsened on Part	icipatio	n what a	ictivitie	es were p	erforn	ned or pe	erceived	?
Meat of chicken/ he goat	21	38.9	35	35.7	8	34.8	64	36.6
Nice food and well dress up	19	35.2	33	33.7	6	26.1	58	33.1
Enjoyed with friends	14	25.9	25	25.5	9	39.1	48	27.4
Celebration of festival by imitation	-	-	3	3.1	-	-	3	1.7
Lonely feeling due to absence of HH member	-	-	2	2.0	-	-	2	1.1
Total	54	100.0	98	100.0	23	100.0	175	100.0

Table 7.23: Distribution of Households According to Increase in Participation in
Religious and Cultural Activities

Source: Field Survey, 2011.

7.4 Perceived Advantages and Disadvantages of Cross-border Migration

After the cross-border migration of family member from migrant's households, their household's level perceptions were found different. Migrant's households expressed their views in both advantages and disadvantages due to involvement of their household members' in migration to India to join work. Economic Improvement, loan repayment, education to the children, construction of house and purchase of land were the main achievements of households after cross-border migration of their family members. Out of total 386 households 58 (15%) households reported that they have not any advantages from involvement of their household members in cross-border migration to India. Mental tension, lack of working manpower at households' level, low income at working place,

discriminating environment and disturbance in continuation of education were the main negative impacts perceived by cross-border migrant's families. Out of total migrants households 75 (19.4%) households perceived no any disadvantages to their households from the involvement of their family members in cross-border migration to India (Table 7.24).

Advantages/ disadvantages	HH with return migrants		HH with current migrants		HH with both (current & return) migrants		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	Ν	%
Advantages								
Economic condition improved	66	30.1	121	55.3	32	14.6	219	100.0
Debt/ loan paid	12	36.4	19	57.6	2	6.1	33	100.0
Helped to improve education	9	50.0	8	44.4	1	5.6	18	100.0
Construction of house	1	9.1	10	90.9	-	-	11	100.0
Buy land	-	-	10	100.0	-	-	10	100.0
Food supply/sufficiency	3	33.3	5	55.6	1	11.1	9	100.0
Improvement on health status	2	25.0	5	62.5	1	12.5	8	100.0
Employment opportunity obtained	2	33.3	4	66.7	-	-	6	100.0
Opportunity of visiting	4	80.0	1	20.0	-	-	5	100.0
Water pump installed	-	-	2	100.0	-	-	2	100.0
Improve relationship with neighbors	-	-	-	-	2	100.0	2	100.0
Learned skills	1	50.0	1	50.0	-	-	2	100.0
Added household materials	-	-	1	100.0	-	-	1	100.0
Economic saving	-	-	1	100.0	-	-	1	100.0
Physically safe (beaten by husband	-	-	1	100.0	-	-	1	100.0
No advantages	15	25.9	42	72.4	1	1.7	58	100.0
Disadvantages		I				I		L
Mental tension	41	29.3	83	59.3	16	11.4	140	100.0
Lack of working manpower	29	29.3	58	58.6	12	12.1	99	100.0
Low income/wage	4	22.2	10	55.6	4	22.2	18	100.0
Should work as slave in foreign country	8	44.4	7	38.9	3	16.7	18	100.0

 Table 7.24: Distribution of Households According to Perceived Advantages and Disadvantages of Cross-border Migration by their Family Members

No opportunity for study	5	29.4	12	70.6	-	-	17	100.0
Returned back due to being	3	50.0	2	33 3	1	167	6	100.0
sick	5	20.0	-	55.5		10.7	Ŭ	100.0
No chance of gathering in			4	100.0			1	100.0
festivals	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	100.0
Habit of alcoholism	2	50.0	2	50.0	-	-	4	100.0
No availability of good job	1	100.0	-	-	-	-	1	100.0
Compelled to face ill-			1	100.0			1	100.0
treatment	-	-	1	100.0	-	-	1	100.0
Lack of self respect and	1	100.0					1	100.0
honor	1	100.0	-	-	-	-	1	100.0
Second marriage by husband	-	-	1	100.0	-	-	1	100.0
Study leave by children	-	-	-	-	1	100.0	1	100.0
No disadvantages	21	28.0	51	68.0	3	4.0	75	100.0
Total	115	29.8	231	59.8	40	10.4	386	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2011. The total per cent exceeds 100 due to multiple responses.

Box: 7. 4: Focus Group Discussion with Non-Migrants Households

Lack of Labour during Agricultural Seasons: Non Migrants Households

Nepalese cross the border to work India in all months/ seasons and increasingly dependence on India. Most of the migrants stay in India at least for six months and earn 30-40 thousands IC during the six months period. Out of total earnings of migrants 60% expenses on paying debt and use of alcohol and smoking; only 40% of income uses on HH expenditure/ consumption.

Landless, having less land, debt, survival of family members and even lack of opportunities of wage labour in Nepal are the main causes of cross-border migration.

Lack of labour supply mainly during cultivation and harvesting time of agriculture has been considered the main negative impact of cross-border migration. Mostly Households from low economic status and involvement of their ancestors/ forefather are involved in cross-border migration.

Migrants have no knowledge of banking system and while returning back from their workplace with cash, and then they frequently face the problems like cheating, looting and dacoits.

The provision of facilities of migrants at their working place depends upon the role of the Meith contractor. Migrants get job in industries, trade, agriculture, security guard and can draw overtime wages if their working hour is more than their assigned duty hour. Most of the Nepalese migrants to India have low paid job/ manual labour due to lack of education and skilled training but income of Indian migrants to Nepal is comparatively high due to their involvement in industry/ factory, trade and more income oriented job due to having skilled and working experience.

Nepal is being the place to recruit labour in cheap wages For India. Generally migrants receive 200 IC per day as their wages and they have to maintain food and shelter from their own wages. To join work in Arabian/ Gulf country migrants Households should pay more money including passport/ visa and work permit, transportation cost at high risks.

7.5 Views of Government Staff (Nepal and India on the Issue of Crossborder Migration

At the transit point, Gadda Chowki (Nepalese side transit point) and Banbasa (Indian side transit point) views on various issues related to determining and consequential factors of cross-border migration; problems related to migrants, main season/duration of crossing the border by the migrants from both the countries, assigned duty related to cross-border migrants, nature and income of migrants of the both countries; knowledge of migrants rights at their working place and Nepal-India Peace and Friendship Treaty, its provisions

for people of both the countries and need of its modification, positive and negative impact of open border on the two countries were collected from the government staff (custom officers, security officers and emigration officers) of both the countries (Appendix VI).

CHAPTER VIII

EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION

This chapter examines the degree and nature of relationship between dependent and independent variables with the help of Phi coefficient. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) is used to analyze the quantitative data. T-test has been use to compare the Non-migrants and migrants households and Karl person's correlation coefficient are used to explain the interrelationships between dependent and independent variables in order to test various hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1: Non-migrant households are better off in size of land holding, annual household income on selling food grains, household indebtedness, and years of schooling of household head than migrants households.

As per the nature of the dependent as well as independent variables, independent sampled T - test has been used to test this hypothesis. The independent variables in this hypothesis are: size of land holding, annual household income from selling food grains, household indebtedness and years of schooling of household heads. Household migration status is the dependent variable.

Table 8.1 shows that the mean differences of size of land holding, annual household income on selling food grains and years of schooling (of household head) are significantly different at *p* values .001, .000, .001 respectively, supporting the hypothesis as stated.

Comparing household indebtedness, migrant households were found to be better with lower mean indebtedness than non migrant households contradicting the hypothesis. It may due to involvement of Non-migrants households economic activities with seeking loan comparatively in large amount than migrant's households of the study area.

Variable(s)	М	SD	t	df	р
Size of land holding			3.46 ^a	793.6ª	.001
Non- migrant HHs	16.42	14.86			
Migrant HHs	13.16	11.89			
Annual household income on selling food g	rains		4.96 ^a	647.9 ^ª	.000
Non- migrant HHs	3646.57	8534.28			
Migrant HHs	1303.11	4450.46			
Household indebtedness			.60 ^a	760.0 ^a	.549
Non- migrant HHs	46918.91	113606.94			
Migrant HHs	42806.99	80140.40			
Years of schooling (of household head)			3.30 ^a	799.4 ª	.001
Non- migrant HHs	3.74	4.62			
Migrant HHs	2.76	3.82			
		1			

Table 8.1: Comparison of Migrant and Non- migrant households (N=423 nonmigrant and 386 migrant HHs).

^aThe *t* and *df* were adjusted because variances were not equal.

Hypothesis 2: The volume of cross-border migration increases with decrease in the annual household income sufficiency.

As per the nature of the variables, Karl Pearson Correlation Coefficients has been used to test this hypothesis. The variables of interest here are volume of cross-border migration and household income sufficiency. Besides, a one-tailed test has been used to examine the correlation as the hypothesis was a directional one.

Table 8.2 shows that, a medium negative correlation is found between the two variables i.e. r(384) = -.475, p = .030, supporting the hypothesis as formulated.

Fable 8.2: Inter correlations	, Means, an	d Standard	Deviations	for Two	Variables
--------------------------------------	-------------	------------	------------	---------	-----------

Variable(s)	1	2	М	SD	
1. Volume of cross-border migration	1	475*	1.61	1.273	
2. Household income sufficiency	-	1	10.08	2.665	

**p*=.030

Hypothesis 3: Volume of cross-border migration increases with the decrease in ownership of cultivable land holding the size.

As per the nature of the variables, Karl Pearson Correlation Coefficients has been used to test this hypothesis. The variable of interest here are volume of cross-border migration and size of cultivable land holding (of the household). Besides, a one-tailed test has been used to examine the correlation as the hypothesis was a directional one.

Table 8.3: Inter correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Two Variables(N=386)

Variable(s)	1	2	М	SD	
1. Volume of cross-border migration	1	070*	1.61	1.273	
2. Size of cultivable land holding	-	1	11.72	11.42	
* = 0.06					

**p*=.086

Table 8.3 shows that the two variables were not significantly correlated but a negative correlation was observed between the two variables i.e. r (384) = -.070, p = .086, supporting the hypothesis as formulated.

Hypothesis 4: The volume of cross-border migration increases with the lack of employment opportunities at migrants' place of origin.

As per the nature of the variables, bi-serial correlation coefficients (r_b) has been used to test this hypothesis. Besides, a one-tailed test has been used to examine the correlation as the hypothesis was a directional one.

As the bi-serial correlation coefficient³ is not calculated directly by SPSS, the point-biserial correlation coefficient i.e. r_{pb} (using dummy coding category for lack of employment opportunities at migrants' place of origin) was first examined using Table 4 and then afterwards the bi-serial correlation coefficient was calculated using the following equation: $r_b = \frac{r_{pb}\sqrt{pq}}{y}$.

 Table 8.4: Inter correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Two Variables

 (N=386)

Variable(s)	1	2	M	SD
1. Volume of cross-border migration	1	.414*	1.61	1.273
2. Lack of employment opportunities at				
migrants' place of origin (Yes=1;	-	1	0.84	0.363
No=0)				
* <i>p</i> =.003				

³ Bi-serial correlation coefficient is used when one of the variable is categorical (dichotomous) and the other is continuous.

It was observed that those migrants who did not migrate due to the lack of employment opportunities at migrants place of origin was 15.5 per cent i.e. .155 in proportion (q) and those migrants who migrated due to the lack of employment opportunities at migrants place of origin was 84.5 per cent i.e. .845 in proportion (p). The value of y (.2396) has been adopted from the normal distribution displayed generated by Field in 2005 (Appendix VII).

Hence,

$$r_{b} = \frac{r_{pb}\sqrt{pq}}{y} = \frac{(.514)\sqrt{.845 \times .155}}{.2396} = .776$$

To get the significance of the bi-serial correlation the following equation has been used:

$$Z_{rb} = \frac{rb}{SE_{rb}}$$

Where,

 Z_{rb} = z-score r_b = bi-serial correlation SE_{rb} = Standard error

The standard error has been calculated using the following equation:

$$SE_{rb} = \frac{\sqrt{pq}}{y\sqrt{N}} = \frac{\sqrt{(.845 \times .155)}}{.2396\sqrt{386}} = .077$$

Here; p, q and y are the values used while calculating bi-serial correlation coefficient. N is the sample size.

Hence,

$$Z_{\rm rb} = \frac{\rm rb}{\rm SE_{\rm rb}} = \frac{.776}{.077} = 10.08$$

Thus, the value of z (10.08) in the appendix table for the normal distribution regarding the one-tailed probability is 0.000.

Hence, it can be stated that the volume of cross-border migration and lack of employment opportunities at migrants' place of origin were significantly correlated. A strong positive correlation was observed between the two variables i.e. r (384) = .776, p = .000, strongly supporting the hypothesis as stated.

Hypothesis 5: The volume of cross-border migration increases with increase in the household indebtedness.

Karl Pearson Correlation Coefficients has been used to test this hypothesis. The variable of interest here are volume of cross-border migration and household indebtedness. Besides, a one-tailed test has been used to examine the correlation as the hypothesis was a directional one.

 Table 8.5: Inter correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Two Variables

 (N=386)

Variable(s)	1	2	М	SD
1. Volume of cross-border migration	1	.231*	1.61	1.273
2. Household indebtedness	-	1	42806.99	80140.40
* <i>p</i> =.045				

Table 8.5 shows a weak positive correlation between the two variables i.e. r (384) = .231, p = .045, supporting the hypothesis as stated.

Hypothesis 6: The volume of cross-border migration increases with the ancestors' participation in cross-border migration.

As per the nature of the variables, bi-serial correlation coefficients (r_b) has been used to test this hypothesis. Besides, a one-tailed test has been used to examine the correlation as the hypothesis was a directional one.

As the bi-serial correlation coefficient is not calculated directly by SPSS, the point biserial correlation coefficient i.e. r_{pb} (using dummy coding category for ancestors' participation in cross-border migration) was first examined using Table 6 and then afterwards the bi-serial correlation coefficient was calculated using the following equation: $r_b = \frac{r_{pb}\sqrt{pq}}{y}$.

 Table 8.6: Inter- correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Two Variables

 (N=386)

Variable(s)	1	2	M	SD
1. Volume of cross-border migration	1	.180*	1.61	1.273
2. Ancestors' participation in cross- border migration (Yes=1; No=0)	-	1	0.40	0.490

**p*=.025

It was observed that those whose ancestors' did not participate in cross-border migration was 60.1 % i.e. .601 in proportion (p) and those whose ancestors' participated in cross-border migration was 39.9 % i.e. .399 in proportion (q). The value of y (.3857) has been adopted from the normal distribution displayed in the Appendix generated by Field (2005).

Hence,

$$r_{b} = \frac{r_{pb}\sqrt{pq}}{y} = \frac{(.180)\sqrt{.601 \times .399}}{.3857} = .229$$

To get the significance of the bi-serial correlation the following equation has been used:

$$Z_{rb} = \frac{rb}{SE_{rb}}$$

Where,

 Z_{rb} = z-score r_b = bi-serial correlation SE_{rb} = Standard error

The standard error has been calculated using the following equation:

$$SE_{rb} = \frac{\sqrt{pq}}{y\sqrt{N}} = \frac{\sqrt{(.601 \times .399)}}{.3857\sqrt{386}} = .032$$

Here; p, q and y are the values used while calculating bi-serial correlation coefficient. N is the sample size.

Hence,

$$Z_{\rm rb} = \frac{\rm rb}{\rm SE_{\rm rb}} = \frac{.229}{.032} = 7.16$$

Thus, the value of z (7.16) in the appendix table for the normal distribution regarding the one-tailed probability is 0.000.

Hence, it can be stated that the volume of cross-border migration and ancestors' participation in cross-border migration were significantly correlated with two variables i.e. r(384) = .229, p = .000, supporting the hypothesis as stated.

Hypothesis 7: The volume of cross-border migration is high with more frequencies of cross-border migration.

As per the nature of the variables, Pearson Correlation Coefficients has been used to test this hypothesis. The variable of interest here are volume of cross-border migration and frequency of migrants migration. Besides, a one-tailed test has been used to examine the correlation as the hypothesis was a directional one.

Table 8.7: Inter correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Two Variables(N=386)

Variable(s)	1	2	М	SD
1. Volume of cross-border migration	1	.466*	1.61	1.273
2. Frequency of migrants migration	-	1	8.53	8.005
* 0.25				

**p*=.037

Table 8.7 shows that the two variables were significantly correlated. A medium positive correlation was observed between the two variables i.e. r (384) = .466, p = .037, supporting the hypothesis as stated.

Hypothesis 8: The volume of cross-border migration increases with increase in the migrants' established networks.

As per the nature of the variables, bi-serial Correlation Coefficients (r_b) has been used to test this hypothesis. The variable of interest here are volume of cross-border migration and migrants established networks. Besides, a one-tailed test has been used to examine the correlation as the hypothesis was a directional one.

As the Bi-serial correlation coefficient is not calculated directly by SPSS, the point-biserial correlation coefficient i.e. r_{pb} (using dummy coding category for migrants established networks) was first examined using Table 8.8 and then afterwards the biserial correlation coefficient was calculated using the following equation: $r_b = \frac{r_{pb}\sqrt{pq}}{v}$.

 Table 8.8: Inter correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Two Variables

 (N=386)

Variable(s)	1	2	М	SD
1. Volume of cross-border migration	1	.136*	1.61	1.273
2. Migrants established networks (Yes=1; No=0)	-	1	0.38	0.486
* 040				

*p=.242

It was observed that those migrants who did not have established networks was 61.9 per cent i.e. .619 in proportion (p) and those who had established networks was 38.1% i.e. .381 in proportion (q). The value of y (.3814) has been adopted from the normal distribution displayed in the Appendix generated by Field (2005).

Hence,

$$r_{b} = \frac{r_{pb}\sqrt{pq}}{y} = \frac{(.136)\sqrt{.619 \times .381}}{.3814} = .173$$

To get the significance of the bi-serial correlation the following equation has been used:

$$Z_{rb} = \frac{rb}{SE_{rb}}$$

Where,

 Z_{rb} = z-score r_b = bi-serial correlation SE_{rb} = Standard error

The standard error has been calculated using the following equation:

$$SE_{rb} = \frac{\sqrt{pq}}{y\sqrt{N}} = \frac{\sqrt{(.619 \times .381)}}{.3814\sqrt{386}} = .065$$

Here; p, q and y are the values used while calculating bi-serial correlation coefficient. N is the sample size.

Hence,

$$Z_{\rm rb} = \frac{\rm rb}{\rm SE_{\rm rb}} = \frac{.173}{.065} = 2.66$$

Thus, the value of z (2.66) in the appendix table for the normal distribution regarding the one-tailed probability is 0.004.

Hence, it can be stated that the volume of cross-border migration and migrants established networks were significantly correlated. A positive correlation was observed between the two variables i.e. r (384) = .173, p = .004, supporting the hypothesis as stated.

Hypothesis 9: The volume of cross-border migration increases with off farming duration or seasons (after cultivation/ after harvesting).

As per the nature of the variables, bi-serial Correlation Coefficients (r_b) has been used to test this hypothesis. The variable of interest here are volume of cross-border migration

and migrants migrating in off farming season. Besides, a one-tailed test has been used to examine the correlation as the hypothesis is a directional one.

As the bi-serial correlation coefficient is not calculated directly by SPSS, the point-biserial correlation coefficient i.e. r_{pb} (using dummy coding category for migrants migrating in off farming season) was first examined using Table 9 and then afterwards the bi-serial correlation coefficient was calculated using the following equation: $r_b = \frac{r_{pb}\sqrt{pq}}{v}$.

Table 8.9: Inter correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Two Variables(N=386)

Variable(s)	1	2	М	SD
1. Volume of cross-border migration	1	004*	1.61	1.273
2. Migrants migrating in off farming season (Yes=1; No=0)	-	1	0.51	0.501
*p=.470				

It was observed that those migrants who did not migrate in off farming season was 49.0 per cent i.e. .490 in proportion (q) and those who migrated in off farming season was 51.0 per cent i.e. .510 in proportion (p). The value of y (.3988) has been adopted from the normal distribution displayed in the Appendix generated by Field (2005).

Hence,

$$r_{b} = \frac{r_{pb}\sqrt{pq}}{y} = \frac{(-.004)\sqrt{.510 \times .490}}{.3988} = -.005$$

To get the significance of the bi-serial correlation the following equation has been used:

$$Z_{rb} = \frac{rb}{SE_{rb}}$$

Where,

 $Z_{rb} = z$ -score $r_b = bi$ -serial correlation $SE_{rb} = Standard error$

The standard error has been calculated using the following equation:

$$SE_{rb} = \frac{\sqrt{pq}}{y\sqrt{N}} = \frac{\sqrt{(.510 \times .490)}}{.3988\sqrt{386}} = .064$$

Here; p, q and y are the values used while calculating bi-serial correlation coefficient. N is the sample size.

Hence,

$$Z_{\rm rb} = \frac{\rm rb}{\rm SE_{\rm rb}} = \frac{.005}{.064} = 0.08$$

Thus, the value of z (0.08) in the appendix table for the normal distribution regarding the one-tailed probability is 0.468.

Hence, it can be stated that the volume of cross-border migration and migrants migrating at off farming seasons were not significantly correlated. A weak negative correlation was observed between the two variables i.e. r (384) = -.005, p = .468, contradicting the hypothesis as stated.

Hypothesis 10: The duration of stay at the migrants' workplace increases with the increase in the income receiving at the workplace. More income longer the stay or less income shorter the stay at destination or workplace

As per the nature of the variables, Pearson Correlation Coefficients has been used to test this hypothesis. The variable of interest here are migrants duration of stay at the workplace and migrants income at the workplace. Besides, a one-tailed test has been used to examine the correlation as the hypothesis was a directional one.

