CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Migration differential, to some extent, exist ethnicity wise in Nepal. There are various causes of migration which depends upon the culture, economy, geographical residence, state's facility and policy and social aspect of the people. In general, migration refers to the change of usual place of residence to the destination. In Nepalese context, there must be crossing from usual place of residence to the other political boundary, i.e. district (CBS, 2001). The Evereet S. Lee defines migration as a permanent or semi permanent change of usual place of residence. (Lee, 1966).

Migration is a form of geographical or spatial mobility, which involves a change of usual residence of a person between clearly defined geographical units. A person who crosses the boundary of own country or places of country is called an out-migrant. Emigration refers to movement out of a particular territory in connection with the international migration (Bhende and Karnitkar, 1998).

Migration has become an essential characteristics feature of modern society speedy advanced in the field of science and technology and consequent rapid industrialization and urbanization have been responsible for population shift. From the demographic point of view, there are a number of distinctive features which separate the migrants from the rest of the population both at the place of their origin and place of destination. This in turn explain a number of qualitative changes that have taken place in relating to age, sex, education, etc., at both the places (Upreti, 1998).

Migration has been an important part of people's life in Nepal. Whether it is an internal migration or foreign migration, a large number of households now have migrants. This fact has also been demonstrated by both Census 2001 and NLSS III study. Accordingly, migration has also significantly contributed to the household economy. The remittances sent by migrants now contribute as much as that of agriculture. In addition, migration has many consequences in the family life as well as development of the country.

In population analysis, internal migration does not have any effect on the structure, composition, and growth of population in a country. However, if the data analyzed by smaller geographic units within in a country internal migration will have effect on all of these factors. International migration has a direct bearing on the population growth, age structure and social composition of the population (MOHP, 2007).

In Nepal, people's access to politics and social and economic development differs according to their social identity (e.g., caste, ethnicity and gender), economic status and location (urban, rural and remote areas). The nation building process of Nepal has been largely discriminatory in practice in every sphere of life. The practice of the state was in favour of a single language, religion, culture and a particular region. Exclusion of a large group of peoples belonging to other languages, religions, cultures and regions from the mainstream political, economical, social, and cultural development is the result of these discriminatory policies and practices (Grung, 2008).

Migration unlike fertility and mortality is the least researched and understood component of demographic dynamics in Nepal despite the fact that many of Nepal's socio-economic and political problems are interwoven with the process of both internal and international migration (KC, 1998).

Migration in Nepal basically interprets nature, volume, causes and consequences of semi-permanent and permanent migration by various studies using census and survey data (Kc. et. al, 1997). Considering the ever expanding phenomenon of migration and its effect on both household and the nation, it is important to come to terms with various dimensions of migration.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The number of international migrants in the world today has exceeded 214 million, which is unprecedented compared to just 191 million in 2005. If the pace of migration continues at the same rate as in the last 20 years, the number of international migrants worldwide could exceed 405 million by 2050. If internal migrants, estimated at 740 million are also taken into account, the total number of migrants would be nearly 1 billion worldwide today (IOM, 2010). With the increase in number, there is a greater diversity of migrants in terms of ethnicity, language, culture and religion. There has also been greater participation of women. Regarding destinations and origin places of

migrants, new markets are emerging not just in Asia and the Gulf but also in Latin America and Africa (NIDS/NCCR, 2010).

Migration has been a significant phenomenon in South Asia. For hundreds of years, circular movements of people have taken place in South Asia primarily of diversify income sources beyond subsistence agriculture. (ADB, 2003). Economic and social conditions continue to be the major reasons behind population movement in South Asia. With forty percent of the world poor, South Asia remains among the poorest region of the world. Forty five percent of the population lives below the international poverty line of one dollar a day and the most economic impact of migration in South Asia is in terms of remittance from both international and internal migrations are significant in the region (Haque, 2005).

2001 census shows the total number of emigrants from Nepal accounting 3.24 percent of the total population 23151423. Of which, male were 679469 and female emigrants were 82712. In addition, the Western Development Region is the largest sending regions accounting for 43.5 percent of the total absentee population in 2001 census. Moreover, Nepal is populated by 103 caste and ethnic groups who are largely Hindus, Buddhists, Animists, some Muslims, and in some cases a combination of two or more of these. High proportion of Brahmin/Chhetri, Janajati and Dalits were reported to be internal as well as international migrants in 2001. The major streams of internal migration are rural to rural (68.2%), rural to urban (25.5%)and hill to Terai (CBS, 2003).

Most of the studies suggest that lack of employment as the main push factors of the hill and land availability and employment as the main pull factors of the Terai (Kc et al., 1997). Further, a study conducted in the camp of Nepalese migrants in Quatar showed that Brahmin/Chhetri and Thakuri was the major out migrants of Nepal to Quatar, followed by Magar, Kami. Study suggested that the poorest people in the village do not travel abroad due to the lack of money. If so, which factors are responsible to the migration in rural area was the primary question of the study (Brusle, 2010).

Migration is the least researched area in Nepal compared to other demographic dynamics despite the fact that many socio-economic, demographic and political problems are closely associated with the process of both internal and international

migration. (Conway et al., 1981). In this context, this study focuses on the various characteristics of migrants by their caste and ethnicity.

1.3 Objective of the study

The broad objective of this study is to compare and analysis the migration differentials accordance to migrant's caste and ethnicity. To support the overall objective, following are the specific objectives.

- To assess the social and economic back ground of the migrants. (to analyzed the characteristic of migrants) .
- To identify the migration pattern among caste/ethnic groups and other correlates of migration.
- To examine the socio-economic impact of migration.

1.4 Significance of the Study

Caste/ethnicity plays a crucial role in the migratory behavior of individuals and there are very few studies conducted in this area regarding this aspect. Hence, there is a need for a new study which attempts to explain the effect of caste/ethnicity on the migratory behavior of individual of this area. This study will give the insights of the migration among people of Dalit, Janajati and Brahman/Chhetri which can contribute for government line agencies and non-governmental organizations to make district level community based intervention program which may help to find the causes and consequences of migration by caste and ethnicity.

Research and studies in the area of migration by caste and ethnicity are gaining poor attention in Nepal. The information on the comparative study between different caste groups of migrations affecting factors behind that is really helpful for findings the gap between the migration differentials within the caste groups. So, the information obtained after this study will be more useful for the policy makers, researchers, administrations, and students in this area.

1.5 Limitation of the Study

The study was conducted in the village of Gulmi district that lies on the Hill region of western Nepal. Hence the findings may not be generalized in other Terai and mountainous districts as well ascan not define in national level because of its small sample size and small area of study.

CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Migration is an important component in the socio-economic and demographic characteristics of Nepal. Role of theoretical perspectives/model of migration helps to analyze the migration data on certain framework while the previous findings gives responsible factors, causes, consequences, trends, pattern etc. of migration.

2.1: Theoretical Literature

2.1.1 Definition of Migration

In general, migration refers to the change of usual place of residence to the destination. In Nepalese context, there must be crossing from usual place of residence to the other political boundary i.e. district (CBS, 2003). United Nations defined migration as a demographic process alone with fertility and mortality. Migration plays in important role in demographic change by estimating selective characteristics of migration stream quantification of their volume direction and distance and assessing their demographic impact of origin and destination (UN, 1970). In addition, the Demographic Dictionary defines migration as a form of geographical mobility between one geographical unit and another, generally involving change in place of residence from the place of origin or the place of departure to the place of destination or place of arrival (UN, 1973).

Migration is not biologically determined and universal and the same sense as births and deaths are. All are born and all die but only some migrate. Even when, strong incentives to more be present, migration result through an act of human will (Wiley and Sons, 1969). Movement of people from their native country to alien country is known as emigration, whereas the movement of people from alien country to the native country is called immigration. Migration that takes place within the country is called internal migration.