Variable(s)	1	2	М	SD
1. Migrants duration of stay at the	1	.656*	9.00	9.731
workplace				
2. Migrants income at the workplace	-	1	71491.19	137014.336
*p=.000				

Table 8.10: Inter correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Two Variables(N=386)

Table 8.10 shows the strong positive correlation was observed between the two variables i.e. r(384) = .656, p = .000, strongly supporting the hypothesis as stated.

Hypothesis 11: Household consumption increases with increase in the household remittances.

As per the nature of the variables, bi-serial correlation coefficients (r_b) has been used to test this hypothesis. The variable of interest here are remittance sent by cross-border migrants and household consumption. Besides, a one-tailed test has been used to examine the correlation as the hypothesis was a directional one.

As the Bi-serial correlation coefficient is not calculated directly by SPSS, the point-biserial correlation coefficient i.e. r_{pb} (using dummy coding category for household consumption) was first examined using table 11 and then afterwards the bi-serial correlation coefficient was calculated using the following equation: $r_b = \frac{r_{pb}\sqrt{pq}}{v}$.

Table 8.11: Inter correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Two Variables (N=386)

	(1000)			
Variable(s)	1	2	М	SD
1. Remittance sent by cross-border	1	.136*	71491.19	137014.336
migrants				
2. Household consumption improved		1	0.54	0 400
(Yes=1; No=0)	-	1	0.34	0.499
* <i>p</i> =.238				

It was observed that those household whose household consumption did not improve accounted 46.4 % i.e. .464 in proportion (p) and those household whose household consumption improved accounted 53.6 per cent i.e. .536 in proportion (q). The value of y (.3973) has been adopted from the normal distribution displayed in the Appendix generated by Field (2005).

Hence,

$$r_{b} = \frac{r_{pb}\sqrt{pq}}{y} = \frac{(.136)\sqrt{.536 \times .464}}{.3973} = .171$$

To get the significance of the bi-serial correlation the following equation has been used:

$$Z_{rb} = \frac{rb}{SE_{rb}}$$

Where,

 $Z_{rb} = z$ -score $r_b =$ biserial correlation $SE_{rb} =$ Standard error

The standard error has been calculated using the following equation:

$$SE_{rb} = \frac{\sqrt{pq}}{y\sqrt{N}} = \frac{\sqrt{(.536 \times .464)}}{.3973\sqrt{386}} = .064$$

Here; p, q and y are the values used while calculating bi-serial correlation coefficient. N is the sample size.

Hence,

$$Z_{\rm rb} = \frac{\rm rb}{\rm SE_{\rm rb}} = \frac{.171}{.064} = 2.67$$

Thus, the value of z (2.67) in the appendix table for the normal distribution regarding the one-tailed probability is 0.004.

Hence, it can be stated that the household remittance and household consumptions were significantly correlated. A positive correlation was observed between the two variables i.e. r(384) = .171, p = .004, supporting the hypothesis as stated.

Hypothesis12: There is a positive correlation between education of children and household remittance.

As per the nature of the variables, Pearson Correlation Coefficients has been used to test this hypothesis. The variable of interest here are education of children and household remittances. Besides, a one-tailed test has been used to examine the correlation as the hypothesis was a directional one.

Table 8.12: Inter correlations, I	Means, and	Standard	Deviations	for Two	Variables
	(N=9	67)			

	(10, 207)	/		
Variable(s)	1	2	M	SD
1. Education of children	1	.225*	4.16	3.186
2. Household remittance	-	1	8115.31	5971.75
*p = 0.50				

Table 8.12 shows that the positive correlation was observed between the two variables i.e. r(965) = .225, p = .050, supporting the hypothesis as stated.

Hypothesis 13: There is positive correlation between loan/debt pay and remittances.

As per the nature of the variables, bi-serial correlation coefficients (r_b) have been used to test the hypothesis. The variable of interest here are loan/ debt pay and household remittance. Besides, a one-tailed test has been used to examine the correlation as the hypothesis was a directional one.

As the bi-serial correlation coefficient is not calculated directly by SPSS, the point biserial correlation coefficient i.e. r_{pb} (using dummy coding category for loan/ debt pay) was first examined using Table 8.13 and then afterwards the bi-serial correlation coefficient was calculated using the following equation: $r_b = \frac{r_{pb}\sqrt{pq}}{v}$.

Table 8.13: Intercorrelations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Two Variables(N=386)

Variable(s)	1	2	М	SD
1. Loan/ debt repay (Yes=1; No=0)	1	049*	.24	.430
2. Household remittance	-	1	71491.19	137014.336
* <i>p</i> =.334				

It was observed that those household who paid loan/ debt accounted 24.4 per cent i.e. .244 in proportion (q) and whose cash saving improved accounted 75.6 per cent .756 in proportion (p). The value of y (.3144) has been adopted from the normal distribution displayed in the Appendix generated by Field (2005).

Hence,

$$r_{b} = \frac{r_{pb}\sqrt{pq}}{y} = \frac{(-.049)\sqrt{.756 \times .244}}{.3144} = -.067$$

To get the significance of the bi-serial correlation the following equation has been used:

$$Z_{rb} = \frac{rb}{SE_{rb}}$$

Where,

 Z_{rb} = z-score r_b = bi-serial correlation SE_{rb} = Standard error

The standard error has been calculated using the following equation:

$$SE_{rb} = \frac{\sqrt{pq}}{y\sqrt{N}} = \frac{\sqrt{(.756 \times .244)}}{.3144\sqrt{386}} = .070$$

Here; p, q and y are the values used while calculating bi-serial correlation coefficient. N is the sample size.

Hence,

$$Z_{\rm rb} = \frac{\rm rb}{\rm SE_{\rm rb}} = \frac{.067}{.070} = 0.96$$

Thus, the value of z (0.96) in the appendix table for the normal distribution regarding the one-tailed probability is 0.169.

Hence, it can be stated that loan/ debt pay and household remittance were not significantly correlated. A negative correlation was observed between the two variables i.e. r(384) = -.067, p = .169, contradicting the hypothesis as stated.

Hypothesis 14: The health and sanitation condition of a household improves with the increase in the amount of remittance sent by cross-border migrants.

As per the nature of the variables, bi-serial correlation coefficients (r_b) has been used to test this hypothesis. The variable of interest here are improvements in health and sanitation of a household and household remittance. Besides, a one-tailed test has been used to examine the correlation as the hypothesis was a directional one.

As the bi-serial correlation coefficient is not calculated directly by SPSS, the point Biserial correlation coefficient i.e. r_{pb} (using dummy coding category for improvement in health and sanitation of a household) was first examined using table 14 and then afterwards the bi-serial correlation coefficient was calculated using the following

equation: $r_b = \frac{r_{pb}\sqrt{pq}}{y}$.

Table 8.14: Inter- correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Two Variables (N=386)

Variable(s)	1	2	М	SD	
1. Improvement in health and sanitation	1	.015*	.57	.496	
(Yes=1; No=0)					

2. Household remittance	-	1	71491.19	137014.336
*p=.382				

Hence, It was observed that those household whose health and sanitation did not improve accounted 43.3 % i.e. .433 in proportion (p) and whose health and sanitation improved accounted 56.7 % i.e. .567 in proportion (q). The value of y (.3932) has been adopted from the normal distribution displayed in the Appendix generated by Field (2005).

$$r_{b} = \frac{r_{pb}\sqrt{pq}}{y} = \frac{(.015)\sqrt{.567 \times .433}}{.3932} = .019$$

To get the significance of the bi-serial correlation the following equation has been used:

$$Z_{rb} = \frac{rb}{SE_{rb}}$$

Where,

 Z_{rb} = z-score r_b = biserial correlation SE_{rb} = Standard error

The standard error has been calculated using the following equation:

$$SE_{rb} = \frac{\sqrt{pq}}{y\sqrt{N}} = \frac{\sqrt{(.567 \times .433)}}{.3932\sqrt{386}} = .064$$

Here; p, q and y are the values used while calculating bi-serial correlation coefficient. N is the sample size.

Hence,

$$Z_{\rm rb} = \frac{\rm rb}{\rm SE_{\rm rb}} = \frac{.019}{.064} = 0.30$$

Thus, the value of z (0.30) in the appendix table for the normal distribution regarding the one-tailed probability is 0.382.

Hence, it can be stated that the improvements of health and sanitation of a household and household remittance were not significantly correlated. A positive correlation was observed between the two variables i.e. r (384) = .019, p = .382, supporting the hypothesis as stated.

Hypothesis 15: Physical properties such as land and house earned by household increases with the increase in the household remittance.

As per the nature of the variables, bi-serial correlation coefficients (r_b) has been used to test hypothesis 15. The variable of interest here are physical properties earned by household and household remittance. Besides, a one-tailed test has been used to examine the correlation as the hypothesis was a directional one.

As the bi-serial correlation coefficient is not calculated directly by SPSS, the point-biserial correlation coefficient i.e. r_{pb} (using dummy coding category for physical properties earned by household) was first examined using Table 15 and then afterwards the bi-serial correlation coefficient was calculated using the following equation: $r_b = \frac{r_{pb}\sqrt{pq}}{v}$.

Table 8.15: Inter- correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Two Variables (N=386)

Variable(s)	1	2	M	SD
1. Physical properties earned	by 1	.118*	.26	.440
household (Yes=1; No=0)				
2. Household remittance	-	1	71491.19	137014.336
* <i>p</i> =.359				

It was observed that those household who did not earn any physical properties accounted 73.8 per cent i.e. .738 in proportion (p) and those household who earned physical properties accounted 26.2 % i.e. .262 in proportion (q). The value of y (.3251) has been

adopted from the normal distribution displayed in the Appendix generated by Field (2005).

Hence,

$$r_{b} = \frac{r_{pb}\sqrt{pq}}{y} = \frac{(.118)\sqrt{.738 \times .262}}{.3251} = .160$$

To get the significance of the bi-serial correlation the following equation has been used:

$$Z_{rb} = \frac{rb}{SE_{rb}}$$

Where,

 Z_{rb} = z-score r_b = biserial correlation SE_{rb} = Standard error

The standard error has been calculated using the following equation:

$$SE_{rb} = \frac{\sqrt{pq}}{y\sqrt{N}} = \frac{\sqrt{(.738 \times .262)}}{.3251\sqrt{386}} = .069$$

Here; p, q and y are the values used while calculating bi-serial correlation coefficient. N is the sample size.

Hence,

$$Z_{\rm rb} = \frac{\rm rb}{\rm SE_{\rm rb}} = \frac{.160}{.069} = 2.32$$

Thus, the value of z (2.32) in the appendix table for the normal distribution regarding the one-tailed probability is 0.010.

Hence, it can be stated that the physical properties earned by household and household remittance were significantly correlated. A weak positive correlation was observed between the two variables i.e. r (384) = .160, p = .010, supporting the hypothesis as stated.

Hypothesis 16(a): Income of cross-border migrants increases at the work-place with the training received by migrants before migrating.

As per the nature of the variables, bi-serial correlation coefficients (r_b) has been used to test hypothesis 16(a). The variable of interest here are income of cross-border migrants and training received by migrants (before migrating). Besides, a one-tailed test has been used to examine the correlation as the hypothesis was a directional one.

As the bi-serial correlation coefficient is not calculated directly by SPSS, the point-biserial correlation coefficient i.e. r_{pb} (using dummy coding category for training received by migrants) was first examined using table 16 and then afterwards the bi-serial correlation coefficient was calculated using the following equation: $r_b = \frac{r_{pb}\sqrt{pq}}{v}$.

Table 8.16.a: Intecorrelations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Two Variables (N=386)

Variable(s)	1	2	М	SD
1. Income of cross-border migrants	1	.144*	71491.19	137014.336
2. Training received by migrants	_	1	0.20	0 404
(Yes=1; No=0)		1	0.20	0.101
* <i>p</i> =.002				

It was observed that those migrants who did not receive training before migration accounted 79.5 % i.e. .795 in proportion (p) and those migrants who received training before migration accounted 20.5 % i.e. .205 in proportion (q). The value of y (.2827) has been adopted from the normal distribution displayed in the Appendix generated by Field (2005).

Hence,

$$r_{b} = \frac{r_{pb}\sqrt{pq}}{y} = \frac{(.144)\sqrt{.795 \times .205}}{.2827} = .206$$

To get the significance of the bi-serial correlation the following equation has been used:

$$Z_{rb} = \frac{rb}{SE_{rb}}$$

Where,

 Z_{rb} = z-score r_b = bi-serial correlation SE_{rb} = Standard error

The standard error has been calculated using the following equation:

$$SE_{rb} = \frac{\sqrt{pq}}{y\sqrt{N}} = \frac{\sqrt{(.795 \times .205)}}{.2827\sqrt{386}} = .029$$

Here; p, q and y are the values used while calculating bi-serial correlation coefficient. N is the sample size.

Hence,

$$Z_{\rm rb} = \frac{\rm rb}{\rm SE_{\rm rb}} = \frac{.206}{.029} = 7.10$$

Thus, the value of z (7.10) in the appendix table for the normal distribution regarding the one-tailed probability is 0.000.

Hence, it can be stated that the income of cross-border migrants' and training received by the migrants before migrating were significantly correlated. A positive correlation was observed between the two variables i.e. r (384) = .206, p = .000, supporting the hypothesis as stated.

Hypothesis 16(b): Income of cross-border migrants increases at their working place with their level of education before migrating.

As per the nature of the variables, Pearson Correlation Coefficients has been used to test the hypothesis. The variable of interest here are income of cross-border migrants and migrants educational attainment. Besides, a one-tailed test has been used to examine the correlation as the hypothesis was a directional one.

 Table 8.16.b: Inter correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Two Variables

 (N=386)

	(11 500)			
Variable(s)	1	2	M	SD
1. Income of cross-border migrants	1	.122*	71491.19	137014.34
2. Migrants educational attainment	-	1	5.82	3.78
* <i>p</i> =.035				

Table 8.16.b shows that the two variables were significantly correlated. A positive correlation was observed between the two variables i.e. r (386) = .122, p = .035, supporting the hypothesis as stated.

Hypothesis 17: There is a positive correlation between improvements in cash saving and remittances from cross border migration.

As per the nature of the variables, bi-serial correlation coefficients (r_b) has been used to test hypothesis 13. The variable of interest here are improvements in cash saving and household remittance. Besides, a one-tailed test has been used to examine the correlation as the hypothesis was a directional one.

As the Bi-serial correlation coefficient is not calculated directly by SPSS, the point-biserial correlation coefficient i.e. r_{pb} (using dummy coding category for improvements in cash saving) was first examined using Table 13 and then afterwards the bi-serial correlation coefficient was calculated using the following equation: $r_b = \frac{r_{pb}\sqrt{pq}}{v}$.

Table 8.17: Inter correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Two Variables(N=386)

Variable(s)	1	2	М	SD
1. Improvement in cash saving (Yes=1;	1	.096*	.08	.268
No=0)				
2. Household remittance	-	1	71491.19	137014.336
* <i>p</i> =.030				

It was observed that those household whose cash saving did not improve accounted 92.2 per cent i.e. .922 in proportion (p) and whose cash saving improved accounted 7.8 per cent i.e. .078 in proportion (q). The value of y (.1456) has been adopted from the normal distribution displayed in the Appendix generated by Field (2005).

Hence,

$$r_{b} = \frac{r_{pb}\sqrt{pq}}{y} = \frac{(.096)\sqrt{.922 \times .078}}{.1456} = .177$$

To get the significance of the bi-serial correlation the following equation has been used:

$$Z_{rb} = \frac{rb}{SE_{rb}}$$

Where,

 Z_{rb} = z-score r_b = biserial correlation SE_{rb} = Standard error

The standard error has been calculated using the following equation:

$$SE_{\rm rb} = \frac{\sqrt{pq}}{y\sqrt{N}} = \frac{\sqrt{(.922 \times .078)}}{.1456\sqrt{386}} = .094$$

Here; p, q and y are the values used while calculating bi-serial correlation coefficient. N is the sample size.

Hence,

$$Z_{\rm rb} = \frac{\rm rb}{\rm SE_{\rm rb}} = \frac{.177}{.094} = 1.88$$

Thus, the value of z (1.88) in the appendix table for the normal distribution regarding the one-tailed probability is 0.030.

Hence, it can be stated that the improvements in cash saving and household remittance were significantly correlated. A weak positive correlation was observed between the two variables i.e. r(384) = .177, p = .030, supporting the hypothesis as stated.

H. No.	Hypothesis Statement	Sig. Level	Finding
H1 (a)	Non migrant households are better off in size of land	001	Accented***
111 (a)	holding than migrants households	.001	Accepted
	Non migrant households are better off in annual		
H1 (b)	household income on selling food grains than migrants	.000	Accepted***
	households		
H1 (a)	Non migrant households are better off in household	540	Pajaotad
III (C)	indebtedness than migrants households	.349	Rejected
Ц1 (d)	Non migrant households are better off in years of	001	A ccontod***
пт (u)	schooling of household head than migrants households	.001	Accepted
	The volume of cross-border migration increases		
H2	with decrease in the annual household income	.030	Accepted*
	sufficiency.		
	Volume of cross-border migration increases with		
Н3	the decrease in ownership of cultivable land	.086	Rejected
	holding the size.		
	The volume of cross-border migration increases		
H4	with the lack of employment opportunities at	.000	Accepted***
	migrants' place of origin.		

Table 8.18: Summary of Hypothesis Testing⁴

⁴ Hypothesis testing could not represented in correlation matrix due to the following reasons: As more than one statistical tool was used (i.e. t test and correlation). Correlation in the other hand comprised of normal bivariate and biserial correlation coefficient hence it could not be represented in a single matrix table.

Н5	The volume of cross-border migration increases with increase in the household indebtedness.	.045	Accepted*
H6	The volume of cross-border migration increases with the ancestors' participation in cross-border migration.	.000	Accepted***
H7	The volume of cross-border migration is high with more frequencies of cross-border migration.	.037	Accepted*
Н8	The volume of cross-border migration increases with increase in the migrants' established networks.	.004	Accepted**
Н9	The volume of cross-border migration increases with off farming duration or seasons (after cultivation/ after harvesting).	.468	Rejected
H10	The duration of stay at the migrants' workplace increases with the increase in the income receiving at the workplace. More income longer the stay or less income shorter the stay at destination or workplace	.000	Accepted***
H11	Household consumption increases with increase in the household remittances.	.004	Accepted**
H12	There is a positive correlation between education of children and household remittance.	.050	Accepted*
H13	There is positive correlation between loan/debt pay and remittances.	.169	Rejected
H14	The health and sanitation condition of a household improves with the increase in the amount of remittance sent by cross-border migrants.	.382	Rejected
H15	Physical properties such as land and house earned by household increases with the increase in the household remittance.	.010	Accepted**
H16 (a)	Income of cross-border migrants increases at the work-place with the training received by migrants before migrating.	.000	Accepted***
H16 (b)	Income of cross-border migrants increases at their working place with their level of education before migrating.	.035	Accepted*
H17	There is a positive correlation between improvements in cash saving and remittances from cross border migration.	.030	Accepted*

Note: $*=p \le .05$, $**=p \le .01$, $***=p \le .001$
CHAPTER IX

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH

9.1 Summary

Cross-border migration is a growing phenomenon, both in scope and in complexity, affecting almost all countries in the world. The broad social, economic and political underpinnings of this mobility are diverse and not always known, although they are often linked to the notion of globalization in broad terms. They include factors as diverse as international patterns of demand for and supply of labour; the advent of systems of electronic communication; and the emergence of transnational family networks. Factors such as social, economic and demographic inequalities are important determinants of migration. The equation of migration-development is complex. The movement of people crossing the borders, primarily in search of employment, has become an unavoidable consequence of development and the globalization process. Labor migration has become a persistent and accelerating reality. How this impacts on family members including intergenerational solidarity has become a matter of considerable debate. Moreover, the impacts of cross-border migration are rarely considered. This study examines the causes and consequences of migration at the family level with a focus on the variable effects of cross-border migration in the areas of origin. The present study adds to the literature on cross - border movements of Nepalese people to India.

Cross-border migration constitutes significant livelihood strategies and it has been found as a strong relationship to poverty, social exclusion, as well as poverty alleviation. Crossborder migration takes many forms. Studies of cross-border migration show that circular migratory patterns are prevalent. Thus, migrants may leave family members at their home country maintaining access to land and housing in rural and urban areas.

Remittances to home areas contribute to household livelihoods. Remittances may be goods or cash. Remittances can play a key role in the livelihoods of migrant households

allowing for social or human capital investment in education, health and housing and food. They may also be used as capital to invest in income earning household inputs as well as to capitalize entrepreneurial activities. It is commonly held that remittances flow from migrants to their place of origin households.

9.1.1 The Study Area and Infrastructural Development

Preliminary field observation and district level consultation meeting in three districts (Baitadi, Surkhet and Kanchanpur) were carried out and finally, the Daijee VDC of Kanchanpur district was selected to carry out field research, mainly because of being a transit point, well access of transportation network and flow of cross-border migrants.

The study area belongs to Tarai region, located at Far-western development region of Nepal. Kailali in east, Dadeldhura in north, and Uttar Pradesh and Uttaranchal of India in south and west are the boundaries of this district.

The study VDC lies on east of Mahendra Nagar Municipality and Mahendra highway passes through it. The Gadda Chowkki (transit point with India) lies near about 15 km far from the studied VDC. Therefore, there is well access of transportation network to move within and outside the country.

9.1.2 Characteristics of Population and Cross-border Migrants

9.1.2.1 Demographic Characteristics

The studied population is composed of 34.25 per cent child population (0-14 years), 58.50 per cent of population belongs in working ages (15-59 years) and 7.25 per cent of old age population (60+ years). The child dependency, aged (old) dependency ad total dependency ratio in the study population was observed 58.5, 12.3 and 70.8 respectively. Among the total 426 cross-border migrants 36 (8.5%) were from the age below 20 years, and 180 (42.2%) and 210 (49.3%) were in the age categories of 20-30 years and more than 30 years respectively. The age of migrants at their first time participating in cross-border migration were 78 (18.3%), 117 (27.5%), 129 (30.3%) and 102 (23.9%) from

completed age less than 15 years, 15-17 years, 18-22 years and more than 23 years respectively.

Out of total 809 households included in this study nearly 80 per cent of head of households were originated from Hills and Mountain regions of Far-western and Mid-western regions and remaining 20 per cent were originated in the study district or area. The origin of study households covers all the nine districts of Far-western region and five districts out of fifteen of Mid-west region of Nepal. Therefore, the sampled households represent the population characteristics of Far-western as well as Mid-western region of Nepal.

The main destinations of Migrants were 92 (21.8%) to Karnataka, 90 (21.1%) to Maharashtra, 74 (17.4%) to Haryana, 50 (11.7%) to Uttar Pradesh, 35 (8.2%) to Uttarakhanda, 26 (6.1%) to Punjab and 16 (3.8%) to Gujarat. The other destinations were Goa, Kerala, Himachal Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Arunachal Pradesh, Rajasthan, Andra Pradesh, Assam, Madhya Pradesh, Jammu Kashmir and Best Bengal.

Regarding the frequencies, for once/first time 62 (14.5%), for (2-4) times 157 (36.9%), more than 11 times 107 (25.1%), and for (6-10) times 100 (23.5%) migrants crossed the border to join work in India.

Nearly one third 134 (31.4%) stayed for less than four months, 112 (26.3%) were for four to six months, more than one-fourth 109 (25.6%) for more than twelve months and 71 (16.7%) for 7-11 months stayed at their working place in India.

Those belonging to the age group 15-59 years (economically active age group) were nearly 44 times more likely to migrate when compared to those from the age group 0-14 years (dependent age group), and females were 97.2 per cent less likely to migrate when compared to male. Those living in a joint family were 1.4 times more likely to migrate than those living in a nuclear family

9.1.2.2 Social Characteristics

The main composition of study households on the basis of caste/ethnicity was Chhetri caste 294 (36.3%), Tharu 165 (20.4%), Brahmin 129 (16%), Lohar 40 (5%), Kami 34 (4.2%), Sarki 32 (4%), Thakuri 29 (3.6%), Dami/Dholi 26 (3.2%), Magar 19 (2.3%), Sonar 15 (1.9%) and Sanyasi 14 (1.7%). It was observed that other caste groups were 1.5 times more to migrate when compared to upper caste groups

Out of total 426 migrants, 141 (33.1%) were from Chhetri, 62 (14.6%) and 42 (9.9%) of migrants are from Brahmin and Tharu caste/ethnicity group. Dalits (Lohar, Sarki, Kami, Damar/ Dholi, Dom and Sonar) represents 143 (33.6%), Thakuri 17 (4%), Magar 10 (2.3%) and Sanyasi 7 (1.6%) were founding involving on cross-border migration.

On the basis of social participation index, 155 (36.4%) were from low level, 200 (47%) and 71 (16.6%) cross-border migrants were from medium and high level. Household's members belonging to the middle category regarding social participation index were 22.6 per cent less likely to migrate than household members belonging to the low category

Out of total 426 total cross-border migrants only 40 (9.4%) have association with any organizations; and only 16 (3.7%) and 8 (1.9%) have knowledge on rights of migrants workers and knowledge of Nepal-India Friendship Treaty of 1950 respectively.

Among the total 426 cross-border migrants (current and return) 98 (23%) migrants were illiterate and 113 (26.5%), 181 (42.5%) and 34 (8%) migrants have attained primary education including non-formal education, some secondary and SLC and above respectively. The highest proportion of migrants has attained some secondary (6-10) level education. Who had primary education were 2.5 times more likely to migrate then those who were illiterate where as those having some secondary were 1.9 times more likely to migrate compared to the same group

Among the migrants, 359 (82.2%) were found currently married and 63 (14.8%) were unmarried. The marital status of migrants for the first time participated in cross-border migration was observed; 253 (59.4%) never married, 170 (39.9%) married, 2(0.4%) and 2 (0.4%) were widower/ widow and divorced/ separated. Those who had ever married were nearly 2 times more likely to migrate than those who had never married

Out of total 426 cross-border migrants 380 (89.2%) reported Nepali language is their mother tongue. Then Tharu language is the second popular mother tongue which is reported by 42 (9.9%) of total migrants. It was observed that those having mother tongue other than Nepali were 79.9 per cent less likely to migrate then those having mother tongue as Nepali

Among the migrants 421 (98.2%) were found following Hindu religion, 4 (0.9%) and 1 (0.2%) were following Christian and Buddhist religion respectively. it was observed that non Hindus were nearly 3 times more likely to migrate than Hindus.

Among the total cross-border migrants only 80 (18.8%) have received one or the other kind of trainings and most of the migrants 346 (81.2%) were without any kind of training.

9.1.2.3 Economic Characteristics

Out of total households (809); 414 (51.2%) households' major source of income was self employment in agriculture and compose of 232 (56%) and 182 (44%) from non-migrants and migrants households. The agricultural labour consists of 140 (17.3%) households from each 50 per cent non-migrant's and migrant's households. Foreign employment has become main occupation for 107 (13.2%) households and other main sources of income for migrant's households was non-agricultural labour (23.2%), regular salary (11.5%) and self employment in non-agriculture (22.2%).

Only 5 (1.2%) migrants were found having not any size of land and 421 (98.8%) migrants were having some size of land. Among the migrants households, 132 (31.4%) were having land size of 5 to less than 10 Kattha, 132 (31.4%) households having 10 to less than 20 Kattha. Among the migrants, 96 (22.9%) households having more than 20 Kattha of land holding size. Only 61 (14.5%) migrant's households were found having land size of less than 5 Kattha.

Out of total 426 cross-border migrants 209 (49.1%) have income sufficiency for 12 and more months. Slightly more than 50 per cent of migrants' income was found insufficient to sustain their households; representing poorest (income sufficiency for 0-3months)

category 15 (3.5%), poorer (income sufficiency for 4-7 months) category 48 (11.3%) and poor category 154 (36.1%) migrants.

Among the cross-border migrants, 285 (66.9%) were found indebted and 141 (33.1%) were without debt.

On the basis of household's wealth status, the lowest number of cross-border migrants, 58 (13.6%) were from richest, 85 (19.9%) from middle and more number of migrants 104 (24.4%) were from poor followed by rich 90 (21.15%) and 89 (20.9%) were from poorest wealth status categories. It was observed that those belonging to the third, fourth and fifth quintiles were 34.5 per cent, 40.6 per cent and 45.0 per cent less likely to migrate when compared to the first quintile respectively.

More than two third 283 (66.4%) of total cross-border migrants were involved on category of physical or unskilled type of labour at their place of destination. More than one fourth 120 (28.2%) and only 23 (5.4%) of total cross-border migrants were involved in semi skilled and skilled types of labour force.

More than one third 156 (36.6%) of the cross-border migrants have earned more the 8, 000, 127 (29.8%) earned (4800- 6399), 77 (18.1%) earned less than 4800 and 66 (15.5%) of total migrants have earned (6400- 7900) Nepalese rupees per month.

According to the duration of stay of less than four months income (4800-6399), for duration of stay four to six months more than 8000, for duration of stay for seven to eleven months more than 8,000 NRs per months. As the duration of stay of migrants increased at their working places their monthly income also has been increases.

On the basis of destination of migrants, the average monthly income varies. The general trends of average monthly income showed that the migrants who crossed, the long distance from their place of origin have relatively high monthly income than the migrants with short distance.

9.1.3 Determinants of Cross-border Migration

9.1.3.1 Reasons behind choosing India

Among the total cross-border migrants 118 (27.7%) have chosen India due to less administrative process, cost, no need of passport/visa, 101 (23.7%) and easy to work. Among the migrants, 73 (17.1%), 69 (16.2%) and 63 (14.4%) respectively choose India due to presence of family members, neighbors/friends and ancestral/intergenerational flow. Only 2 (0.5%) were India due to available of prior information.

9.1.3.2 Economic Reason

More than two-third 289 (67.8%) cross-border migrants reported lack of employment opportunity at their place of origin, due to having debt of cross-border migrants or their households, 58 (13.6%), 33 (7.7%) to increase household's income, 27 (6.3%) to join with friends/accompany, 8 (1.9%) due to employment opportunities in India, 7 (1.6%) is for children education, 3 (0.7%) due to conflict/political instability in origin and 1 (0.2%) due to intergenerational practice. The economic reasons (lack of employment, due to debt, increase HH income, and employment opportunities) were the dominant reason in which 388 (91.1%) migrants reported the cause of cross-border migration to India.

Among the total 386 migrants households 344 (89.1%) mentioned that they have no any alternatives of cross-border migration to meet their daily needs, currently having no alternatives work for living, mainly poverty 256 (74.4%) and unemployment 83 (24.1%). Among the total migrants 426, 209 (49.1%) and 207 (50.9%) cross-border migrants were from non-poor and poor of different categories.

9.1.3.3 Land Holding Size

In the study area the volume of cross-border migrants was low among land less and land size less than 5 Kattha and was high having land holders of 5 to less than 10 and 10 to less than 20 Kattha, and the volume of migrants decreased to those households having land size more than 20 Kattha. There is less representation in cross-border migration activities from landless, marginal land size and relatively more land holder households of study area. The impact of land holdings on decisions regarding migration moves to opposite direction. There is less migration as the size of landholding increases and vice versa and the cost of migration constrains the decision to migrate for landless and

marginal land holders. Migration is not accessible to the poorest; though in some cases the poor also migrate, but most likely to the better-off group.

9.1.3.4 Frequency of Migrants crossing the border and Intergenerational Practice

Only 62 (14.5%) migrants have joined for the first time cross-border migration. More than one third 152 (35.7%) migrants crossed the border for 2-5 times, nearly one fourth 100 (23.5% and one fourth 107 (25.1%) crossed the border to join work for 6-10 times and more than 11 times respectively. The experiences of the past cross-border migration or who have frequently moved has developed social networks for these people, the psychosocial costs of mobility are likely to be lower and have better information concerning the various cost-aspects of migration, and develop their ability to evaluate the costs and benefits of cross-border migration.

Among the total 426 cross-border migrants 172 (40.2%) migrant's ancestors have joined in cross-border migration and had begun since the time of their grandparents. This showed the high degree of continuity over their working lives and the social position of families over several generations. Many migrant sending households have a migration tradition which is passed on from one generation to the next (usually but not exclusively fathers to sons).

9.1.3.5 Off-farming Seasons/ Duration

Among the migrants households, 197 (51%) households members participated in crossborder migration during agricultural off seasons of their place of origin, 185 (48%) unsure/ all seasons and 4(1%) during time of cultivation or harvesting at their origin. It can be claimed that 50 per cent of migrants' households provide more priority to their own agricultural work at their place of origin and 50 per cent households are influenced by availability of work at their destination, India among the cross-border migrant's households.

9.1.3.6 Network

Among the total cross-border migrants only 153 (35.9%) migrants have joined work by crossing the border alone (self), therefore 273 (64.1%) of migrants have used any

networks (friends, relatives, own family members and Meith) available to join the work in India.

9.1.4 Consequences of Cross-border Migration

9.1.4.1 Remittances: Main Share for household Consumption

In the study area, the cross-border migrants have used their remittances for basic need (food and clothes) by 197 (51.0%) households, children's education by 45 (11.7%) households, repay debts by 38 (9.8%) households, to add properties by 24 (6.2%) households, construct or reconstruct house by 22 (5.7%) households, celebration of customs/ festivals by 4 (1%) households and health care and treatment by 3 (0.8%) households. More than one-tenth migrants households 53 (13.7%) have not received any income or remittances.

9.1.4.2 Improvement of Human Capital and Prevalent Infectious Diseases.

Among the total cross-border migrant's households (386), 231(59.8%) households reported that improvement in their children's education, in 5 (1.3%) household's children education was negatively affected and 150 (38.9%) households were found indifferent, no any change in education of their children after and before households members joined cross-border migration.

Similarly, 203 (52.6%) households reported enhancement of their health service capacity, 182 (47.1%) households with not any change in their health status due to cross-border migration and only one household mentioned the negative effect on health service capacity.

Among the total cross-border migrant's households 207 (53.6%) reported that their improvement on household's food consumption and 179 (46.4%) households have not any change on food consumption. Availability of food sufficiency, nutrient contained food, fresh vegetable and fruit were the improved situation in food consumption among the migrant's households.

Among the total households, 219 (56.7%) households reported that their sanitation and health condition has been improved, 162 (42%) households have not any change in sanitation and health condition and 5 (1.3%) households informed that their household's member (who crossed the border) their health condition has been deteriorated due to HIV/AIDS infections.

Out of total migrant's households, 24 (6.2%) households members (migrated to India) have suffered from various communicable diseases (Jaundice, Tuberculosis, HIV/AIDs, Malaria, Typhoid and Diarrhea).

9.1.4.3 Variation in Income of Cross-border Migrants

The variation on average monthly income of migrants was observed on the basis of duration of stay of cross-border migrants at their working place. Those who stayed longer duration at their working place their monthly average income was found high. The positive effect on monthly income from longer stay abroad may contribute towards improvement in salary package through periodical increases. The longer stay may also lead to the improvement in skill and experience which consequently contribute to the improvement of income.

The variation on monthly average income of cross-border migrants was also observed on the basis of literacy and level of education. As the levels of education have increased the monthly average income of migrants it is also increased significantly. Education played positive role in formation of human capital and quality education, skills and competency and also increases the worker's efficiency as well as productivity. In addition, education also produces the efficient and skilled labour force and helps to increase income as compared to those with low education or illiterate.

Variation on average income among cross-border migrants was also observed on the basis of training received by migrants. The training received by migrants has been beneficial to increase their income at their working places rather than the migrants without any training.

9.1.4.4 Saving, Investment on Physical Properties and Cash Accumulation

Out of 386 migrant's households, 193 (50%) households reported that they have been able to improve economic savings, 183 (47.4%) households mentioned they have no any change and 10 (2.6%) households reported that, their economic condition has been worsened than previous.

Only 101 (26.2%) households have invested their remittances primarily on buying land, construction of households, electrification and construction of latrine. Nearly three fourth migrants household's have not any achievement in accumulation of physical properties from cross-border migration.

Among the cross-border migrants households only 30 (7.8%) households were found able to accumulate cash properties, 3 (0.7%) households have negative effect on their cash properties due to being unable to pay loan including interest and 353 (91.5%) households have no any changes on cash their properties from cross-border migration.

9.1.4.5 Relationship within Family Members, Neighborhood and Participation on Religious and Cultural Activities

Among the migrants households, 210 (54.4%) households reported not any change n their relationship within family members and their neighborhood and they are living in a usual circumstances, 167 (43.3%) household experienced improved condition of relationship within family members and neighborhood and 9 (2.3%) household's experienced worsened relationship within family members and neighborhood after participation in cross-border migration by their family members.

9.1.5 Testing of Hypotheses

In-order to accomplish the statistical tests and hypothesis set for the study Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) was used for analyzing the quantitative data. In total 17 hypothesis are tested, among them 9 hypothesis are related to determinants and 8 are related to consequences of cross-border migration. Binary logistic regression was undertaken to analyze the characteristics of migrants who were likely to migrate from the sampled household.

9.1.5.1 Testing of Hypotheses Related with Determinants of Cross-border Migration

The non-migrants households were found better off compared to the migrant's households in terms mean of size of land holding, annual household income by selling food grains and years of schooling of household head than cross-border migrants households accepting the hypothesis and migrant's households were found to be better (i.e. with lower mean indebtedness) then non migrant households that contradicted the hypothesis. Decreases in household's income sufficiency and volume of cross-border migration shows weak positive correlation and contradicted the hypothesis.

Household's size of cultivable land and volume of cross-border migration were not significantly correlated. A weak negative correlation was observed between the two variables supporting the hypothesis.

The volume of cross-border migration and lack of employment opportunities at migrants' place of origin were not significantly correlated. A weak positive correlation was observed between the two variables supporting the hypothesis.

Increased in household's indebtedness and volume of cross-border migration were not significantly correlated. A weak positive correlation was observed between the two variables supporting the hypothesis.

The volume of cross-border migration and ancestors' participation in cross-border migration were significantly correlated supporting the hypothesis.

The frequencies of cross-border migrants and volume of cross-border were not significantly correlated but a weak but positive correlation was observed between the two variables supporting the hypothesis.

The volume of cross-border migration and migrants established networks were not significantly correlated. A weak positive correlation was observed between the two variables supporting the hypothesis.

The volume of cross-border migration and migrants migrating during off farming seasons were not correlated and contradicts the hypothesis.

9.1.5.2 Testing of Hypotheses Related with Consequences of Cross-border Migration

The duration of stay at cross-border migrant's working place and their income were significantly correlated strongly supporting the hypothesis.

Remittance sent by cross-border migrants and their improvement on household consumptions were not significantly correlated but a weak positive correlation was observed between the two variables supporting the hypothesis.

Remittance sent by cross-border migrants and their improvement on children's education was not significantly correlated but a weak positive correlation was observed between the two variables supporting the hypothesis.

Remittance sent by cross-border migrants and loan/debt pay were not significantly correlated and a weak negative correlation was observed between the two variables, contradicting the hypothesis.

The improvements of health and sanitation of a household and remittances sent by crossborder migrants were not significantly correlated but a weak positive correlation was observed supporting the hypothesis.

Physical properties (land and house) earned by migrants household and remittance from cross-border migrants were not significantly found but a weak positive correlation was observed between the two variables supporting the hypothesis.

The average income of cross-border migrant's and training received by them before their migration were significantly correlated supporting the hypothesis.

Income of cross-border migrants' increased at the work-place with the level of education received by migrants before their migration were not significantly correlated but a positive correlation supporting the hypothesis.

The improvements in cash saving among cross-border migrant's household and remittances sent by migrants were significantly correlated supporting the hypothesis.

9.2 Conclusions

9.2.1 Unemployment at the Place of Origin: Main Reason of Cross-border Migration

The involvement of people in cross-border migration, primarily in search of employment, is an inescapable consequence of development. Cross-border migration is caused due to growing unemployment associated with high wages in countries of destination. Causes of cross-borderlabour migration range from differences in employment opportunities between countries of origin and destination. Established inter-country networks based on family, culture and history are also responsible either to increase or to decrease the volume of cross-border migrants. Nepal is an agricultural country with high population growth resulting large section of unemployed working age population. The situation of unemployment increases the level poverty. To meet the household's daily need, cash income is essential, if it cannot be fulfilled in place origin, cross-border migration in search of employment can be regarded an option to meet household's needs.

9.2.2 Cross-border Migration: Intergenerational Practice

Social institutions, which transcend individual lives, help support multigenerational influence, particularly at the extreme top and bottom of the social hierarchy, but to some extent in the middle as well. Multigenerational influence also works through demographic processes because families influence subsequent generations through differential fertility and survival, migration and marriage patterns, as well as through direct transmission of socioeconomic rewards, status, and positions. The *demographic* significance on intergenerational correlation also lies in the geographic mobility of individuals.

The countries Nepal and India have historical relation based on similar religious and cultural patterns. In addition, existing open border between two the countries has made

easy for the movement of peoples of the two countries. The outflow of Nepalese people to India and inflow of Indian People to Nepal has long history. The ancestors of more than 40 per cent cross-border migrants have involved in cross-border migration to India in search of employment, reflecting intergenerational practice and culture of cross-border migration.

9.2.3 Involvement in Cross-border Migration: A Gateway to Marry

Cross-border migration has considered as a source of accumulating cash income among the migrants' households. In absence of employment opportunities at the place of origin, join to work in India and earn cash income can be considered a better alternative. Remittances from cross-border migration act as a partial remedy for risk management and liquidity constraints in migrant's households. Cross-border migration further helps to extend networks, experiences and skills of migrants. Roles of these out-put due to crossborder migration were observed in marriage pattern of migrants. More than 60 per cent of migrants were found never married just before the first time their involvement in crossborder migration and now more than 80 per cent have currently married.

9.2.4 Tharu Community: A New Test of Cross-border Migration

Tharu community is the indigenous community and resident of Tarai region of Nepal. The flow of people from Mountain and Hill regions of Nepal to Tarai region, the geographical distribution of population has significantly changed. The man land ratio has been decreasing mainly due to internal migration to Tarai and increased population and households of Tharu community themselves. The Tharu community was fully engaged or dependent on their own enough land nearly two decade ago but now due to land fragmentation within households (sharing of parental properties) the current available land size does not meet the basic income to run the households of Tharu community. Now, to meet the household's need, youths from Tharu community have joined crossborder migration to India in search of employment.

9.2.5 Testing of Hypothesis

The testing of hypothesis related with determinants of cross-border migration shows: the non-migrants households were found better than migrant's households on size of land, annual household income on selling food grains and years of schooling (of household head) against cross-border migrants. Lack of employment at the place of origin and volume of cross-border migration; increased in household's indebtedness and volume of cross-border migration; ancestor's participation (intergenerational) and volume of cross-border; migrants established networks and volume of cross-border migration were correlated as predicated in the hypothesis.

The volume of cross-border migration and migrant's migration during off farming seasons were not found correlated to each other.

Similarly, the testing of hypothesis related to the consequences of cross-border migration shows: the duration of stay at cross-border migrant's working place and their income; Remittance sent by cross-border migrants and their improvement on household consumptions; remittance sent by cross-border migrants and their improvement on children's education; improvements of health and sanitation of a household and remittances sent by cross-border; Physical properties (land and house) earned by migrants household and remittance; average income of cross-border migrant's and training received by them before migrating; average income of cross-border migrant's and education received by them before migrating; improvements in cash saving among cross-border migrant's household and remittances sent by migrants were correlated as predicted in hypothesis.

Remittance sent by cross-border migrants and loan/ debt pay shows a weak negative correlation contradicting with hypothesis.