2.2.2 Scholar's Models of Migration

If we look at the history of migration, the people started to move from the age of hunting-gathering period for seeking the daily needs. Moreover, in the agricultural

society in the ancient period, people were shifted from one place to another to achieve better cultivated land. But in the modern society, there are multi-purpose aspects of migration. Different scholars have presented different aspects or model of migration.

Revenstein enunciated “The Law of Migration”. He articulated the push and pull factors that lead to migration. Ravenstein further analyzed that high rate of migration occurs in short distance, usual streams of migration is from rural to urban areas, urban areas people less migrate than those of country side, short distance migration predominance by female, high level of technology creates high level of migration and the main factor is economy among the various factor to motivation of migration (Revenstein 1885).

The Evereet S. Lee (1966) defines migration as a permanent or semi permanent change of usual place of residence. He reformulated Ravenstein's theory to give more emphasis to internal (or push) factors. Lee also outlined the impact that intervening obstacles have on the migration process. He argued that variables such as distance, physical and political barriers, and having dependents can impede or even prevent migration. Lee pointed out that the migration process is selective because differentials such as age, gender, and social class affect how persons respond to push-pull factors, and these conditions also shape their ability to overcome intervening obstacles. Furthermore, personal factors such as a person's education, knowledge of a potential receiver population, family ties, and the like can facilitate or retard migration.

Zipf (1946) purposed formulated intervening opportunities directly proportional to the number of intervening opportunities. The model viewed the problem of obstacles in positive rather than negative way and considered as hypothesis of intervening opportunities. Ho found migration directly proportional to the number of completing migrants for the opportunities.

Mabogunje(1972) applied a concept of system theory in the system of rural urban migration with concerning African developing countries. He focus that migration is bounded by complexity of social, economic, cultural, personal, political distance and other demographic features and, following this situation person makes the perception on migration. And migration occurs towards agriculture to non-agricultural and economic activities area. He further pointed out that basic transformation change the structure of the society, change of the individuals’ skill, attitude and quality of life etc.

Following this theory, the researcher draws a framework to present the situation of society with consulting migration.

Bogue (1969) observed that migration is selective; selectivity of migration has been developed as a major branch of migrating studies. Number of socio-economic and demographic factors has been found as the features of propensity to migrate and the selectivity of migration depends on the phase of migratory movement patterns with certain attributes regarding age, sex and educational attainment.

Harris Todaro (1976) gives the most significant contribution to the large number of migration literature. From his views, migration mechanism can be explained by the difference in expected rather than actual earnings between two places. He has formulated migration model is four different features as;

- Migration is estimated primary by national income considerations of relatives benefited, which are mostly financial and psychological.
- The decision to migrate depends on real wages differentials (expected rather than the actual new or old real differential).
- The probability of obtaining employments in the new sector in inversely related to the unemployment rate in the new sector

To sum of this model interprets that migration of population is the matters profit and loss and it experienced by the migrants themselves. This is also applicable to the Nepalese migrants. Most of the Terai people of Nepal come from the hill and mountain region of Nepal with facing the problem of bread and butter there.

Zelinsky (1971) was developed the “mobility transition theory” in 1971. Hypothesis of a “mobility transition” focuses on the relative importance of different types of movement changes with the process of modernization in a pattern analogous to that observed fertility and mortality rates in the demographic model. The model presents five distinguished phases, ranging from the pre modern transitional society characterized physically and culturally limited migration and circulation to the transitional phase with rapid population growth, high level rural urban migration and circulation, and the colonization, and the colonization of frontier regions. The dominant phase ultimately will be the advance and across international boundaries migration. The five stage in a temporal sequence as presented in the model as;

Phase 1: Pre modern traditional society

Phase 2: The early transitional society

Phase 3: The late transitional society

Phase 4: The advanced society

Phase 5: The future super advanced society.

Stuffer Samuel (1960) proposed formulating intervening opportunities directly proportional to the number of intervening opportunities. The model viewed the problem of obstacles in positive rather than negative way and considered as hypothesis of intervening opportunities. He found migration directly proportional to the number of completing migrants for these opportunities.