9.2.6 Remittances: Mainly to Fulfill Household Consumption

The success of cross-border migrants in accumulating capital and skills does not lead to investing productively in their place of origin. Other factors come into play the migrant's educational level; the living conditions at destination; the migrant's intention of returning; the characteristics of the migrant's household and her or his access to local assets; and the social, economic and ecological contexts in place of origin. The impact of remittances is complex and varied. However, remittances are more often used for consumption than investment. Remittances have had positive impacts on household consumption. Migration serves first to assure survival. In the best of cases, it helps to improve daily life, but rarely does it concern itself with development. Out-migration is seen by most households as a survival strategy rather than an accumulation strategy. Additional income from remittances enables households to invest in farm and off-farm activities and entrepreneurial endeavors. This may in turn create employment opportunities for other villagers. Among the migrant's households, the main areas for the use of remittances were to fulfill basic needs (food and clothes) for 197 (51.0%).

9.2.7 Households Wealth Status and Involvement in Cross-border Migration

Household's wealth enables to cross-border migration process. This combination of low migration costs and access to migrant networks allowed the poor to access to migration. Wealth influences the migration decision by affecting the available opportunities in the country of origin.

The households from poorest and richest wealth status were found comparatively less participation in cross-border migration than poor and rich categories of wealth status. Poorest households cannot manage required resources and cost, and richest have enough properties and resources at their place of origin. Households from top and bottom level of wealth status were found less likely in cross-border migration.

9.2.8 Social Participation Index and Involvement in Cross-border Migration

The variation of level of social participation index at place of origin of migrants shows the variation in volume of cross-border migration. The level of social participation includes social integration with the help of social interaction in various social activities. The people may engage more in community-based social networks with feeling of responsibilities towards their society. Households having high level of social participation index decreases participation in volume of cross-border migration from migrant-sending communities. The cross-border migrants were observed more from medium (47%), low (36.4%) and high (16.6%) respectively. As the level of social participation index of households reaches high, the volume of cross-border migrants tends to decrease, households with low social participation index may have not required resources and networks to join cross-border migration but their share is more in migration than households with high social participation index. The households with medium social participation index have nearly 50 per cent share in cross-border migration. These households can manage required resources and internal and external networks while joining cross-border migration.

9.2.9 Remittances: Investment in Human Capital (Education and Health of Children)

Remittances promote children's school attendance particularly among secondary schoolage children and higher order of birth siblings. Remittances do positively impact children's school attendance. Per cent increase in the likelihood of receiving remittances raises the likelihood of school attendance. The likelihood of remittance-receipt by the household raises their probability of school attendance. Income from remittances has a large positive impact on school retention rates.

Children in migrant's households have lower rates of mortality than non-migrants households, because migration raises health knowledge as well as wealth. In addition, there are a number of expenditure items that are considered as consumption, but, directly or indirectly, have a positive effect on child education. For instance, expenditure in child health, nutrition, and clothing are part and parcel of investment in human capital. Many studies suggest that the use of remittances for education has significant social and economic effects for individuals, their families and society at large. Among the total cross-border migrant's households (386), 231(59.8%) households were able in improving their children's education and 203 (52.6%) households reported that their health service capabilities have been enhanced.

9.2.10 Income/ Remittances: Varies with Attained Level of Education and Trainings

Education seems to improve the income distribution. Rates of schooling and rates of economic growth have been observed to move in the same and opposite directions. Education and skill promote labor productivity and, consequently, labor productivity positively influences the productivity of other factors of production. The probability of finding employment rises with higher levels of education, and that earnings are higher for people with higher levels of education. Education clearly enhances people's earning ability. Education and skill of the workforce have played an important role in modernizing the economy and increasing their own income. The average earning of migrants with level of education SLC and above was found nearly two times more than illiterate migrants, and average earning migrants with having any kind of skill was significantly higher than migrants without any training.

9.2.11 Lack of Knowledge on Right's of Migrant's Workers

Knowledge on rights of migrants to migrants themselves helps to protect from any kind of exploitation at their working place. Cross-border migrant workers are looked as a pool of cheap, flexible, and exploitable labour. Rights for migrant workers are often secondary to the economic benefits they bring to both countries of origin and countries of destination. Fundamental human rights at work, including the right to be protected against discrimination on the basis of sex, racial, ethnic and social origin, religion and political opinion productive work as the basis of a livelihood protection against accidents, injuries and diseases at work, and social security social inclusion and participation in social dialogue are some rights of migrants workers at their place of work. Among the total 426 cross-border migrants only 8 (1.9%) have few knowledge on their rights. This showed that cross-border migrants are working without knowledge of their own right. In such working environment, there is high possibility of exploitation and lack of social security to the cross-border migrants workers to India.

9.2.12 Knowledge on Migrant's Rights and Distinct Perspectives of Government Staff (Nepal and India)

There is important role of government staff to provide services and facilitate while entry and exit of transit point by cross-border migrants. Government staffs from both countries (Nepal and India) are implementing the guideline of their own government. The government staffs of both countries have no any assignments and knowledge on migrant's rights at their working place.

The government staff of Indian side was found with longer duration of work at transit point than staff of Nepalese side. The staff of Indian government side was concerned much more with long-term security issues of their nation and mentioned open-border is much more beneficial to Nepalese side. Staff of Nepalese government expressed their experiences of behavior of big-brotherhood rather than respecting as the staff of sovereign, independent and neighboring country and frequently, Nepalese cross-border migrants are being victimized (theft, robbery, ill-treat, unnecessary torture etc.) in Indian territory and while crossing the border (joining and returning back from the work).

9.3 Further Research Issues

- The present study is based on data/information from only place of origin (non-migrants and of cross-border migrant's households). The study including in both place of origin and destination (working place of migrants in India) would be more useful.
- 2. The study covers only one transit point of Far-west Nepal. The study covering at least one transit point from each development region will be more representative.
- The study is related only cross-border migration of Nepalese people to India, the further study can be helpful by combining with cross-border migration of Indian people to Nepal.
- 4. Cross-border migration study in large scale with both countries Nepal-India, India-Nepal and Nepal-China, China-Nepal can provide detail, comparative information and situation among these three countries.

APPENDIX I: ASSUMPTIONS, PROPOSITIONS AND CRITIQUES OF MIGRATION THEORIES

Theory/ Approach		Assumptions/ Laws	Propositions	Critique		
Broader	Specific	1	1	L. L		
EO CLASSICAL	RAVENSTEIN	Seven laws; The greatest body of migrants travel short distance, Migration produces currents directed towards great commercial centers, Each current has a compensating counter-current in the opposite direction, Both current display similar characteristics, Long distance movements are directed towards great commercial centers, People in urban areas migrate less than people in rural areas, Males migrate more over long distances and females migrate more over short distances.	Migration - an inseparable part of development and the major causes were economic. A positive function of repulsive forces at origin and attractive forces at destination, and is inversely related to the friction or distance between origin and destination.	Exclusion of, politics and policies, Unable to explain migration differentials, A static perspective		
CLASSICAL N	DUALLABOUR	Migration- is the means by which surplus labor in the traditional (agricultural) sector is redeployed to fill rising modern (urban) sector labor demands. Migration is demand-or employment-driven rather than being driven by wages, which are assumed to be fixed.	Labour surplus exists in rural areas. The loss/migration of labour does not reduce agricultural production or affect wages, Once migration eliminates rural labor surpluses, urban wages must rise to lure workers from the rural sector.	Receiving state bias-excludes push factors, Unable to account for differential immigration rates in even with similar economic structures, Division of primary and secondary sector is usually arbitrary.		

	Migration decision-influence by; Factors associated with	At the macro level migration is an	People's perceptions on push and pull
	the areas of origin, Factors associated with the areas of	outcome of poverty and backwardness in	factors vary due to different access to
	destination, Intervening obstacles between place of origin	the sending areas,	source of information and it may affect
	and destination and Personal factors,	At micro level individual's migration	people's perceptions in migration
	Factors involved at origin and destination ('pull'-which act	behavior results from rational calculation	decision,
E	to hold people within the area/to attract people to it, 'push'-	of costs and benefits and aims at	Non-economic factors ought to play an
LE	which act to repel people from the area, and factors	maximizing gains, pursuing the economic	important role in affecting individuals'
	essentially indifferent),	gain being prime goal. Migration	migration decision,
	Revenstein's laws has refined-as volume of migration,	movements tend towards a certain spatial-	Fails to acknowledge the limitations in
	development of stream/counter stream, characteristics of	economic equilibrium	time, resources and personal ability.
	migrants and perceptions on factors differs between	Flow of knowledge back from destination	
	migrants	facilitates the passage for later migrants.	
	Migration- not only due prevailing income differentials but	Free choice, full access to information of	Largely ignores the existence of market
	also rural-urban income differential adjusted for the	origin/destination, destination where able	imperfections, different sources and
•	probability of finding an urban job,	to earn the highest wages,	reliability of information and other
RC	Macro level- migration is caused by geographical	Factor price equalization- eventually	structural constraints, Mainly focuses
DA	differences in the supply and demand for labour and capital	result in growing convergence between	on expected income and ignores the
ΓΟ	is expected to move in the opposite direction,	wages at the sending/receiving ends the	role of households, social, cultural,
D	Micro level- migrants as an individual, rational actors, who	incentives for migrating, Mechanically	political, institutional, government
AN	decide to move on the basis of a cost-benefit analysis,	reduces migration determinants,	restrictions and remittances,
Η	Expected to move from low income to high income areas,	Migration- fulfils the same facilitating	Migration trends are not correlated with
RIS	and from densely to sparsely populated areas, countries	role in the modernization of currently	trends in relative wages,
[Y]	with (large labour- low wage and with limited labor- high	developing countries as it did in	
H	wage)	nineteenth and twentieth century in	
		Europe,	
		-	

M A R I X	POLITICAL ECONOMY CAPITAL	Each person can be considered as the product of the series of investment – in his or her education/skills/experience/ trainings and heath etc. Creates differences in individuals' economic earnings/returns from migration, Emphasis on the rational calculation of benefits /costs in migration decision making, Economic and political power is unequally distributed among developed and underdeveloped countries, that people have unequal access to resources, Migration- as a natural outgrowth of disruptions and dislocations that are intrinsic to the process of capitalist accumulation, Migration- occurs on the foundation of social formation which are; relations of production and uneven geographical development,	Migration becomes a means of personal investment that will be made only if returns for the behavior are justified. Migration replaces benefits and costs with human capital and other variables Underdeveloped countries are trapped by their disadvantaged position within the global geopolitical structure instead of their modernization and development, As one of the very causes of underdevelopment, ruins stable peasant societies, undermines their economies and uproots their populations.	Optimistic, migration is not always a voluntary process to maximize gain, Empirical applications of this approach do not adequately assess the cost benefit calculation Too determinist and passively adapt to macro-forces, largely ruling out individual agency, generates passive model of human being, underestimates the processes by which people change their economic and social environments, Lacking of empirical test.
I S T N E O	CUMULATIVE CAUSATION	Once differential growth had occurred, internal and external economies of scale will perpetuate and deepen the bipolar pattern characterized by the vicious cycle of poverty in the periphery and the accelerated growth of the core region Migration- the process draining developing countries in general and backward rural areas in particular of their labour and human capital resources. Migration- to intensify regional developmental disparities.	Increases regional inequalities, creates de-developing feedback mechanisms—the backwash effects in sending societies regions, additional movements more likely, Undermines regional and local economies by depriving communities of their most valuable labour force, increasing dependence on the outside world.	Deterministic and self-affirming nature of model which does not give room for heterogeneity in the specific, localized migration impact, Remittances never matches with blackwash effects, Inconsistent logic

M A R X I S T	WORLD SYSTEM	Only a single path of evolutionary development for all country, Capitalistic truly global nature, and that it is a world-economy that has not become politically unified into a world-empire and divided on the basis of penetration of capital; , core, Periphery, semi periphery and external nations, The penetration of capitalist economics relations into non capitalist societies creates a mobile population that is prone to migrate abroad,	Migration, once induced or forced, becomes a self-perpetuating and self- regulating process of dependency, Incorporation of the peripheries into the capitalist economy is associated with putting migration drain on them, International migration not to the bifurcation of the labor, but to the structure of the world market.	Only applicable at the global level, cannot be empirically tasted, Deviating too far from Marxist principles for -Marxist Bluing the boundaries between state and businesses for- State autonomists, Much importance on economy- Culturalists
T R A N S I T	MOBILITY TRANSITION	All societies undergo the same kind of processes and mobility transition links the vital transition; Pre-modern traditional society (high fertility and mortality, little natural increase if any); Early transitional society (rapid decline in mortality, major population growth); Late transitional society (major decline in fertility, significant but decelerating natural increase); Advanced society (fertility and mortality stabilized at low levels, slight population increase; and Future super advanced society (continuing low fertility and mortality) Scientific knowledge- extended control over birth and death resulting demographic transition	Migration processes tends to change over the course of this vital transition, Level of economic development, state formation and the patterns of population mobility are interrelated,	Universalistic pretensions are not only its strength, but also its main weakness, European experience does not necessarily exactly apply to contemporary developing countries. Failure to specify the actual causal relation between demographic transitions and mobility change

I O N A L	MIGRATION HUMP	Temporary increase in migration – a migration hump – has been a usual part of the process of economic development. In the early stages of development, an increase in wealth tends to lead to a rise in migration, since a certain threshold of wealth is necessary to enable people to assume the costs and risks of migrating.	Increased wealth and migrant networks, an increasing proportion of the population is able to migrate, At later stages of development, emigration tend to decrease and regions and countries tend to transform from labour exporters to labour importers	Lack of historical-regional, social and cultural dimensions, and time-spatial variations, Indirect and probabilistic relationship Unable to integrate the both causes and co <i>nse</i> quences of migration
NET WOR K A N D SY STE MS	SOCIAL CAPITAL NETWORK	Once someone has migrated internationally, he/she is very likely to do so again, leading to repeated movements over time, Network connections- are a form of social capital that people draw upon to gain access to employment abroad, reduces moving and psychic cost, Network constructed through movements and interactions of people across the space constitute center of micro- structures that sustain migration over time	At once network- reaches at critical level, migration becomes self-perpetuating, the success/failure in migration process is largely depends on the available social networks/access to such networks Migration-flows hierarchal order: Immediate family, extended family and kin, friends, people from same area of origin, people with shared ethnic interest/people with common organizational affiliation	Conceptual framework rather than a theory, Ignores the factors weakening and crumbling of networks, Not explicate the link between group behavior and individual migration decision making and the issue of how an individual deals with conflicting views or information from different networks,
	SYSTEM	Migration- a set of places linked by flows and counter- flows of people, Flow of information, goods, services and ideas, mass culture connections, state to state relations, and family/social networks, favorable information encourages further migration,	Migration- alters social/cultural/economic/ institutional conditions at sending/receiving ends, the entire developmental space within which migration processes operate/reshapes the socio-economic development context.	Purely descriptive Lacking of empirical test

P L		Migration- reaction to relative rather than absolute deprivation	Household strategy to diversify the household's income to increase	Very methodological design, lack of analytical rigor failed to take into
UR	z	Not only to maximize income but also to minimize spread	household income and overcoming	account the influence and role of
AL	NEL	risks.	constraints on economic activities/investments in of origin.	remittances, sending side bias
IS		Decisions are not made by isolated individuals actors, but larger units (families/households),		
T A P P	OD	Migration- one of the main elements of strategies to diversify, secure and, potentially, durably improve households combined with farm and non- farm activities,	Poor are passive victims of global capitalist forces but trying to improve their livelihoods within their constraining	Underplays elements of the vulnerability context; such as macro economic trends and conflict.
RO A	ELIHO	and means to acquire a wider range of assets which insure against future shocks and stresses. Capital assets can be expanded in generalized and ingrammatal fashion	conditions, encompasses households' income generating activities, social institutions intra household relations and	Ignored the existing inequalities of power, and the fact that enhancing the
	LIV	expanded in generalized and incremental fashion	mechanisms of access to resources through the life cycle	those of another



APPENDIX – II: FIELD QUESTIONNAIRE

Tribhuvan University

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Kirtipur

Determinants and Consequences of Cross-border Migration of Nepalese People to India

Questionnaires Related with the Study of Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, 2011

SECTION 01: SURVEY INFORMATION AND IDENTIFICATION OF HOUSEHOLD

101. HSNO:	102. S	legment NO.	HHSNO =			103. Selected HHSN	0=		
104. District	10:	5.VDC] 106. Ward No	107.	. Name of	currently Residing Loca	tion/Area:		
108. Mother Tongue		08. Caste/ethnicity				109. Religior	1		
110. Place of origin (if mig	rant) 11	11. Place of origin (if	migrant again in	n Q. 110)	11	2. Place of origin (if mi	grant again in Q. 11	1)	
A.District (code)		A. District (cod	de)			A. District (code)			
B. VDC 1, Munic	pipality 2	B. VDC 1	, Municipality	2		в. VDC1, М	unicipality 2		
113. Name of Interviewee:		114.Nai	ne of Interviewe	r:	115	. Interview date			
116. Name of Supervisor:								•	

SECTION 02: HOUSEHOLD ROWSTER

I D C O D E	201. Member of same household living together and joining same kitchen including living outside the household /working members (Start to write from the name of head of the family)	202. Sex Male1 Female2	203. Relationship with Household head HH head	204. Age Compl eted_ Write 00 for less than 1 year	205. What is Marital Status? (Ask only to completed Syrs and above) Married1 Divorced2 Separated3 Widower/Widow 4 Unmarried5 Forbidden6	206. Educational Status (Ask only to completed Syrs and above) Literate 1 Illiterate 2	207. If literate, level of comple ted (Use code)	208. Currently reading on school/col lege or not? Yes1 No2	209. Currently living together with family or not? Yes1 No2 (if $2 \rightarrow 211$)	210. Have moved to work outside the district Within the period of last 5 yrs? Moved1 Not moved2 (if $2 \rightarrow 212$)	211. If moved outside/not living with family, where was the destination? Or now here living ? Other district1 India2 Arab/Gulf countries3 Other country4 Don't Know99	212. What is the reason behind of not living with family for any duration within period of last five yrs? Marriage1 work2 Education3 Household reason4 Other (Specify)5
01												
02												
03												
04												
05												
06												
07												
08												

213.	Do you have lan Yes1,	nd ownershij No		218.		
	Types of land		Area -Hect			
		Irrigated	Not irrigated	Total		
	1. House and its premises					
	2. Paddy field					
	3.Field					1
	4. Steep field					219 Di
	5.Thatch/Hay					12
	field personal forest land					220. Ho
No	te: if having only land $\rightarrow O = 2$	house and its	<i>premises, and</i> the	atch/hay field	d/personal forest	12
214. I Al Or No	s all of your all h l land is cultivat ly some Part of ot any part of lan	and being cu ed by family land is cultive id is cultivate	Iltivated by your members vated by family i ed by family men	own family 1 nembers2 nbers	y members? →216 3	221. Fc fi ir
215. I	f not any part o been cultivating	f land is cul ?	tivated by your	family men	mbers, then who has	Note: S
	Relatives	1, Half	share of product	tion2		222. If
216. I	s your family me Yes	ember cultiva	ating the land of2	other's?		tha
217. F	for how many me	onths can yo	u earn livelihood	d to your fai	mily from	
a	gricultural prod	uction (from	the land of your	own and o	other's) and its	
i	ncome?					
	(If more than 12	months and	saving of food g	grains) →21	9	

How do you fulfill for the months of food deficit? (Write main three responses according to the priorities of respondent) Seeking debt (loan).....1 Begging/gift or help gain by relatives2 first Wage labor (Night stay at home)......4 Wage labor (Night stay outside home)....5 second Foreign country-to save food grain......6 Wild roots and bulbs.....7 Selling cattle and birds......8 Third Not taking enough food.....10 Other (specify) id you get income from sale of saving food grains during last months? Did1, Did not $2 \rightarrow 221$ ow much income did you get by selling food crops during last months? NRs or how many months in a year, does it help to make your family livelihood rom all sources of income (agriculture, non-agriculture and regular ncome)? (If more than 12 months and saving $\rightarrow 223$) Salary, regular wages, pension, occupation and other regular sources are included in regular income) income from all sources can meet livelihood of your family for less an one year, then how do you manage the expenditure of your family? Seeking debt.....1 Credit/Lending......2 Selling cattle and birds......4 Selling land ornaments......5 Other (specify])

223. What are the main sources of income of your family?	230. What is the main mate
(Mention up to three sources if) First	Thatch/straw/hay
Self employment in agriculture1	Wood
Agriculture labor	Zinc
Self employment in non-agriculture3 Second	Tile/stone
Non -agriculture labor4	Concrete/cemented.
Regular salary	other
Foreign employment	231. What is the main source
Other (Specify)	Electricity.
224. What is the status of ownership of house where you residing?	Bio-gas
Your own house1	Light from ba
Rented House2	Ŏil
Free available	Pine Wood
225. How many rooms are being used by your family?	232. Is there rugular electric
226. How many stories are there in your house?	house?
Ground floor/one storey1	A. Regular
Two stories2	B Power g
Three or more than three Stories	C. Solor no
227. Is your family using separate room for kitchen?	C. Solar po
Ye1, No2	255. What is the main sour
228. What is the main material being used for the floor of your house?	water piped within
Clay1, Wood2	Water piped of pub
Stone/Brick3, Cement4	Personal Hand pur
Other	Personal Hand pur
229. What is the main material being used for the wall of your house?	Public hand pump -
Bamboo/Wood/Cement Mixed1	Personal Hand pur
Setting by cement with stone/brick2	Personal well
Setting by cement with stone/brick	Public well
Wood4	Storage rain water.
Concrete	Spring/river,pond/c
Bamboo/fodder6	Water tanker
Clay/husk7	Other
No wall	
other	

What is the main material used for the roof of your house?
Thatch/straw/hay1
Wood2
Zinc3
Tile/stone4
Concrete/cemented5
vhat is the main source of lighting in your house?
Electricity1 kerosen oil2
Light from battery (tukimira)4
Dill
Pine wood/ Other
s there rugular electricity, power generator or solar power supply in your
nouse ?
A. Regular electricity Tes, No2
B. Power generator Yes1, No2
C. Solar power Yes1, No2
What is the main source of drinking water in your home?
Water piped within household compound1
Water piped of public tap 2
Personal Hand pump -surface 3
Personal Hand pump -Dip 4
Public hand pump -surface
Personal Hand pump -Dip
Personal well7
Public well
Storage rain water
Spring/river,pond/other open source of water10
Water tanker
Other

234. What are the main sources of fuel, generally used for cooking/heating in your house ? (*Only main three*)



235. What type of latrine is being used by your family ?

Flush system connected with public se	wage	1
Flush sytem connected with septic tank	2	
Closed domestic toilet	3	
Open domestic toilet	4	
Public toilet	5	
Other (specify)		
No toilet (open field, river, forest)	7	

236. Which properties below are under the ownership of your family members ?

Sn	Properties	a. yes1 no2 →next	bif yes, number
1	TV		
2	Electricity/electric fan		
3	Telphone/Mobile		
4	Mopad/Scquit/Motor		
_	cycle		
5	Cycle		
6	Tractor/power tealer		
7	Cart		
8	Car/van		
9	Bus/truck		
10	Riksaw		
	Two-wheeled horse		
11	driven vehicle		
12	solar		
13	Push cart		
14	Refrigerator		

237. Has your family taken loan?

Yes.....1, No2→241

238. If loan/lending has taken please mention major among them (*Include major three loan if*)

<i>S</i> .	No	A Amount in Rs.	B. Time Duration of loan	C. Annual interest rate	D. Mode of payment
1					

2		
3		

239. What were the purposes of loan taken? (Mentional Content of the second sec	on any three if)
Food/clothing1	
Education2	First obj.
Treatment of health3	
Busines4	Second obj.
Construction/Maintainance of house5	
To buy land and other properties	Third obj.
To celebrate custom, festival and culture7	
To join foreign employment8	
Other (specify)	
240. What was the relation/relationship of your far	nily with loan provider?
(Mention outmost three, if)	
Relatives1	First
Neighbours/friend2	
Local merchant/merchant/landlords3	Second
Co-operatives4	
Bank/financial institutions5	Third
Other (Specify)	
241. Has any family member from your house invo	olved in foreign
employment during last 12 months?	
Involved1	
Not involved $\dots 2 \rightarrow 245$	

242. If involved, how much income did your family earn during last 12 months from foreign employment?

Destination	Income in NRs			Total
India				
Arab/Gulf countries				

Other countries		

243. Mainly for what purposes the income from foreign employment was used? (Mention any main three purpose, if)

To add household properties1 First use	
To construct/renovate house2	
Education of children	
Basic Needs (food, shelter and cloth4	
To pay debt5	
No any use/no saving6 Third use	
Other (specify)	
244. Mainly in which season/time you or your family member join to work	in
India/foreign countries?	
Agricultural off season1 during time of cultivation2	Г
After harvesting	
245 Can you inform about the available service facilities uses and satisfa	otion

245. Can you inform about the available service, facilities, uses and satisfaction

at your place of residence/VDC. (In case of No or 2 answer go to next service)

Service/Facilites	a.available yes1 No2	b.use of service, facilities yes1 No2	c. Satisfaction from service/facilites Yes1 No2
01. School-1-10_class			
02. Campus, +2			
03.Health post/center/Hospital			
04. Agriculture center			
05. Community forest/office			
06. Vietnary clinic			
07.Small farmer group			

08. Women development group		
09.Bank/Cooperatives		
10. Police station		
11. Motorable road		
12. Town/bazzar		

246. Are, the following groups/organizations are formed or not in your community? Is any member from your family affiliated or not to such organisations?

Group/organizations	a. b.Member in this yes1 group No2 → Yes1 Next No2 →Next		c.Is your family included member in working committee of such organization? Yes1, No2		
		Female	Male	Female	Male
01. Water users group					
02. Community forest users					
group					
03. Small credit group					
04. Saving/credit group					
05. Women/Mother group					
06. Small hydropower					
users group					
07. Non-governmental					
organizations					
08. Local clubs					
09.Community based					
organizations					
10. Political parties					
11.Ethnic organization					
12. Local					
government/ward/VDC/Munic					
ipality/District Development					
Committee					
13.Professional groups					

14. Cooperatives			
15. Agricultural group			
16. Other (specify)			

Less cost/easy for work	Third
Other (specify)	

Section 03: RETURNED MIGRANTS

305. Last time, with whom did you go to India to work? Alone/Worked there previously 1 With own family members 2 With relatives 3	
With Friends	
With Meith	
With Manpower agent	
$\frac{\text{Other (Specify)}}{1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 +$	
306. How did you manage provision of your food/lodging while work	ling in
India?	
Managed by employer/company at working place	
Initialized by sell seperately	
Managed by agent/maitha/agency	
Not fieved/elsewhere 5	
Other (specify)	
307. Who is mainly responsible to take decision while you move India?	d to work in
Self	
Other (Specify)	
308. Up to now, how many times did you go to work India? (<i>If only one time</i> →312)	

222

309. If you were India for work two or more than two times, did you worked at the
same working place?
Yes, worked at the same place $1 \rightarrow 312$
No, worked at different place2
310. If you worked at different places, up to now, in how many working
places did you work?
311. What was the reason behind the change of working places?
Due to friend/accompany1
Less salary/wages2
Lack of good working environment3
Compulsion of work/Company closed4
Due to Meith/Agent5
Other (specify)
312. Did you seek any financial help with someone while you worked in India last
time?
Ves 1 No $2 \rightarrow 314$
313. If you sought financial help, who did you ask for help?
313. If you sought financial help, who did you ask for help? Relatives
313. If you sought financial help, who did you ask for help? Relatives
313. If you sought financial help, who did you ask for help? Relatives
313. If you sought financial help, who did you ask for help? Relatives
313. If you sought financial help, who did you ask for help? Relatives
313. If you sought financial help, who did you ask for help? Relatives
313. If you sought financial help, who did you ask for help? Relatives Manpower agency/agent Neighbors/friend Meitha Local merchant/merchant/landlord Other (specify) 314. What was your age when moved to work in India first time?
313. If you sought financial help, who did you ask for help? Relatives Manpower agency/agent Neighbors/friend Meitha Local merchant/merchant/landlord Other (specify) 314. What was your age when moved to work in India first time? (Completed age)
313. If you sought financial help, who did you ask for help? Relatives Manpower agency/agent Neighbors/friend Meitha Local merchant/merchant/landlord Other (specify) 314. What was your age when moved to work in India first time? (Completed age) 315. What was your educational status while moved to work to India first
313. If you sought financial help, who did you ask for help? Relatives Manpower agency/agent Neighbors/friend Meitha Local merchant/merchant/landlord Other (specify) 314. What was your age when moved to work in India first time? (Completed age) 315. What was your educational status while moved to work to India first time? (Write the completed level and code)
313. If you sought financial help, who did you ask for help? Relatives Manpower agency/agent Neighbors/friend Meitha Local merchant/merchant/landlord Other (specify) 314. What was your age when moved to work in India first time? (Completed age) 315. What was your educational status while moved to work to India first time? (Write the completed level and code) 316. What was your marital status when moved to work in India first tim
313. If you sought financial help, who did you ask for help? Relatives Manpower agency/agent Neighbors/friend Meitha Local merchant/merchant/landlord Other (specify) 314. What was your age when moved to work in India first time? (Completed age) 315. What was your educational status while moved to work to India first time? (Write the completed level and code) 316. What was your marital status when moved to work in India first tim Married 1
313. If you sought financial help, who did you ask for help? Relatives Manpower agency/agent Neighbors/friend Meitha Local merchant/merchant/landlord Other (specify) 314. What was your age when moved to work in India first time? (Completed age) 315. What was your educational status while moved to work to India first time? (Write the completed level and code) 316. What was your marital status when moved to work in India first tim Married 1 Married 2 Separate 2

317. What are the main reasons for going to India to work?	
Lack of omployment here 1	
Due to debt 2 First	
To increase household income/halp 3	
After holiday, to join for work	
Conflict/political instability have 5 Second	
Eriondo/occommenty suggestions	
Concentrational (an acatera) practice	
In India and amounturity of ampleument 9 Third	
In India, good opportunity of employment8 Inita	
More wages/salary	
Educational support to children	
Other (specify)	
318. Is your joining work in India is the continuation of your ancestors?	
Yes1, No	
319. If yes, since when your family is going to India for work?	
Before the time of grandfather	
Since the time of grandfather2	
Since the time of father	
Other 9specify)	
320. Are you affiliated to any union/organizations where you are current	ly
residing?	
Yes1, No2→326	
321. If affiliated, in which type of organization are you affiliated?	
Social (users group, management committee, club, etc) 1	
Financial (co-operatives, saving etc)2	
Religious (Guthi, religious organizations, etc)3	
Professional/employment oriented4	

322. What is your position in the affiliated organization?	
Advisor1	
Main post-chairman, secretary, treasurer, etc2	
Member-working committee member	
General member	
323. Have you done any counselling with the organization while	
joining work in India?	
Yes, done1, No2 → 326	
324. Did you seek any type of help from your affiliated organization	
while counselling with them?	
Yes1, No2 →326	
325. If you sought help of your affiliated organization, in which area was the	:
help sought?	
Financial1, Social2	
Develop relationship at destination3, Other(specify)	
326. Were you affiliated/membership taken from any organization	l
while working in India?	
Yes1, No2→331	
327. If affiliated, in which types of organization were you affiliated?	
Social (users group, management committee, club, etc)1	
Financial (co-operatives, saving etc)2	
Religious (Guthi, religious organizations, etc)	
Professional/employment oriented4	
Political (Party member, VDC/DDC representative5	
Ethinic organizaron6	
Other (specify)	
328. What was your position in the affiliated organization?	
Advisor1	

Main post (Chairman, secretary, treasurer, etc)2
Member (working committee member)
General member4
329. Did you seek any type of help of the affilated organization?
Yes1, No
530. If you sought help in which area the help was it?
Search employment
Social (shelter, lood, treatment during seek etc)
10 extend relationship4, Other (Specify)
331. Have to taken any skill training?
Yes
332. If yes, what type of skill training have you taken?
Sewing
Wood/furniture3, soap making4
Candle making5, Food/bread
Materials from bamboo7, Security training8
Other (specify)
333. In which area of labor were you involved at working place?
Physical labor/unskilled1, Semi skilled2
Skilled
334. How much income, per month, did you earn during latest work
in India? Nrs
335. Mainly, for what purpose as your income used in your home?
(Mention maximum three areas of expenditure)
To add household property1
House construction/repair2 First
Education of children
Basic need (food, cloth and shelter4 second
To pay debt5
Nothing/no saving6 Third
Other (specify)
336. Did you get success to fulfill economic expectation as you desired?
Yes, get success1, No2
--
 337. Why did you come back from your working place? To join for household work/family cause1 To celebrate holiday
 339. Were all (gone together) returned together from working place? Yes, almost all
Other (specify)7 Third

3._____4.____351. What is your opinion on Nepal-India friendship treaty of 1950? (Write according to respondent) 2._____

1._____

Nepal Government should band/stop to go to India 12 for work Nepal government should protect and manage the right of Nepalese migrant workers working in India 13

3.

352. Show agrees or disagrees of your family with the following statements?

4.___

S.No	Statements	Agree1 Disagree2
1	India is good place for work	
2	We cannot bear the cost to go to other countries,	
_	therefore India is our destination	
3	My ancestor/forefather joined work in India	
	therefore India is also my destination	
4	It is easy to go and return from India, therefore I go	
	to India	
5	There is not any alternatives to me/my family	
	except to go India for work	
6	It is difficult to survive my family without working	
	in India	
7	The income by working in India is the main cash-	
	income of my family	
8	In case of having skilled training, the income can be	
	increased by working in India	
9	we are being frequently cheated by Agent/Meith	
	(who took us to India)	
10	We have to face ill treatment in working place,	
	while moving to India and returning back{	
11	I am fully satisfied by getting opportunity to work	
	in India	

SECTION 04: CURRENT MIGRANTS

(The family if in Q. 209 \rightarrow 2, Q=210 \rightarrow 1 and 211 \rightarrow 2, 212 \rightarrow 2 answers were received)	
ID Number of respondent	
 401. In which state of India, he/member of your family has gone? (Write the name of state and code (Nrite the name of state and code]
Months:	
403.Why he/your family member has chosen India as country of destination (Mention main three causes) Being contact since the time of ancestors1 First Being family members and relatives there 2	1?
Having neighbors/friends there	
Less cost/easy for work	
Own household member1 Relatives2 Friends3	

Manpower agency/agent5 Other (specify)
405. Who is responsible mainly to take decision for his/your family member to move India for work?
Self
Husband/Wife3, Friends/Accompanies4
Senior / respected persons of community
Meith /Manpower/Agent
Other (Specify)
406. With whom has he been India to work currently (latest one)
Alone/Worked there previously1
With own family members
With relatives
With Friends/relatives4
With Manpower agent /Meitha5
Other (Specify)
407. How did he manage the provisión of food and shelter while residing in India
for work?
Managed by employer/company at working place1
Managed by self seperately
Jointly together with friends
Managed by agent/Meith/agency4
Not fiexed/elsewhere5
Other (specify)
408. Is it first time of the member of your family has been India for work?
Yes
409. If not, currently (latest one) gone to India for work belongs on which
number?
410. Is he working at the previous/ same place? (If $Q=409$ + more than 1
times)
Yes1→412
No2

Meith.....4

Don't know/not sure $3 \rightarrow 412$	After holi
411. If no, why is he going to change the working place?	Conflict/p
Due to friend/accompany1	Friends/ac
Less salary/wages2	Generation
Lack of permanent working place	In India, g
Completion of work/Company closed4	More wage
Due to Meith /Agent/manpower5	Education
Other (specify)	Other (spe
412. Is his migration to India for work the continuation of his past	
generation/ancestor?	419. Did he ask
Yes1,No2→414	Yes
413. If yes, since when your family has been in migration to India for work?	No
Since the time before grandfather1	320. If yes, with
Since the time of grandfather2	With rel
Since the time of father	Manpow
Other (specify)4	Local me
414. What was his age while moved to work in India first time?	421. Has he tak
	Yes
415. What was his educational status at the time he moved to work in India first	422. If yes, in w
time?	Social (users
(Write educational level and code)	Financial (co
416. What was his marital status when moved to work in India first time?	Professional
Married1, Divorced2	Religious (G
Separate	Political (par
Unmarried5, Forbidden6	Ehinic-affilia
417. Now, in which area of labor he is working?	Other (speci
Physical labor/unskilled1, Semi skilled2	423. What was
Skilled	Advisor
Other (specify)	Main pos
418. What are the main reasons behind going to India for work of your family	Member
member? (Mention main three reasons, if)	General
Lack of employment here1	424. Has he tak
Due to debt2 First	migration
To increase household income/help3	Yes

After holiday, to join for work4		
Conflict/political instability here5	Second	
Friends/accompany suggestions6		
Generational (ancestors) practice7		
In India, good opportunity of employment8	Third	
More wages/salary9		
Educational support to children10		
Other (specify)		
9. Did he ask someone for any financial help during migrat	tion?	
Yes1		
No2→421		
20. If yes, with whom the financial help was asked?		
With relatives1, Meith2		
Manpower company/agent		
Local merchant/merchant/land lords4, Other (Spe	cify)	
21. Has he taken jæðFnikelælnið þa son e fótgelnisfæling helver for s	slt aif{sf]	x'g [] <
Yes1, No2→427		
22. If yes, in which type of organization he was affiliated?		
Social (users group, management committee, club, etc)	1	
Financial (co-operatives, saving etc)	2	
Professional/employment oriented	3	
Religious (Guthi, religious organizations, etc)	4	
Political (party member, VDC/DDC representative	5	
Ehinic-affiliated with ethnic groups	6	
Other (specify)		
23. What was his positional status in affiliated organization?)	
Advisor1		
Main post (president, secretary, treasurer2		
Member (working committee)		
General member4		
24. Has he taken any consultation with affiliated organizatio	n about	
migration to India for work?		
Yes1, No		

425. Did he seek any help from affiliated organization during consultation?	Cash	Kind(change in cash)	Total	
Yes1, No	435. Has your f Yes	amily/he got knowledge about right	s of migrant's labor? 437	
427. Has he taken any kind of skill training? Yes1, No				
428. If yes, skill training of which area was taken? Sewing	436. If yes, wi answer giv 1 3	hat are the rights of migrants' we yen by respondent)	orkers? (Write accordin 24	g to the
Other (specify)	437. Was he in: Yes 438. Was he	formed about his monthly income a1, No	this place of working in 2 dence /shelter at the	<u>India</u> ? place of
430. How many other persons were with him when moved to India for work?	working? Yes 439. Have you/	he got knowledge about Nepal-Indi	a friendship treaty of 19	50?
431. Generally, do they all come back together while returning back to Nepal? Yes, almost all	Y es	1, No	05	
No, only myself2 Most of them3 Only few4 Don't know5	440. If yes, where <i>(Write an</i>	hat are the provisions of work for nswer given by respondents)	the citizens of two co	ountries?
432.How much income per month is expected by him or your family?	1	2		
 433. Did he send any cash/kind after joining work in India? Yes1, No2→435 434. If yes during last 12 month how much cash and kind (change in cash) did he send? 	3 441. What are (Write a 1	your/family perceptions on Nepal- ccordingly responses of respondent	_4 India friendship treaty ()	 of 1950?
20	0			

	(Write according to the reply of respondents)
34	1 2
	34
	506a. Have you been able to add properties (house, patch of land, land etc)
	Yes 1
	No2 → 507
SECTION 05: CONSEQUENCES OF MIGRATION	506b.If yes, what physical properties did you add and what are their worth? (Mention main three properties (If?) added with the help of remittances
(Ask to interviewed household in Section 03 or 04 or both)	from India)
501. Did you/your family take loan/debt after migration to India for work?	S no Properties Worth (Nrs.)
Yes taken1, No2→503	
502. If loan/debt was taken what was its purpose?	4 Total
For food/clothing	507a Have you been able to add cash properties (cash bank balance invest in
Education and health	interest etc) from the income made by working in India?
Other (specify)	Yes, added/improved1
503 Did you sell any properties after migration of your family member to India	Not any change
for work?	Worsened than previous3
$Yes 1 No 2 \rightarrow 505$	507b.If improved or worsened than previous how did it happen?
504 If sold what was its purpose?	(Write according to the reply of respondents)
For food/clothing	1 2
Education and health	
To build/construct house/ buying household goods3	34
Other (specify)	508a.1s there any improvement in consumption of nutritional food in your family
505a.Has your family been able to improve economic saving after migration of	After migration to India for Work?
you/your family member to India for work?	1 es, improved.
Improve in economic saving1	Worsened than previous
No change/as usual	508h If improved or worsened than previous how did it happen?
Worsen than previous	5060.11 miproved of worsened than previous now did it happen?
505b. If improved or worsened than previous how it happened?	

(Write according to the responses of respondents) 1 2	Worsened than previous
34	1 2
	34
 509a.Is there any improvement in education of children in your family after migration to India for work? Improved1 Not any change2→510 Worsened than previous3 509b. If improved or worsened than previous, how did it happ? (Write according to the reply of respondents) 	 512a. Is there effect/symptom of any infectious disease in your family member after migration of you/your family member to work in India? Yes, affected
1. 2. 3. 4. 510a. Is there any improvement in health services/capacity enhanced after migration of you/your family member to work in India? Improved. 1 Not any change. 2→511 Worsened than previous. 3 510b If improved or worsened than previous how did it happened? (Write according to the reply of respondents)	3. 4. 513a. Is there any improvement in quantity and quality of clothes in your family after migration of you/your family member to work in India? Improved 1 Not any change. 2→514 Worsened than previous. 3 513b. If improved or worsened than previous how did it happen? (Write according to the reply of respondents) 1. 2.
12 34 511a. Is there any improvement in sanitation and health condition of your family after migration of you/your family member to work in India?	3. 4. 514a. Is there any improvement of relationship within family members, neighbors and friends of your family after migration of you/your family member to work in India?
Improved1 Not any change $2 \rightarrow 512$	Not any change $2 \rightarrow 515$ Worsened than previous3

514b.If improved or worsened than previous how did it happen?

(Write according to the reply of respondents)

 1._____
 2._____

 3._____
 4._____

515a. Did yo	ur family face th	ne problem of separa	tion/dissolution of unity after
migration of	you/your family	member to work in	India?
* *			

Yes, separated.....1 No.....2→516 515b.If separated/dissolved how did it happen?

(Write according to the reply of respondents)

1. _____ 2. _____

3._____4. ____

516a. Is there any increment in participation in religious and cultural activities in your family members after joining work in India by you /your family members?

Participation increased......1

516b.If improved or worsens than previos how it happened?

(Write on the basis of answer)

1._____ 2.____

3. <u>4.</u> 517a. Is there any increment on political participation and freedom among your family members after joining work in India by you or your family members?

517b.If increased or worsened than previous how did it happen?

	(Write on the basis of answer)
1	2
3.	4.
·	

518. What were the major advantages and disadvantages to your family after joining to work in India by you or your family members?

0		- 1	dia daa ta
8	.no	advantages	disadvantages
19a.Did	your	family face any particular prob	lems after joining work in India
b	y you	a or your family members?	
	Yes	s, problem faced	1
	Not	any problem	2 →520
519b. If y	es, w	what were those particular proble	ems? (Write on the basis of reply)
1		1 F	2.
3	.		4.
3 519c.Hov	s v did	vou solved those problems? (W	4 rite on the basis of reply)
3 519c.How	s v did	you solved those problems? (W	4 rite on the basis of reply)
3 519c.How 1.	s v did	you solved those problems? (W	4 rite on the basis of reply)
3 519c.How 1	v did	you solved those problems? (<i>W</i>	4 rite on the basis of reply)
3 519c.How 1 3	v did	you solved those problems? (<i>W</i>	4 rite on the basis of reply) 4.
3 519c.How 1 3 520. Wha	5 v did 5 t cha	you solved those problems? (<i>W</i>	 4
3 519c.How 1 3 520. Wha you/y	y did t cha	you solved those problems? (<i>W</i> 222	 4
3 519c.How 1 3 520. Wha you/y (List	v did s t cha your :	you solved those problems? (<i>W</i> 22	 4
3 519c.How 1 3 520. Wha you/y <i>(</i> List	b v did b t cha vour : out a 1.	you solved those problems? (<i>W</i> 2. nges are being on in your villag family member to work in India ny five on the basis of priority of re	 4
3 519c.How 1 3 520. Wha you/y (List	5 v did 6 t cha vour : out a 1 5.	you solved those problems? (<i>W</i> 222	4 rite on the basis of reply) 4 e/community after joining? ? espondent) 2 4.