2.2.3 Background of Ethnicity

The Nepalese caste system is highly influenced by the Hindu religion. Before the first Civil Code (MulukiAin) in 1854, most part of the existing Nepal's geographical boundary, people were socially defined by the Caste system whether they were Hindu or not. The civil code itself an influenced by the Hindu religion and it also further strongly emphasized to the caste system based on classical Hindu varna system i.e. Brahman priests, Kshatriya Kings and Warrior, the Vaisya traders and businessmen and the Sudra peasants and labourers-with an additional group technically "outside" the caste system because of their ritually defiling occupations which rendered them "untouchable" by others (Bennet et al., 2008: 1).

Occupying the top and bottom of the Varna system were the hill Hindus or Parbatiya who migrated into Nepal from the western hills. They were from the Indo-European language group and spoke Sanskrit-based language (Khas) from which the modern Nepali language emerged. The top ordered caste in Varna hierarchy caste system i.e. Brahman and Kshatriya/Thakuri as considered as Tagadari or 'wearers of the sacred thread' and the people from the occupational group Damai (tailors/musicians), Kami (blacksmith) and Sarki (cobblers) was collectively considered as 'impure' or PaniNachalne or Non-Tagadari (Bennet et al., 2008: 2).

The state civil code thus restructured the Nepalese social structure into a four-fold caste hierarchy and placed Dalits-the groups of Sudra category (Damai, Kami and Sarki). On the other, the people resided in hill and mountain areas in Nepal were ranked in middle order to the existing Indigeneous groups, belonging to the Tibeto-Burman language. Since many of these groups consumed homemade beer and spirits, they were called 'liquor-drinkers' or matwali by the Brahmans and Chhetris whose

caste status did not allow them to take alcohol which was considered polluting. In contemporary Nepal, these various ethnic groups are considered as the Adibasi Janajati (indigeneous Nationalities) (Bennet et al., 2008: 3).

Nepal is populated by 103 caste and ethnic groups who are largely Hindus, Buddhists, Animists, some Muslims, and in some cases a combination of two or more of these. One of the most common ways of classifying these groups is to cluster them in three major overlapping divisions: (i) the hierarchical caste structured groups (jats) and the egalitarian ethnic groups (Janjatis); (ii) the high caste or the ritually 'pure' castes and the low, ritually 'impure untouchable' castes (Dalits); and (iii) Pahadis and Madhesis. The ethnic groups, currently known as Janjatis, comprise mainly of Mongoloid stock, speak various Tibeto-Burman languages, such as Tamang, Gurung, Newari, and Magar. And, three main reasons have been identified for the country's ethnic diversity, structured hierarchy, and inequality. They include: (i) migration of different groups into Nepal, (ii) political unification of these groups into the nation-state by the Nepali-speaking groups formerly known as Khas and now as Parbatiyas, and (iii) state laws and policies (Pradhan and Sherestha, 2005).

2.2 Empirical Literature

Migration is one of the three components of population change. Any change in the volume and flow of migration will change the size, growth, and other characteristics of the population both in sending and receiving areas. Migration within a country does not affect it's the total size of the population and growth rate but it affects regional and sub-regional population and growth rate within the country. But migration into and/or outside the country does affect the size and the growth of a country's population (KC 1998). In today's highly mobile world, managing migration either at the national or regional level is a complex issue. Migration has become an increasingly complex area of governance, inextricably interlinked with other key policy areas including economic and social development, national security, human rights, public health, etc. the national level policy may integrate all types of population movement, regular and irregular in a coherent manner and in a coherent manner and in harmony with the development process of the country. (Heque, 2005).

2.2.1 Migration Situation in Nepal Based on Census 2001

In Nepal internal migration takes place chiefly from hills to Terai. On the basis of data collected in Population Census 2001 there are four streams of migration viz, rural to rural, rural to urban, urban to rural and urban to urban. Migration studies showed that in agriculture based rural economy rural to rural migration stream dominates other streams. Rural to rural 86.2 percent and rural to urban migration stream account for and 25.5 percent of total migrants.