521a. Did your family learn and	/ new things after joining work by you
or your family members	?
Yes, learned1, No	
521b.If learned what are they?	
1	2
3	4
522a. What is the economic con	ndition of your family after joining work in India by
you/ your family memb	
very good1, g	50d2
Not change3, ba	a4
Very bad5	
522b.If bad or very bad how di	d it happen? (Write on the basis of reply)
1	2
3	4
523. Joining work in India by y	ou / your family members is compulsion?
Yes 1,	No2
524. If compulsion, what are th	ose compulsions? (Write on the basis of answer)
1	2

3._____4.____

Thank you for your co-operation in providing valuable time

CODES SHEET

DISTRICT CODES
TAPLEJUNG01
PANCHTHAR02
ILAM03
JHAPA04
MORANG05
SUNSARI06
DHANKUTA07
TEHRATHUM08
SANKHUWASABHA09
BHOJPUR10
SOLUKHUMBU 11
OKHALDHUNGA12
KHOTANG13
UDAYAPUR14
SAPTARI15
SIRAHA 16
DHANUSHA 17
MAHOTTARI 18
SARLAHI 19
SINDHULI20
RAMECHHAP 21
DOLAKHA 22
SINDHUPALCHOK 23
KAVREPALANCHOK24
LALITPUR25
BHAKTAPUR26
KATHMANDU27
NUWAKOT28
RASUWA 29
DHADING
MAKWANPUR 31
RAUTAHAT 32
BARA 33
PARSA34

CHITWAN35
GORKHA
LAMJUNG
TANAHUN
SYANGJA39
KASKI40
MANANG41
MUSTANG42
MYAGDI43
PARBAT44
BAGLUNG45
GULMI
PALPA47
NAWALPARASI48
RUPANDEHI49
KAPILBASTU50
ARGHAKHANCHI51
PYUTHAN52
ROLPA53
RUKUM54
SALYAN55
DANG56
BANKE
BARDIYA58
SURKHET 59
DAILEKH60
JAJARKOT61
DOLPA62
JUMLA63
KALIKOT64
MUGU65
HUMLA66
BAJURA67
BAJHANG68
ACHHAM 69

DOTI70
KAILALI71
KANCHANPUR72
DANDHELDHURA73
BAITADI74
DARCHULA75
INDIA81
BHUTAN82
CHINA83
BANGLADESH84
HONG KONG85
MALAYASIA86
JAPAN87
SAUDI ARABIA88
QATAR89
UNITED ARAB EMIRATES90
UNITED KINGDOM91
USA92
OTHER COUNTRY93
OTHER COUNTRY93 ETHNICITY CODES
OTHER COUNTRY

TELI16
CHAMAR/HARIJAN
/RAM17
KOIRI18
KURMI19
SANYASI20
DHANUK21
MUSAHAR22
DUSADH/PASWAN/
PASI23
SHERPA24
SONAR25
KEWAT26
BRAHMAN (TARAI)27
BANIYA28
GHARTI/BHUJEL29
MALLAH30
KALWAR31
KUMAL32
HAJAM/THAKUR33
KANU34
RAJBANSI35
SUNUWAR
SUDHI37
LOHAR38
TATMA39
KHATWE40
DHOBI41
MAJHI42
NUNIYA43
KUMHAR44
DANUWAR45
CHEPANG/PRAJA46
HALUWAI47
RAJPUT48

KAYASTHA 49
BADHAE 50
MARWADI 51
SANTHAL/SATAR 52
DHAGAR/JHAGAR 53
BANTAR 54
BARAE 55
KAHAR 56
GANGAI 57
LODHA 58
RAJBHAR 59
THAMI 60
DHIMAL 61
ВНОТЕ 62
BING/BINDA 63
BHEDIYAR/GADERI64
NURANG 65
ҮАККНА 66
DARAI 67
TAJPURIYA 68
THAKALI 69
CHIDIMAR 70
PAHARI71
MALI 72
BANGALI 73
CHHANTAL 74
DOM75
KAMAR76
BOTE 77
BRAHMU/BARAMU78
GAINE 79
JIREL 80
ADIBASI/JANAJATI 81
DURA 82
CHURAUTE 83

BADI	84
MECHE	85
LEPCHA	86
HALKHOR	87
PUNJABI/SIKH	88
KISAN	89
RAJI	90
BYANGSI	91
HAYU	92
КОСНЕ	93
DHUNIA	94
WALUNG	95
JAINE	96
MUNDA	97
RAUTE	98
YEHLMO	99
PATHARKATA/	
KUSWADIYA 1	.00
KUSUNDA 1	.01
OTHER CASTE 1	.02
UNIDENTIFIEDCASTE 103	

LANGUAGE CODES
NEPALI 1
MAITHILI2
BHOJPURI3
THARU4
TAMANG5
NEWARI6
MAGAR7
AWADHI8
BANTAWA9
GURUNG10
LIMBU11
BAJIKA12
URDU13
RAJBANSI14
SHERPA (TIBETAN)15
HINDI16
CHAMLING17
SANTHALI18
CHEPANG19
DANUWAR20
JHANGAR/DHANGAR21
SUNUWAR22
BANGLA23
MARWARI

(RAJASTHANI)24	
MAJHI25	
THAMI26	
KULUNG27	
DHIMAL28	
ANGIKA (BIHARI HINDI)29	
ҮАККНА	
THULUNG31	
SANGPANG32	
BHUJEL33	
DARAI34	
KHALING35	
KUMAL36	
THAKALI37	
CHHANTYAL	
NEPALI SIGN	
LANGUAGE	
TIBETAN40	
DUMI41	
JIREL42	
WAMBULE/UMBULE43	
PUMA44	
YHOLMO (TIBETAN)45	
NACHHIRING46	
DURA	

MECHE	.48
PAHARI	.49
LEPCHA/LAPCHE	.50
BOTE	.51
BAHING	.52
KOI/KOYU	.53
RAJI	.54
HAYU	.55
BYANSI	.56
YAMPHU/YAMPHE	.57
GHALE	.58
KHADIYA	
(SOUTH MUNDA)	.59
CHHILING	.60
LOHORUNG	.61
PUNJABI	.62
CHINESE	.63
ENGLISH	.64
MEWAHANG	.65
SANSKRIT	.66
KAIKE	.67
RAUTE	.68
KISAN	.69
CHURAUTI	.70
BARAMU/BRAMU	.71

TILUNG72
JERO/JERUNG73
DUNGMALI74
ORIYA75
LINGKHIM76
KUSUNDA77
SINDHI78
KOCHE79
HARIYANWI
(WESTERN HINDI)80
MAGAHI (BIHARI HINDI)81
SAM82
KURMALI83
KAGATE (TIBETAN)84
DZONKHA85
KUKI (NAGA)86
CHHINTANG87
MIZO (NAGA)88
NAGA89
LHOMI (TIBETAN)90
ASSAMESE91
SADHANI (BHOJPURI)92
UNKNOWN LANGUAGE93
RELIGION CODES
HINDU01

BOUDDHA 02	
ISLAM03	
KIRANT04	÷
JAIN05	,
CHRISTIAN06	,
SHIKH07	/
ВАНАІ08	
OTHER RELIGION 09	1

MONTH CODES

BAISHAKH 01
JETH 02
ASAR 03
SAUN04
BHADAU05
ASOJ06
КАТТІК 07
MANGSIR 08
PUSH09
MAGH 10
FAGUN 11
CHAIT 12
EDUCATION CODES

PRE-SCHOOL/	
KINDERGARTEN	00
CLASS 1	01
CLASS 2	02
CLASS 3	03
CLASS 4	04
CLASS 5	05
CLASS 6	06
CLASS 7	07
CLASS 8	08
CLASS 9	09
CLASS 10	10
SLC	11
CLASS 11	12
CLASS 12 OR INTERMEDIATE	13
BACHELOR LEVEL	14
MASTER LEVEL/	
PH.D	15

States and Territories of India Codes

ANDRA PRADESH01 ARUNACHAL PRADESH02 ASSAM03 CHHATTISGARH......05 GOA......06 GUJARAT07 JAMMU AND KASHMIR10 JHARKHAND 11 KARNATAKA 12 KERALA...... 13 MADHYA PRADESH......14 MHARASHTRA.....15 MEGHALAYA......17 NAGALAND......19 ORISSA...... 20 UTTAR PRADESH......26 UTTARKHAND......27 WEST BANGAL...... 28

UNION TERROTORIES

ANDAMAN AND NICOBAR	
ISLAND	29
CHANDIGARH	30
DADRA AND NAGAR	
HAVELI	31
DAMAN AND DIU	32

Land Unit Convesion

1 ROPANI= 74*74 SQ FEET= 4 MATO MURI= 16 ANNA= 64 PAISA 1 BIGHA= 270*270 SQ FEET= 20 KATHA= 400 DHUR Land Conversion Table 1 Ropani=0.05087 Hectare, 74 * 74 Sq.

Feet, 16 Ana, 64 Paisa, 4 Matomuri 1 Ana = 0.00317 Hectare, 4 Paisa 1 Paisa = 0.00079 Hectare 1 Bigha= 0.67730 Hectare, 270 * 270 Sq. Feet, 20 Kattha, 400 Dhur, 13.63125 Ropani 1 Kattha=0.03386 Hectare, 20 Dhur 1Dhur = 0.00169 Hectare

APPENDIX III: FGD GUIDELINES

(for both current and return cross-border migrants' households)

- Family and historical background of joining to work in India
- Main causes, trends and practice of joining to work from study area
- Main time/season of joining to work in India, average duration of stay at working places
- Income (remittances) and main areas of expenditures
- Social, economic and political involvement and background of migrants at place of origin and destination
- Existing family and other extended network
- Existing relationship among migrants and non-migrants family members and household relationship
- Role of migrants themselves, Meith (agent/ contractor) in migration decision making process
- Working environment of working place, behavior and mode of payment
- Management of food and shelter at working place or destination
- Mis/ un human behave faced by migrants at transit point while joining to work and returning back
- Knowledge on Migrants rights
- Main advantage and disadvantage of cross-border migration
- Change occurred due to migration process at individual, family/households and society
- Changes on education, health, skills and other sector due to migration process
- Suggestions for good management of migration process
- Knowledge on Nepal-India friendship treaty of 1950 and working provisions for people of both countries
- Perceptions on Nepal-India friendship treaty of 1950
- Ways of obtaining maximum benefit at individual, family, society and country
- Role of political parties and Government of Nepal to manage cross-border migration

Focus Group Discussion Guideline (for Non-migrants households)

- Main differences (caste, family, social and economic) between migrants and nonmigrants households
- Main causes, trends and practice of joining to work from study area
- Relationship between migrants and non-migrants households
- Main time/season of joining to work in India, average duration of stay at working places and it's impact
- Main differences in areas of expenditures between migrants and non-migrants households
- Differences in social and political participation between migrants and non-migrants households
- Role of migrants themselves, Meith (agent/ contractor) in migration decision making process
- Knowledge on rights of migrants workers
- Main advantages and disadvantages from cross-border migration process
- Changes occurred at individual, family and society due to migration process
- Change occurred in education, health, skilled and other sectors due to migration process
- Suggestion to well mange of cross-border migration process
- Knowledge on Nepal-India friendship treaty of 1950 and working provisions for people of both countries
- Perceptions on Nepal-India friendship treaty of 1950
- Ways of obtaining maximum benefit at individual, family, society and country
- Role of political parties and Government of Nepal to manage cross-border migration

	A NEPAL 2
E Harden	Questionnaires Related to the Study of Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, 2011
(Check list to ask with border security force, Immigration and Custom officers and to other relat officers working at Transit Point (GaddaChowki/Banbasha)
	Name=====Post
M=	
	Country ====================================
1. 9	Since when are you working in this transit point?
2. 4	Are you assigned any responsibility related to cross-border migrants?
	Yes, given ======1
	No any $====2 \rightarrow 4$
	34
4. '	What are the main problems faced by you from cross-border migrants?
	34
5. 4	According to your experience, what are the major problems facing by cross-border Migrants? 122.
	34
6.	According to your knowledge, in which month/season the number of cross-border mign becomes high and low? Month/season to be high Month
	Month/season to be low Month
7.	According to your observation from this transit point, from which country the number of cr border migrants is high?
	India====================================
	Not any Idea======3

1._____2.____

3 4
9. Are any complaints registered by cross-border migrants in your office? Yes, being registered ===================================
Not any registered ===================================
10. If registered, what types of complaint are registered?
1 2 3 4 5
11. In your opinion, what are the main causes for cross-border migration between these two countries? 1. 2.
3. 4.
12. Do you think cross-border migrants are benefited from migration process?
Yes, benefited ====================================
Not any benefited ===== $2 \rightarrow 14$
Not any idea =======3→14
13. If migrants are being benefited, how? 122
344
Yes benefited ====================================
Not any benefited ====================================
Not any idea ======3→16
15. If both countries are benefited, how? 1 2
3 4
 16. Do you think the existing open border is a benefit for both countries? Yes, benefit for both countries=====1 No benefit for both Countries====================================
17. If you think any benefit for both countries, what are those benefits?
123
456

18. Do you have knowledge about rights of migrants labour?

Yes ======1					
No ===== $2 \rightarrow 20$					
19. If you have knowledge about rights of migrants labour, what are they?					
123					
1 5 6					
20. Do you think cross-border migrant labours have knowledge about their rights at their working					
place?					
Yes, they have knowledge about it ==================================					
No knowledge on it ===================================					
Not any Idea ====================================					
21. Do you think cross-border migrant labours are receiving proper working environment at their place of work?					
Yes, receiving proper environment ==========1					
Not receiving proper environment ====================================					
Not any Idea ====================================					
22. In your opinion what are the positive and negative influence of open border between two countries? (List out up to five according to priority)Positive 1 2					
3 4 5					
Negative 1 2					
345					
23. In your opinion the existing open border should be kept as it or need to manage? Keep as it is=================================					
Need to manage it ===================================					
Not any Idea ======3→25					
24. If open border need proper management, in your view how it be should it be done?					
3. 4.					
25. In your view, what are the challenges of border management between two countries?					
1 2					
34					
26. In your view, what are your suggestions to face with those challenges?					

34
27. In your view, how can cross-border migration be managed for the betterment of both countries?
1 2
34
28. Have you knowledge in Nepal-India friendship treaty of 1950?
Yes, have Knowledge ===================================
Not any knowledge ====== $2 \rightarrow 30$
29. If you have knowledge, what are the provisions made for migrants' workers of both countries?
1 2
34
30. What is your opinion on Nepal-India friendship treaty of 1950?
Should be maintained as is =================================
Need to modify according changed context ====2
No any Idea ====================================
31. If needs to modify according to changed context, in your view, what main points should be added?
1 2

3. _____4. ____

THANK YOU!

APPENDIX V: CO-LINEARILTY STATSTCS

Table: List of independent variables and their corresponding co-linearity statistics (Tolerance and VIF)

SN	N Independent Variables	Co-linearity	Co-linearity Statistics	
314		Tolerance	VIF	
1	Age	.558	1.792	
2	Sex	.943	1.061	
3	Caste/ ethnicity	.607	1.647	
4	Mother tongue	.664	1.506	
5	Religion	.960	1.042	
6	Marital status	.550	1.817	
7	Educational attainment	.828	1.207	
8	Sex of household head	.939	1.065	
9	Family structure	.610	1.639	
10	Family size	.620	1.612	
11	Wealth quintile	.763	1.311	
12	Social participation index	.965	1.036	

Dependent Variable: Migration status of household members

APPENDIX VI: VIEWS OF GOVERNMNET STAFF

Distribution of Views of Government Staff (Nepal and India) working at Gadda Chowki/ Banbasa Transit Point

Ingrand Origina	Information/ views from		
issues/Queries	Nepalese side	Indian side	
Duration of work at transit point?	Less than 2yrs in an average	At least 4 years in an average	
Any Responsibilities on Cross-border Migrants? Problems created by cross- border migrants	Security Check, custom clearance and regulation, No any specific work related with cross-border migrants. Transit point opens, 6-7 am, 12-2 and 5-6pm, which creates more crowded and rush to carry out duties.	Security Check, custom clearance and regulation, checking of fake currency Record keeping of incoming/outgoing migrant's only tentative number. Privileges given to migrants are being misused; facilities of buying goods for household consumption have been widely used in business purpose.	
Any problems faced by cross- border migrants?	Have to pay money illegally in Indian customs, Migrants gives money instead of facing ill treatment/unnecessary problems / torture at transit points of Indian side, frequently used of drugs/medicine to make senseless; as a result migrants are looted, beaten, cheated, in the name of body search money looted by Indian personal. Barrage opening time only 4hrs a day and transportation problem to migrants to reach their destination.	By use of poisonous drugs/foods by convicts frequently more Nepalese are being looted and cheated The convicts are both Nepalese and Indian, Transportation: due to opening of time daily only 4 hrs; Road condition is not good and difficulties of getting vehicles/transportation for migrants to reach their destination.	
Flow of migrants more in which season/time?	High from both country: After cultivation and harvesting of agriculture (Off farming seasons) to join destination and new year and in main festivals (Dashin, Tihar and other local festival/occasion) return back to origin Low: Agricultural seasons and peak period of festivals.	High: Off farming seasons (after cultivation and harvesting of agriculture) to join work at destination and at festivals to return back to origin Low: Agricultural seasons and on the days of festivals.	
Migrants more from which country?	More or less equal but more Nepalese than Indian in search of employment.	60-70 per cent Nepalese and 30-40 per cent Indian cross the border to join work.	
Main differences on nature of works among	Nepalese: Comparatively low status works and irregular wage labour, lack of skills and working in security	Nepalese: labour work and daily wages in an uncertain environment	

Nepalese and	guard, wage labor and without any	Indian: Tourist, religious purpose,
Indian cross-	agreement.	business and less number in unskilled
border Indian: Comparatively high status/ labou		labour; mostly having skilled training
migrants?	runs own business, work in	and comparatively earns more than
_	carpentering and brick factories, trade, Nepalese in India.	
	tourism and works on	
	contract/agreement basis.	
Registration of		Not yet, but security threat to India and
any complains	Not yet!	provides more tension due to cases like
by migrants?		fake currency.
	Nepali: Poverty, lack of employment	
	opportunities, agricultural production	Poverty, unemployment, trade, tourism,
Main causes of	is not sufficient to run households	religious purpose and mainly
migration?	throughout the years,	employment opportunities to Nepalese
_	Indian: to hold trade, tourist,	in India
	employment on skilled labour work	
	Earning cash, buying clothes and	In India look of labour for work on hill
	attained school by their children,	ragion and Nonalasa are getting
Popofit to	consumer goods in cheap price,	amployment
migrants if any?	employment opportunities even for	Wage rate in India is high Promotion
migrants, ir any:	unskilled and illiterate people,	of joint culture increasing income by
	minimum earning 2500-3000 IC per	migrants of both countries
	month.	lingrants of both countries
	Remittance, exchanging skills and	Remittances to Nepal and
Both countries	ideas; in fulfilling scarcity of labour in	Industrialization to India, exchanging
are benefited?	low cost to India, employment to	skills for development work,
are benefiteu.	Nepalese people; and extending Indian	Developing relationship between two
	trade/market over there.	countries
	No any benefit, tax invasion, illegal	Mainly in favor of Nepal, freely
Open border	import and export of goods, security	movements, remittances, easy for
beneficial for	threat, increasing dependency and	importing and exporting goods, no
both countries?	decreasing production in Nepal,	beneficial to India due to illegal trade
	Nepali are being humiliating, only	and increasing threat in security affairs
	one benefit is easy access to go and	of India by entering of third country's
	return back; low cost and risks,	citizens
Knowledge on		
migrants	No, any knowledge regarding on it.	No, any knowledge regarding on it.
rights:		
Migrants' nave	Mast of them have no any linewiledge	Ne any ideas an it
knowledge on	Most of them have no any knowledge.	No any ideas on it.
their rights?	N	
	No, especially in case of Nepalese	
Good working	in here it sting and in the state of the	Nepalese migrants are cheated by their
environment at	In numinating environment, some time	contractor and some time even by their
working place?	without wages/salary of work,	own friends.
	problems of their and rubbery while	
	returning back to country.	

	Positive: to go and return back,		
Positive and	promotion of culture Negative: Tax evasion, illegal import	Positive: Promoting trade, culture employment, and good relationship,	
negative effects	and export of goods, smuggling of	more positive for Nepal than India	
of open border?	illegal/band items, security threat,	Negative: robbery, security, entry of	
1	increased of social crimes and	take currency to India from Nepalese	
	convicted persons/group easily	territory, Tax evasion, megal trade,	
	Should be managed initially		
Open Border	should be managed, initially	Should be managed: checking, ID card,	
should keep as it	system limited transit points	fortification/surrounded by walls,	
is or properly	gradually introducing the provision of	registration system and gradually the	
managed?	visa Passport system	provision of visa, Pass port system.	
	Cultural and religious homogeneity.		
	dual citizenship especially people of	Geographical coverage of two country,	
Challenges of	border areas of both countries, Indian	local people(nearer the border) who are	
management of	interest, differences in economic	taking more advantages and having	
open border?	development, lack of political	illegal trade and developing their own	
	determination of political parties and	networks of trade and business	
	government.	networks of trade and business.	
	Introducing ID card/registration	Governments of both countries should	
Suggestions to	system, strong political commitment,	develop common plan and program;	
face challenges?	political stability, collect and listen the	implement it in a harmony	
	voice of experts regarding it.	environment.	
How to make	ID card Percent keeping and gradual		
cross-poruer migration for	Implementation of Passnort and Visa	Exercise should be done at political	
henefit of both	provision	level between the two countries.	
countries?	provision.		
Knowledge on			
Nepal-India	Free movement of people, holding	Not anymore knowledge on it, but	
friendship treaty	houses	people can freely move from one	
of 1950?	nouses.	country to another.	
Views on Nepal-	It should be modified as per changing	Should be modified, with the help of	
India friendship	of time.	joint review committee of experts from	
treaty of 1950?		both countries.	
If need to be		Minimizing debate with logic based on	
modified of	Equal and independent status,	nistorical evidence, promotion of trade	
Nepal-India	provision of permission to citizen of	brotherhood should be ended:	
friendshin		THE REAL MARKEN AND THE FULLET	
p	third country entry implementation of	discouraging any kind of terrorist	
treaty, mainly	third country entry, implementation of passport/visa provision	discouraging any kind of terrorist activities from the land of both	
treaty, mainly what should be	third country entry, implementation of passport/visa provision.	discouraging any kind of terrorist activities from the land of both countries should be strongly	
treaty, mainly what should be incorporated?	third country entry, implementation of passport/visa provision.	discouraging any kind of terrorist activities from the land of both countries should be strongly maintained.	

Source: Key Informants Interview with Government Staffof Nepal and India working at Gadda Chowki/ Banbasa Transit Point, 2011.

APPENDIX VII: TABLE OF THE STANDARD NORMAL DISTRIBUTION

Larger Smaller	.41 .65910 .34090 .3668	.83 .79673 .20327 .2827	1.25 .89435 .10565 .1826
² Portion Portion ⁹	.42 .66276 .33724 .3653	.84 .79955 .20045 .2803	1.26 .89617 .10383 .1804
.00 .50000 .50000 .3989	.43 .66640 .33360 .3637	.85 .80234 .19766 .2780	1.27 .89796 .10204 .1781
.01.50399.49001.3989	.44 .67003 .32997 .3621	.86 .80511 .19489 .2756	1.28 .89973 .10027 .1758
.02 .50798 .49202 .3989	.45 .67364 .32636 .3605	.87 .80785 .19215 .2732	1.29 .90147 .09853 .1736
.03 .51197 .48803 .3988	.46 .67724 .32276 .3589	.88 .81057 .18943 .2709	1.30 .90320 .09680 .1714
.04 .51595 .46405 .5960	.47 .68082 .31918 .3572	.89 .81327 .18673 .2685	1.31 .90490 .09510 .1691
.05.51994.48006.3984	.48 .68439 .31561 .3555	.90 .81594 .18406 .2661	1.32 .90658 .09342 .1669
.00 .52392 .47608 .3982	.49 .68793 .31207 .3538	.91 .81859 .18141 .2637	1.33 .90824 .09176 .1647
.07 .52790 .47210 .3960	.50 .69146 .30854 .3521	.92 .82121 .17879 .2613	1.34 .90988 .09012 .1626
.00 .55100 .40012 .5977	.51 .69497 .30503 .3503	.93 .82381 .17619 .2589	1.35 .91149 .08851 .1604
10 52082 46017 2070	.52 .69847 .30153 .3485	.94 .82639 .17361 .2565	1.36 .91309 .08691 .1582
11 54280 45620 2065	.53 .70194 .29806 .3467	.95 .82894 .17106 .2541	1.37 .91466 .08534 .1561
.11.54360.45620.3965	.54 .70540 .29460 .3448	.96 .83147 .16853 .2516	1.38 .91621 .08379 .1539
12 .54770 .45224 .5901	.55 .70884 .29116 .3429	.97 .83398 .16602 .2492	1.39 .91774 .08226 .1518
14 55567 44433 3051	.56 .71226 .28774 .3410	.98 .83646 .16354 .2468	1.40 .91924 .08076 .1497
15 55962 44933 3945	.57 .71566 .28434 .3391	.99 .83891 .16109 .2444	1.41 .92073 .07927 .1476
16 56356 43644 3030	.58 .71904 .28096 .3372	1.00 .84134 .15866 .2420	1.42 .92220 .07780 .1456
17 56749 43251 3932	.59 .72240 .27760 .3352	1.01 .84375 .15625 .2396	1.43 .92364 .07636 .1435
18 57142 42858 3925	.60 .72575 .27425 .3332	1.02 .84614 .15386 .2371	1.44 .92507 .07493 .1415
19 57535 42465 3918	.61 .72907 .27093 .3312	1.03 .84849 .15151 .2347	1.45 .92647 .07353 .1394
20 57926 42074 3910	.62 .73237 .26763 .3292	1.04 .85083 .14917 .2323	1.46 .92785 .07215 .1374
21.58317 41683 3902	.63 .73565 .26435 .3271	1.05 .85314 .14686 .2299	1.47 .92922 .07078 .1354
.22 .58706 .41294 .3894	.64 .73891 .26109 .3251	1.06 .85543 .14457 .2275	1.48 .93056 .06944 .1334
.23 .59095 .40905 .3885	.65 .74215 .25785 .3230	1.07 .85769 .14231 .2251	1.49 .93189 .06811 .1315
.24 .59483 .40517 .3876	.66 .74537 .25463 .3209	1.08 .85993 .14007 .2227	1.50 .93319 .06681 .1295
.25 .59871 .40129 .3867	.67 .74857 .25143 .3187	1.09 .86214 .13786 .2203	1.51 .93448 .06552 .1276
.26 .60257 .39743 .3857	.68 .75175 .24825 .3166	1.10 .86433 .13567 .2179	1.52 .93574 .06426 .1257
.27 .60642 .39358 .3847	.69 .75490 .24510 .3144	1.11 .86650 .13350 .2155	1.53 .93699 .06301 .1238
.28 .61026 .38974 .3836	.70 .75804 .24196 .3123	1.12 .86864 .13136 .2131	1.54 .93822 .06178 .1219
.29 .61409 .38591 .3825	.71 .76115 .23885 .3101	1.13 .87076 .12924 .2107	1.55 .93943 .06057 .1200
.30 .61791 .38209 .3814	.72 .76424 .23576 .3079	1.14 .87286 .12714 .2083	1.56 .94062 .05938 .1182
.31 .62172 .37828 .3802	.73 .76730 .23270 .3056	1.15 .87493 .12507 .2059	1.57 .94179 .05821 .1163
.32 .62552 .37448 .3790	.74 .77035 .22965 .3034	1.16 .87698 .12302 .2036	1.58 .94295 .05705 .1145
.33 .62930 .37070 .3778	.75 .77337 .22663 .3011	1.17 .87900 .12100 .2012	1.59 .94408 .05592 .1127
.34 .63307 .36693 .3765	.76 .77637 .22363 .2989	1.18 .88100 .11900 .1989	1.60 .94520 .05480 .1109
.35 .63683 .36317 .3752	.// .77935 .22065 .2966	1.19.88298.11702.1965	1.61 .94630 .05370 .1092
.36 .64058 .35942 .3739	.78.78230.21770.2943	1.20.88493.11507.1942	1.62.94/38.05262.1074
.37 .64431 .35569 .3725	./9./8524.21476.2920	1.21.88686.11314.1919	1.63.94845.05155.1057
.38 .64803 .35197 .3712	.80.78814.21186.2897	1.22.88877.11123.1895	1.64 .94950 .05050 .1040
.39 .65173 .34827 .3697	.81.79103.20897.2874	1.23.89065.10935.1872	1.65.95053.04947.1023
.40 .65542 .34458 .3683	.82 .79389 .20611 .2850	1.24 .89251 .10749 .1849	1.00.95154.04846.1006

1.67 .95254 .04746 .0989	2.15 .98422 .01578 .0396	2.63 .99573 .00427 .0126	
1.68 .95352 .04648 .0973	2.16 .98461 .01539 .0387	2.64 .99585 .00415 .0122	
1.69 .95449 .04551 .0957	2.17 .98500 .01500 .0379	2.65 .99598 .00402 .0119	
1.70 .95543 .04457 .0940	2.18 .98537 .01463 .0371	2.66 .99609 .00391 .0116	
1.71 .95637 .04363 .0925	2.19 .98574 .01426 .0363	2.67 .99621 .00379 .0113	4.00 .99997 .00003 .0001
1.72 .95728 .04272 .0909	2.20 .98610 .01390 .0355	2.68 .99632 .00368 .0110	
1.73.95818.04182.0893	2.21 .98645 .01355 .0347	2.69.99643.00357.0107	
1.74 .95907 .04093 .0878	2.22 .98679 .01321 .0339	2.70.99653.00347.0104	
1.75.95994.04006.0863	2.23 .98713 .01287 .0332	2.71.99664.00336.0101	
1.76.96080 03920 0848	2 24 98745 01255 0325	2.72 99674 00326 0099	
1.77.96164.03836.0833	2 25 98778 01222 0317	2 73 99683 00317 0096	
1.78.96246.03754.0818	2.26.98809.01191.0310	2 74 99693 00307 0093	
1.79.96327.03673.0804	2.27.98840.01160.0303	2,75,99702,00298,0091	
1.80.96407.03593.0790	2.28 98870 01130 0297	2 76 99711 00289 0088	
1.81 96485 03515 0775	2.29 98899 01101 0290	2 77 99720 00280 0086	
1.82 96562 03438 0761	2 30 98928 01072 0283	2 78 99728 00272 0084	
1.83 96638 03362 0748	2.31 98956 01044 0277	2 79 99736 00264 0081	
1.84 96712 03288 0734		2 80 99744 00256 0079	
1.85 96784 03216 0721	2.33 99010 00990 0264	2 81 99752 00248 0077	
1.86 96856 03144 0707	2.33 99036 00964 0258		
1.87 96926 03074 0694		2.83 99767 00233 0073	
1.88 96995 03005 0681	2.36 99001 .00933 .0232	2.84 99774 00236 0073	
1.80.07062.02038.0660	2.30 .99000 .00914 .0240	2.85 00781 00210 0060	
1.09.97002.02930.0009	2.37 .99111 .00009 .0241		
1.90.97128.02872.0030	2.38.99134.00800.0233		
1.91.97193.02807.0044	2.39.99138.00842.0229	2.87 .99795 .00205 .0005	
1.92.97237.02743.0032	2.40 .99160 .00620 .0224	2.00.99001.00199.0003	
1.93.97320.02000.0020	2.41 .99202 .00796 .0219	2.09.99007.00193.0001	
1.94 .97361 .02019 .0006	2.42 .99224 .00776 .0213	2.90.99613.00167.0060	
1.95.97441.02559.0590	2.43 .99245 .00755 .0208		
1.90.97500.02500.0564	2.44 .99200 .00734 .0203	2.92.99625.00175.0056	
1.97 .97556 .02442 .0575	2.45 .99200 .007 14 .0190	2.93.99631.00169.0055	
1.90.97015.02305.0502	2.40.99303.00095.0194	2.94.99630.00164.0053	
1.99.97670.02330.0551	2.47 .99324 .00676 .0189	2.95.99841.00159.0051	
2.00.97725.02275.0540	2.48 .99343 .00657 .0184	2.96.99846.00154.0050	
2.01.97778.02222.0529		2.97.99851.00149.0048	
2.02.97831.02169.0519	2.50 .99379 .00621 .0175	2.98.99856.00144.0047	
2.03 .97882 .02118 .0508	2.51 .99396 .00604 .0171	2.99.99861.00139.0046	
2.04 .97932 .02068 .0498	2.52 .99413 .00587 .0167	3.00 .99865 .00135 .0044	
2.05 .97982 .02018 .0488	2.53 .99430 .00570 .0163		
2.06 .98030 .01970 .0478	2.54 .99446 .00554 .0158		
2.07 .98077 .01923 .0468	2.55 .99461 .00539 .0154		
2.08 .98124 .01876 .0459	2.56 .99477 .00523 .0151		
2.09 .98169 .01831 .0449	2.57 .99492 .00508 .0147	3.25 .99942 .00058 .0020	
2.10 .98214 .01786 .0440	2.58 .99506 .00494 .0143		
2.11 .98257 .01743 .0431	2.59 .99520 .00480 .0139		
2.12 .98300 .01700 .0422	2.60 .99534 .00466 .0136		
2.13 .98341 .01659 .0413	2.61 .99547 .00453 .0132		
2.14 .98382 .01618 .0404	2.62 .99560 .00440 .0129	3.50.99977.00023.0009	

REFERENCES

- Adhikary, J & Gurung, G. (2011). Foreign Employment, Remittance and Its contribution to economy of Nepal (Kathmandu: Government of Nepal and International Organization of Migration)
- Ahlburg, D. and R. Brown (1998). "Migrants' Intentions to Return Home and Capital Transfers: Study of Tongans and Samoans in Australia". *The Journal of Development Studies*, 35:125–51.
- Akaha, Tsuneo (2004). "Cross-border Human Flow in North-East Asia". Migration Information Source, Washington: Migration Policy Institute. www.unu.edu/media/publication/000/002/174/crossingnborders.pdf, accessed on 6 August 2010.
- Altai consulting (2008). ILO-UNHCR Cooperation towards Comprehensive Solution for Afghan Displacement. <u>www.altaiconsulting.com/.../Altai%202008%20Paris%20Conference</u> accessed on 20 August 2010.
- Altai consulting (2009). Study on Cross Border Population Movements Between Afghanistan and Pakistan. (New York: United Nations High Commission for Refugees). <u>www.altaiconsulting.com/psd.html</u> accessed on 20 August 2010.
- Amin, S. (1980). *Class and Nation: Historically and in the Current Crisis*. (New York: Monthly Review Press)
- Appleyard R. (1992). Migration and Development: An Unresolved Relationship. *International Migration* 30:251-66
- Babatunde, R.O., Martinetti, E.C. (2011) 'Impacts of migrant remittances on food security and nutrition of Farming Households in Kwara State, Nigeria'. Contributed paper for the *International Conference: Shocks in Developing Countries*. June 30 July 1, 2011, Paris, France. www.ids.ac.uk/download.cfm?objectid=6D7AEC70-781E-11E1...accessed on 10 December 2011
- Bauer, T., and K. F. Zimmermann (1998): "Integrating the East: The Labor Market Effects of Immigration," in S. Black (ed.): *Europe's Economy Looks East:*

Implications for Germany and the EU. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) pp 269-306.

- Bean, F.D., B.L. Loweell and L.j. Taylor. (1988). "Undocumented Mexican Immigrants and the Eranings of other workers in the United States" *Demography* 25:35-52.
- Bebbington A. (1999). "Capitals and Capabilities: A Framework for Analyzing Peasant Viability, Rural Livelihoods and Poverty". *World Development* 27:2021-44
- Becker GS. (1962). Investments in Human Capital: A Theoretical Analysis. *Journal* of Political Economy 70:9-49
- Bennett, E., Neiland, A., Anang, E., Bannerman, P., Rahman, A., Huq, A., Bhuyia, S.,
 Day, M. Fulford-Gardiner, M. and W. Clerveaux. (2001). "Towards a better understanding of conflict management in tropical fisheries: evidence from Ghana, Bangladesh and the Caribbean". *Marine Policy* 25:5: 365–76.
- Bhandari Prem (2004). *Relative Deprivation and Migration in an Agricultural Setting of Nepal.* <u>www.pire.psc.isr.umich.edu/research/profile/1029/Prem</u>Bhandari, accessed on 15 August 2008
- Bocker A. (1994). Chain Migration over Legally Closed Borders: Settled Migrants as Bridgeheads and Gatekeepers. *Netherlands' Journal of Social Sciences* 30:87-106
- Bohning WR. (1994). *Helping Migrants to Stay at Home*. (Geneva: International Labour Organization)
- Borjas GJ. (1989). Economic Theory and International Migration. *International Migration Review*, (New York: Center for Migration Studies) 23:457-85
- Borjas GJ. (1990). Friend or Strangers: The Impact of Immigrants on the US Economy. (New York: Basic Books)
- Brettell, C. B; and Hollifield, J. F. (2007) Migration Theory: Talking Across Disciplines. 2nd Edition, (New York and London: Routledge).
- Brimelow, P. (1995). *Alien Nation: Common Sense about America's Immigration Disaster*. (New York: Random House).
- Brown, J. D. (2001). *The Japan Association For Language Teaching*. Retrieved October 6, 2012, from http://www.jalt.org/test/PDF/Brown12.pdf

- Bryant, John (2005). Children of International Migrants in Indonesia, Thailand, and the Philippines: A Review of Evidence and Policies. *Innocenti Working Paper* 2005-05, (New York: UNICEF).
- Bryceson, D.F. (1995). 'Wishful Thinking: Western Donor Efforts to Raise Women's Status', in Bryceson, D.F. (ed.), Women Wielding the Hoe: Lessons from Rural Africa for Feminist Theory and Development Practice, (Oxford: Berg Publishers).
- Cadwallader, M. T. (1992). *Migration and Residential Mobility*, (London: The University of Wisconsin Press)
- Carney De. (1998). Sustainable Rural Livelihoods. What Contribution can we make? (London: DFID)
- Casteles, S. (2008). Development and Migration-Migration and Development: What Comes First? *A paper presented to Social Science Research Council Conference*, 28 February- 1 March, New York. <u>www.essays.ssrc.org/developmentpapers/wp-content/uploads/2cCastels.pdf</u>, accessed on January 10 2011.
- Casteles, S., Mark J. Miller (2003). The age of Migration (New York: Guilford Press)
- Castles, S., & Miller, M., (1993). *The Age of Migration, Chicago Area Transportation Study, 1959, Final Report* (New York: Guilford).
- Cebula, R.J. (1979). *The Determinants of Human Migration*. (Lexington, Mass: Lexington Books).
- Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) (1987). Population Monograph of Nepal (Kathmandu: National Planning Commission Secretariat, Government of Nepal).
- Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) (1995). Population Monograph of Nepal (Kathmandu: National Planning Commission Secretariat, Government of Nepal).
- Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) (2003). *Population Monograph of Nepal* (Kathmandu: National Planning Commission Secretariat, Government of Nepal).
- Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) (2011). *Nepal Living Standard Survey* (Kathmandu: National Planning Commission Secretariat, Government of Nepal).

- Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) (2012). Preliminary Census Result, 2011 Nepal (Kathmandu: National Planning Commission Secretariat, Government of Nepal).
- Chambers, R. (1989). "Editorial Introduction: Vulnerability, Coping and Policy." *IDS Bulletin* 20: 1-22
- Chan, Kam Wing. (2009). "Population, migration and the Lewis turning point in China," in F. Cai and Y. Du (eds.), *The China Population and Labor Yearbook*, Volume (1): The Approaching Lewis Turning Point and Its Policy Implications. (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, pp. xix–xli).
- Comay, Yochanan (1972). "The Migration of Professionals: An Empirical Analysis," *Canadian Journal of Economics*, (5) 419-429.
- Dahal, Dilli Ram (1978). Indian Ethnic Groups in the Nepal Tarai: A Study of Immigration Pattern and Socio-economic Behaviour. (Part I, Eastern Tarai Sector). (Kathmandu: Research Center for Nepal and Asian Studies, T. U)
- De Haan A, Brock K, Carswell G, Coulibaly N, Seba H, Toufique KA. (2000). *Migration and Livelihoods: Case Studies in Bangladesh, Ethiopia and Mali*, (Brighton: Sussex Institute of Development Studies)
- De Haan, A., 2000. "Migrants, Livelihoods, and Rigths: The relevance of Migration in Development Policies", Social Development Department Working Paper 4, DFID.
- De Haas H. (2003). Migration and Development in Southern Morocco: The Disparate Socio- Economic Impacts of Out-Migration on the Todgha Oasis Valley. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Radboud University, Unpublished PhD Thesis Nijmegen. www.heindehaas.com/.../de%20Haas%202005%20-%20Migration, accessed on February 09 2008.
- De Haas H. (2005). "International migration, remittances and development: Myths and facts". *Third World Quarterly* 26 (8):1269-84. www.heindehaas.com/.../de%20Haas%202005%20-%20, accessed on January 25, 2010.