The lowlands have experienced a higher population pressure both in terms of crude density and persons per hectare cultivated land. Nepal's average density of population per square kilometer increased from 15.6 persons in 1971 to 78.5 persons in 1991. On the other hand, the average land holding has been decreased from 1.11 ha in 1961/62 to o.96 ha in 1991 in Nepal (CBS, 2002). The total population absent from household is 762181 for various purposes such as employment, dependence in agriculture labor (CBS, 2001). This indicates a huge number of migrations leading to the labor crisis in agricultural production system.

The 2001 census shows that among the total percentage of migrants, Brahmin and /Chhetri males of hill occupy higher position (46.32%) than that of Dalit (Kami and Damai) (4.26%) and Janajati (Magar and Grung) (9.27%) migrants. Same situation can be seen in female migrants. This consists, Brahmin and Chhetri (39.16%), Dalit (5.57%) and Janajati (9.32%) (CBS, 2001).

2.2.2 Findings of Previous Studies

A study showed that the proportion of migrant among Hindu (82.68%) was higher than Muslim (17.32%), migrant's age 20 to 29 years was higher, literate migrants was higher than illiterates. Further, migrants who left their village during the last one year tended not to send any remittances. Ninety percent household used remittances for certain purpose, especially daily consumption such as food and clothing; health care, agriculture. This implies that the strong linkage between migrants and their families in origin (Tsujita and Oda, 2012).

Rudolph Alexander further analyzed, immigration, migration, and emigration trace their origins to the beginning of humankind. People have immigrated, migrated, and emigrated in search for food, survival from predators and enemies, and improved lives. In modern societies throughout the world, immigration remains a highly

sensitive phenomenon, especially when race and ethnicity are involved (Alexander, 2010).

Heider has included in his study conducted in Bangladesh migrants, migrated from rural to city, that lack of work availabilities, unemployment, poverty, natural disaster i.e. flood, draught, river erosion, etc, and others socio-cultural factors like, marriage, family conflict, better life living, better education facilities, social discrimination, social problems prejudice, fanaticism, political chaos, dominating village elders etc are also act as motivate form of migration. The responses reveal that the process of rural-urban, semi urban-urban, urban-urban migration is strongly influenced by the incidence of push factor, or which the most important one is the absence of jobs in the villages, and pull factors like the prospect fop rearing higher income in the cities. He further added that better educational and health care facilities and other social amenities that are necessary for better living conditions are added attractions of the migrants towards the city life. A number of respondents indicated, in his study, that they had migrated to the city with a view to giving their children a better education. They feel that there is a wide gap between the urban and rural areas in terms of both the quality of education and the type of educational institutions providing a wide range of facilities, which encouraged them to migrate (Heider 2010).

Foreign labor migration started since the early 19th century. Migration of Nepali workers to overseas countries was opened up in mid 1980s with the formulation of "Foreign Employment Act 1985". Annually some 2-8 thousands of Nepal workers went to overseas through official channels during 1993/94-1997/98 period. In this way migrant members have been increasing over the year 2006/07 about 600 Nepali workers are getting government approvals daily to go overseas countries for employment. Over the years scale of foreign labor migration and its contribution to the national as well as household economy through remittance has tremendously increased. With this Nepal is gradually recognizing as "manpower-exporting country" and country's economy is turning out to be as a remittance economy (Suwal and Adhikari, 2007).

The significant migration from Mountain and Hill to Terai can be explained by the pull factors such as: a) resettlement programs b) availability of fertile arable land c) employ opportunities and d) better communication and transportation (MOHP, 2007).

Urbanization in Nepal has its point of departure in the migration of the people from the inaccessible villages to places with access, which offers opportunities for employment, education and health. The migrant population is 36.6 per cent in the country (CBS, 2004). Whilst 81.5 per cent of the people are migrants from VDCs, only 5 per cent are the migrants from the municipalities. 75.2 per cent of the migrants had left their place for family reasons, 11.6 per cent had done so for easier life style. 6.8 per cent migrated looking for job (Pokharel, 2006).