- De Haas H. (2008). Irregular migration from West Africa to the Maghreb and the European Union: An Overview of Recent Trends, (Geneva: International Organization for Migration).
- De Haas, H. (2010). *Migration and development: a theoretical perspective* (Oxford: International Migration Institute, University of Oxford). *www.migrationdevelopment.org/.../INTConf_1_316200645328PM_...* accessed on July 13 2011.
- De Haas, H., Carlos Vargas-Silva and Simona Vezzoli (2009). Global Migration Futures: A conceptual and methodological framework for research and analysis (Oxford: International Migration Institute).
- District Development Committee (DDC) (2008). *Kanchanpur District Profile* (Kanchanpur: Information and Record Section, Office of District Development Committee).
- Djajic, S. (1986). International Migration, Remittances and Welfare in a Dependent Economy. *Journal of Development Economics* 21:229-34, www.graduateinstitute.ch/webdav/site/iheid/shared/summer/.../SD3.pdf, accessed on January 15, 2010.
- Duong, Le Bach with Danièle Belanger and Khuat Thu Hong (2005). "Transnational Migration, Marriage and Trafficking at the China- Vietnam border'. CEPED-CICRED-INED Seminar on Female Deficit in Asia: Trends and Perspectives, Singapore, 5-7 December 2005. www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/.../08china-immigrants-shen accessed on May 20, 2009
- Duryea, Suzanne, Ernesto López Córdova, and Alexandra Olmedo (2005). *Migrant Remittances and Infant Mortality: Evidence from Mexico* (Mimeo: Inter-American Development Bank). www. lib.ruppin.ac.il/multimedia_library/PDF/29503.pdf accessed on February 5 2010.
- El Sakka, M.I.T. (2004) "Following the Flow of Remittances in the Middle East: An Overview" in. Wilson S. R. (ed.), *Beyond Small Change: Making Migrants' Remittances Count* (New York: Inter-American Development Bank).
- Ellis F. (1998). Household Strategies and Rural Livelihood Diversification. *Journal of Development Studies* 35:1-38
- Ellis F. (2000). *Rural Livelihoods and Diversity in Developing Countries*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

- Faist, T. (2004). *The Volume and Dynamics of International Migration and Transnational Social Spaces* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Fawcett, J. T. (1989). "Networks, Linkages and Migration Systems". International Migration Review 23(2):671-80
- Field, A. (2009). Discovering Statistics Using SPSS. New Delhi: SAGE.
- Frank AG. (1966). The Development of Underdevelopment. (New York: Monthly Review Press)
- <u>Frank AG. (1969</u>). *Capitalism and underdevelopment in Latin America*. (New York: Monthly Review Press)
- Frank, R. and R. Hummer. (2002). "The Other Side of the Paradox: The Risk of Low Birth Weight among Infants of Migrant and Non-migrant Households within Mexico". *International Migration Review* 36 (3): 746-65.
- Franz J.G. (1939). "Review: Cityward Migration: Swedish Data". Sociometry 2: 109
- Giddens A. (1984). The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration. (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Guarnizo L, Portes A, Haller W. (2003). "Assimilation and transnationalism: determinants of transnational political action among contemporary migrants". *American Journal of Sociology* 108 (4):1211-48.
- Gurung, S.B. and Buchma (1973). *Causes and impact of migration: Preliminary survey in Surkhet region*, (Kathmandu: Centre for Economic Development and Administration).
- Gurung, Ganesh, David Seddon and Jagannath Adhikari, (2003). "Foreign Labor Migration and the Remittance Economy of Nepal." *Critical Asian Studies* 34(1):19-40.
- <u>Gurung, Harka (2001</u>). "Highlands o the Move: The Migration Trends in Nepal", in Susanne von der Hede and Thomos Hoffmann (Eds.). *Aspects of Migration and Mobility in Nepal* (Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar) pp. 11-42.
- Gurung, Harka (2002). "Nepal's Population Trend: Towards the Low Lands", Population and Development in Nepal, In Bal Kumar KC (ed.) Volume 10 (Kathmandu: Central Department of Population Studies, Tribhuvan University), pp.1-10.

- Gurung, Harka, Bal Kumar KC, Chandra Bahadur Shrestha, Chaitanya Mishra, Durga Prasad Ojha, Parthiveshwor Prasad Timilsina, Santa Bahadur Gurung and Vidhya Bir Singh Kansakar (1983). *Internal and International Migration in Nepal.* (Kathmandu: National Commission on Population).
- Hanson, G. and Christopher Woodruff (2003). "Emigration and Educational Attainment in Mexico", *Mimeo*, (San Diego: University of California), April 2003.
- Harris JR, Todaro MP. (1970). "Migration, unemployment and development: A twosector analysis". *American Economic Review* 60:126-42
- Harvey, D. (1982). "The Limits to Capital", *Antipode*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 13 (2)
- Hirschman C. (1994). "Why Fertility Changes?" *Annual Review of Sociology* 20:203-33
- http://WWW. Migrationinformation.org/profiles/Display,Cfm?ID=227 accessed on May 25 2008.
- Huber, Peter and Kalus Nowtony (2009). "Return Intentions among Potential Migrants and Commuters: The Role of Human Capital, Deprivation and Networks", *WIFO Working Papers*, 342/2009
- Hugo, Graeme (2007). International Migration and development in Asia, Presentation to 8th International Conference of the Asia Pacific Migration Research Network on the theme of 'Migration, Development and Poverty Reduction, Fuzhou, China, 25-29 May 2007, available at: http://apmrn.usp.ac.fj/conferences/8thAPMRNconference/1.Hugo.pdf, accessed January 18, 2010.
- International Organisation for Migration (IOM) (2005). Cross-border Labour Migration Flows, Croatia-Italy: Focus on Shipbuilding, (Geneva: International Organization of Migration)
- International Organization for Migration (IOM) (2000). *Labour Migration Policy and Research*, (Geneva: IOM), <u>www.labourmigration.eu/research/</u> accessed on June 17 2007.
- International Union for the Scientific Study of Population (IUSSP) (2005). Annual Activities and Management Report.(Paris: IUSSP) www.iussp.org/members/restricted/Act reports/actrep05.pdf accessed on May 25, 2008

- Jenkins, J. Craig (1977). "Push/Pull in Recent Mexican Migration to the U.S". International Migration Review 11:178-89.
- Jha, H. (1999). Status of Informal Sectors Workers: The Other side of Economy In Nepal, (Kathmandu: Center for Economy and Technical Studies)
- Kabki, M., Mazzucato, V., and Appiah, E., (2003). "Wo Benane A Eye Bebree". The Economic Impact Of Remittances Of Holland Based Ghanaian Migrants On Rural Ashanti, Brighton, (Brighton: Centre For Migration Research, University Of Sussex)
- Kanaiaupuni, S., & Donato, K. (1999). "Migradollars and mortality: The effects of male migration on infant mortality in Mexico". *Demography*, 36(3) 339-53.
- Kansakar, Vidhya Bir Singh (1982). *Emigration, Remittances and Rural Development.* (Kathmandu: Centre for Economic Development and Administration).
- Kapur D. (2003.) Remittances: the new development mantra? Palais des Nations, Geneva Katseli LT, Lucas REB, Xenogiani T. 2006. Effects of Migration on Sending Countries: What do we know? *Rep. Working Paper No. 250*, OECD, Paris
- KC, Bal Kumar (1998). *Trends, Patterns and Implications of Rural-To-Urban Migration in Nepal.* (Kathmandu: Central Department of Population Studies).
- KC, Bal Kumar, Bhim Prasad Subedi, Yogendra Bahadur Gurung, Bidhan Acharya, Bhim Raj Suwal (1997). *Migration Situation in Nepal*. (Kathmandu: Ministry of Population and Environment, HMG, and UNFPA).
- King, R. and J.Vullnetari (2003). Migration and Development in Albania, *Working Paper C5*, Development Research Centre on Migration, Globalisation and Poverty, (Brighton: Centre for Migration Research, University of Sussex).
- Kirk D. (1996). "Demographic Transition Theory". Population Studies 50
- Klaver J. (1997). Migranten-netwerken in Los Angeles. *Geografie* 6:30-4 www.imi.ox.ac.uk/.../. accessed on July 25 2011
- Knodel, J., Kespichayawattana, J., Wiwatwanich, S., & Saengtienchai, C. (2007). *Migration and Intergenerational Solidarity: Evidence from Rural Thailand*. (Bangkok: UNFPA Thailand and Country Technical Services Team for East and South-East Asia).

- Kugler, Maurice (2005). Migrant Remittances, Human Capital Formation and Job Creation Externalities in Colombia, (Southampton: Department of Economics, University of Southampton). Southampton SO17 1BJ, U.K.
- Kule, D., A.Mancellari, H.Papapanagos, S.Qirici and P.Sanfey (2002). 'The Causes and Consequences of Albanian Emigration During Transition: Evidence from Micro Data', *International Migration Review* 36:.229-239.
- Lee ES. (1966). "A Theory of Migration". Demography 3:47-57
- Leeds, A. (1977). "Mythos and Pathos: Some Unpleasantries on Peasantries". In R. Halperin and J. Dow (eds.) *Peasant Livelihood*, (New York: St. Martin Press).
- Lenin, V.I (1969). Imprerialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism. (Peking: Foreign Language Press)
- Lewis WA. (1954). "Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour". Manchester School of Economic and Social Studies 22:139-91
- Liaw K-L.(1990). "Joint effects of personal factors and ecological variables on the interprovincial migration pattern of young adults in Canada" *Geographical Analysis* 22: 189-208
- Lipton, M. (1977). *Why Poor People Stay Poor: A Study of Urban Bias in World Development*, (London: Temple Smith).
- Lopez, Espinosa (2005). Globalization, migration and development: The role of Mexican migrant remittances. *Paper presented to Economía Panel Meeting*, *Santiago, Chile*, 13-14 May 2005.
- Lucas, David and Elespeth Young (1994)." International Migration", in David Lucas and Paul Myer (eds.), *Beginning Population Studies* (The Australian National University: National Center for Development Studies).
- Mabogunje AL. (1970). "Systems Approach to a Theory of Rural-Urban Migration". Geographical Analysis 2:1-18
- Macfarlane, A. (1976). *Resources and Population: A Study of the Gurungs of Nepal*, (London: Cambridge University Press).
- Mare, R. D. (2011). "A Multigenerational View of Inequality." *Demography* 48: 1-23. <u>www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov</u> accessed on may 20 2012.
- Martin PL, Taylor JE. (1996). "The anatomy of a migration hump". In JEe Taylor (ed.), Development strategy, employment, and migration: Insights from models, (Paris: OECD, Development Centre) pp 43-62.

- Martin PL. (1992). "Migration and Development: A Conference Report". *International Migration* 30:457-76.
- Martin PL. (1993). *Trade and Migration: NAFTA and Agriculture*. (Washington D.C.: Institute for International Economics), pp 457-76.
- Marx, K. (1976). Preface and Introduction to a Contribution to the Critique of *Political Economy*, (Peking: Foreign Language press).
- Massey DS, Arango J, Hugo G, Kouaouci A, Pellegrino A, Taylor JE. (1993). "Theories of international migration: A review and appraisal". *Population and Development Review* 19:431-66
- Massey DS, Arango J, Hugo G, Kouaouci A, Pellegrino A, Taylor JE. (1998). Worlds in motion: Understanding international migration at the end of the millennium, (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Massey DS. (1989). International Migration in Comparative Perspective. (Washington, D.C.: Commission for the Study of International Migration and Co-operative Economic Development).
- Massey DS. (1990). "Social Structure, Household Strategies, and the Cumulative Causation of Migration". *Population Index* 56:3-26.
- Massey, D. S., & Espinosa, K. E. (1997). "What's driving Mexico-US migration? A theoretical empirical and policy analysis". *American Journal of Sociology*, 102(4), 939–999.
- Massey, Douglas S. and Audrey Singe (1995). "New estimates of undocumented Mexican migration and the probability of apprehension," *Demography* 32: 203-213.
- Massey, Douglas, L. Goldring, and Jorge Durand. (1994). "Continuities in Transnational Migration: An Analysis of Nineteen Mexican Communities." *American Journal of Sociology* 99:1492-533.
- McDowell, C., and de Haan, A. (1997). Migration and sustainable livelihoods: A critical Review of the Literature, *Working paper 65* (Brighton: Institute of Development Studies).
- McKee DL, Tisdell CA. (1988). "The Developmental Implications of Migration from and between Small Island Nations". *International Migration* 26:417-26
- Messinis, G.& Cheng, E. J. (2009). *Earnings, Education and Training in China: The Migrant Worker Experience*. (Melbourne: Victoria University).

- Migrants Counseling Center (MCC) (2011). Unpublished Report on Origin and Destination of Nepalese Cross-border Migrants to India from GaddaChowki Transit Point. (Mahendra Nagar: Migrants Counseling Center funded by International Nepal Fellowship).
- <u>Mincer, Jacob</u> (1974). *Schooling, Experience and Earnings*. (New York: National Bureau of Economic Research).
- Myrdal G. (1957). *Rich Lands and Poor*. (New York: Harper and Row)
- New Era (1981). *Study on Inter-Regional Migration in Nepal*. (Kathmandu: National Planning Commission).
- Olesen H. (2002). "Migration, return, and development: An institutional perspective". *International Migration* 40:125-50
- Passaris C. (1989). "Immigration and the Evolution of Economic Theory". International Migration 27:525-42
- Petersen, W. (1958). "A general typology of migration", *American sociological review* 23(3): 256–266.
- Portes, A. (1978). "Contemporary immigration: Theoretical perspectives on its Determinants and modes of incorporation". *International Migration Review* 23:606-30
- Potter RB, Binns T, Elliot JA and Smith D. (1999). *Geographies of Development*. (Harlow, England: Prentice Hall).
- Quinn, Michael A. (2001). Haves and Have Nots, Relative Deprivation and Mexican Migration 1987-1997. (UNC: Chapel Hill). www.unc.edu/depts/econ/seminars/migrationoct11.pdf, accessed on January 23 2009.
- Ratha D. (2003). "Workers' Remittances: An Important and Stable Source of External Development Finance". *Global Development Finance* (Washington D.C.: World Bank). pp. 157-75.
- Ravenstein EG. (1885). "The Laws of Migration". *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* 48:167-227
- Ravenstein EG. (1889). "The Laws of Migration". Journal of the Royal Statistical Society 52:214- 301
- Reniers G. (1999). "On the History and Selectivity of Turkish and Moroccan Migration to Belgium". *International Migration* 37:679-713.

- Salt J. (1987). "Contemporary Trends in International Migration Study". *International Migration* 25:241-51.
- Sander, Cerstin. (2003). "Migrant Remittances to Developing Countries—A Scoping Study: Overview and Introduction to Issues for Pro-Poor Financial Services." Prepared by Bannock Consulting for the U.K. Department for International Development, London.
- Sawhill, Isabel V. (1988), "Poverty in U.S: Why did it so persistent"? *Journal of Economic Literature*, 26 (3), pp.1073-1119.
- Schoorl J. (1998). The Analysis Generating International Migration: A multi-country approach to study the determinants of migration (Oxford: International Migration Institute).
- Scoones I. (1998). Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: A Framework for Analysis. (Brighton: International Institutes of Development Studies).
- Seddon, David, Jagannath Adkhikari and Ganesh Gurung (2001). *The New Lahures: Foreign Employment and Remittance Economy of Nepal.* (Kathmandu: Nepal Institute of Development Studies).
- Sheddon, D. (2005). "Nepal's Dependence on Exporting Labor". (Washington DC: Migration Policy Institute).
- Shrestha, N. R. (2001). *The Political Economy of Land, Landless and Migration in Nepal.* (New Delhi: Nirala Publication).
- Sjaastad AH. (1962). "The Costs and Returns of Human Migration". *Journal of Political Economy* 70:80-93.
- Skeldon R. (1992). "On Mobility and Fertility Transitions in East and Southeast Asia". *Asian Pacific Migration Journal* 1:220-49.
- Skeldon R. (1997). *Migration and development: A global perspective*. (Essex: Longman).
- Skeldon, R. (2003a). 'Migration and migration policy in Asia: a synthesis of selected cases', Migration, Development and Pro poor Policy Choices in Asia, *Regional Conference, Refugee and Migratory Movements*, (Dhaka: Research Unit/DFID, Bangladesh). July 14-18.
- Stark O, Helmenstein C and Prskawetz A. (1997). "A brain gain with a brain drain". *ECOLET* 55:227-34
- Stark O, Levhari D. (1982). "On Migration and Risk in LDCs". *Economic Development and Cultural Change*: 191-6.
- Stark O, Taylor JE, Yitzhaki S., (1998). "Migration, Remittances in Inequality: A Sensitivity Analysis Using the Extended Gini Index". *Journal of Development Economics* 28:309-22.
- Stark O. (1978). *Economic-Demographic Interactions in Agricultural Development: The Case of Rural-to-Urban Migration.* (Rome: FAO).
- Stark O. (1980). "On the Role of Urban-to-Rural Remittances in Rural Development". *Journal of Development Studies* 16:369-74.
- Stark O. (1991). The migration of labor, (Cambridge & Oxford: Blackwell).
- Stark, O. and Taylor, J.E. (1991). "Migration incentives, migration types: the role of relative deprivation", *Economic Journal*, 101(408): 1163Á78.
- Stiglitz J. (2003). *Globalization and its Discontents*, (London: The Penguin Press)
- Suro, R. (2003). *Remittance Senders and Receivers: Tracking the Transnational Channels*, (Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center)
- Tacoli, C. (2002). Changing rural-urban interactions in sub-Saharan Africa and their impacts on livelihoods: a summary. (London: International Institute for Environment and Development).
- TARU, Nepal Institute of Development Studies and Refugee and Migration Study Unit (2011). Survey of Cross Border Migrants from Bangladeshi and Nepali to India across the Source-Destination Continuum: Synthesis Report Submitted to the World Bank.
- Taylor JE, Arango J, Hugo G, Kouaouci A, Massey DS, Pellegrino A. (1996)."International migration and community development". *Population Index* 62:397-418
- Taylor JE, Wyatt TJ., (1996). "The shadow value of migrant remittances, income and inequality in a household-farm economy". *Journal of Development Studies* 32:899-912.
- Taylor, J. E. (1999). "The New Economics of Labour Migration and the Role of Remittances in the Migration Process." *International Migration* 37:63–88.
- Taylor, J. Edward and T.J. Wyatt, (1996). "The Shadow Value of Migrant Remittances, Income and Inequality in a Household-farm Economy", *Journal of Development Studies* 32 (6):899-912.
- Taylor, J.E. (2006). "International Migration and Development." International Symposium on International Migration and Development, Population

Division, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations Secretariat, Turin, Italy.

- Thieme, Susan (2006). "Social Networks and Migration: Far West Nepalese Labour Migrants in Delhi". *Münster*: pp. 36-40.
- Todaro MP, Maruszko L. (1987). "Illegal migration and US immigration reform: A conceptual framework". *Population and development review* 13:101-14
- Todaro, MP. (1969). "A model of labor migration and urban unemployment in lessdeveloped countries". *American Economic Review* 59:138-48.
- UNDP (2005). "International trade unlocking the potential for human development", *Human Development Report 2005* (New York: United Nation Development Program), pp. 113-148.
- UNHCR (2009). Research study on cross border population movements between Afghanistan and Pakistan (New York: United Nations High Commission for Refugees). www.altaiconsulting.com/psd.html accessed on 20 August 2010.
- UNICEF (2007). The Impact of International Migration: Children left Behind in Some selected Countries of Latin America and the Caribbean, *Working Paper*, *Division of Policy and Planning* (NewYork: UNICEF).
 www.unicef.org/.../The Impact of International Migration LAC.pd accessed on May 22 2009.
- UN-INSTRAW (2008). Gender, remittances and development: the case of Filipino migration to Italy. Santo Domingo, the Dominican Republic. (New York: United Nations International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women; IFAD; and the Filipino Women's Council).
- United Nations (1990). *The International Convention on Migrant Workers and its Committee* (New York: Office of the United Nations High Commission for Human Rights)
- United Nations (2011). UN Backgrounder: Confronting family poverty and social exclusion.

www.upf.org/united-nations/upf-un-news/3611-un-backgrounder-qconfronting <u>-family-</u> accessed on July 24 2011

United States Immigration and Naturalization Service (1992). Statistical Yearbook of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (Washington: United States Immigration Law Policy).

- United States Immigration and Naturalization Service (1998). Statistical Yearbook of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (Washington: United States Immigration Law Policy).
- Van Wey (2005). "Land Ownership as a Determinant of International and Internal Migration in Mexico and Internal Migration in Thailand." *International Migration Review* 39:141-172.
- Vernon, M. (1975) "Mexican Workers in the United States Labour Market: A Contempory Dilema". *International Labour Review*. 112 (5), PP. 351-368
- Vertovec S. (1999). Conceiving and researching transnationalism. Ethnic and Racial Studies 22:445-62
- Vu Manh Loi and Nguyen Tuan Huy (2002). Community Baseline Study for Project intervention, Policy Formulation and Research Capacity Building for DSEP and Sub- DSEPs in Vietnam. (Hanoi: International Labour Office-IPED Mekong Sub-Regional Project to Combat Trafficking in Children and Women).
- Waddington, H., Sabates-Wheeler, R. (2003). Poverty, Vulnerability and Migration Choice. *Working Paper T3*, (Sussex: Development Research Centre on Migration, Globalisation & Poverty).
- Wahba, S. (1996). Temporary labor migration in Egyptian agricultural households: Implications for gender differences in school enrolment. *Forum* 3(4).
- Waldorf, B. (1998). "A network-based model of international migration". In P Gorter,
 P Nijkamp and J Poot (eds.). *In Crossing borders: Regional and urban perspectives on international migration*, (Aldershot: Ashgate), pp. 323-35.
- Wallerstein I. (1974). The Modern World System I, Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century. (New York: Academic Press)
- Wallerstein I. (1980). The Modern World System II, Mercantilism and the Consolidation of the European World-Economy, 1600-1750. (New York: Academic Press)
- Wallerstein, I. (1983). Historical Capitalism, (London: Verso)
- Wilpert, C. (1992) "The use of social networks in Turkish migration to Germany", in Kritz, M.M., Lin, L.L. and Zlotnik, H. (eds.), *International Migration Systems* (London: Clarendon Press), 177Á89.

- Winer, Myron (1971). "The Political and Demography of Nepal". *Population and Development Review*, (Kathmandu: CEDA) pp 99-124.
- Winters, P., A. de Janvry, and E. Sadoulet (2001). "Family and community networks in Mexico- US migration". *Journal of Human Resources* 36(1):159-184.
- Woodruff, Ludger (2003). "Specifying Human Capital". *Journal of Economic Surveys* 17(3): 239-270.
- World Bank (2005). Global Economic Prospects (Washington: World Bank)
- World Bank (2010). "Outlook for Remittance Flows 2010-2011", *Migration and Development Brief*, (Washington: World Bank).
- Yang, D. (2004). International Migration, Human Capital and Entrepreneurship: Evidence from Philippine Migrants' Exchange Rate Shocks. Ford School of Public Policy Working Paper Series No. 02-011, (Michigan: The Economic Journal).
- Yount, W. R. (2006). North American Professors of Christian Education. Retrieved October 6, 2012, from http://napce.org/documents/research-designyount/22_correlation_4th.pdf
- Zelinsky, Z. (1971). The Hypothesis of the Mobility Transition. *Geographical Review* 61:219-49
- Zolberg, Aristide R. (1978). "International Migration Policies in a Changing World System". In William H. McNeill and Ruth Adams (eds.) *Human Migration: Patterns and Policies*. (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press).