Peoples of South Asian countries have moved due to economic difficulties, natural disasters, religious and ethnic conflicts, war and civil unrest. In recent time globalization and growth in information and communication technology have acceleration in migration, adding new dynamics to the world of migration in South Asia. Today, factor such as economic imbalances, extreme poverty, population growth, land security, environmental degradation, social networks long and porous internationals borders, global and regional opportunities, trades and migration policies, awareness and lack of it, continue to contribute to the increasing magnitude and varied forms of internal and international migration in the South Asian region. At the same time various pull factors in destination countries including expanding markets, labor shortfalls, and aging population also motivate people to migrate across boarder. Better educational opportunities for migrants' children, access to especial jobs, better health care system also the pull factors of destinations (Heque, 2005).

According to available empirical studies and evidences, the migration is always a selective process in which, the community, family or individuals fall into certain or characteristics and it varies extensively from culture to culture several studies reported that migration varies depending on socio-economic, demographic and cultural factors (Akand, 2005).

David Seddon focuses on his paper, "Nepal's Dependence on Exporting Labor". The failure to create and implement a coherent overall development strategy mobilizing all of Nepal's resources — including effective education, training, and manpower planning for human resource development — has led to low rates of growth and high levels of unemployment and underemployment in what remains a largely subsistence agriculture, handicraft, and service-based economy, with around 40 percent of the population below the poverty line. Hence, the massive upsurge in migration from rural areas to cities and other countries Seddon (2005).

The higher castes have always maintained a superior socio-economic position. The socio economic composition of the various castes has helped the migrants to attain various occupational positions in the place of their migration. On the other hand, the migrants from the untouchable castes have not succeeded in attaining an upward social mobility in the destination because most of them are engaged in those jobs which are rated as inferior. And from the economic point of view, a migrant family is better of then that of non migrant in the village (Upreti, 1998).

The fertility, mortality and migration are all affected by the socio-cultural characteristics of the different religion and ethnic groups, the more open groups are more mobile than the secluded groups (Panday, 1998).

The major consequences of migrations in destination are social and political conflict, growing population pressure, and land encroachment, cultivation of marginal land and lack of social services, which lead to imbalances in development. The major consequences in the origin are attributed to shortage of labor and lack of proper land management (Kc et al.,1997).

Overall reason for inter-regional migration was the imbalance between population and resources in different regions of the country. The main reason of out migration could be scarcity of agricultural land (Silwal, 1995). In addition to the growth of urban economy and facilities, personal factors such as the economic condition of the families, job security, skill and education have encouraged migration. Poverty and population pressure play the most important role in the process of migration in developing countries.

The male migrants due to rural poverty and better income opportunities in urban areas have resulted in the growth of the number of female headed households in the mountain and hills (Bajracharya 1994).

Due to the subsistence nature of agriculture, it is hardly justified for the bulk of the agricultural labor force to remain confined to the farming alone. This will have a tendency to aggravate the situation and give rise to the problem of disguised unemployment. Population pressure, scarcity of arable land, limited food production, under employment/ unemployment and indebt in the hills were mainly responsible for the migration (Jha, 1993).

Chaurasia (1990) stated that the negative aspect of migration is more serious. Increasing deforestation of parts of the Terai from the migrant population of the hills has reduced the country's timber resources and increased soil erosion and flooding. In the beginning migration helped reduce population pressure in the hills, but in the course of time it has been felt that labor migration has affected the regional balance.

It is suggested that a cross cultural analysis is a very useful strategy for a deeper understanding of differing patterns of selectivity in migration, and substantively it has argued that as the different characteristics of migrants are greatly conditioned by interplay of numerous, social, cultural and economic factors. Migration is both a consequences of various social, cultural and economic constraints as experience by the people in society (Singh, 1986).

A cross-sectional survey conducted in Bihar, India demonstrated that a person's educational level plays an important role in making decision on migration. There are two different arguments: one is that migrants tend to be better educated or skilled than non migrants because they can expect higher wages and they also have higher chances of receiving employment (Levy and Wadychi, 1974).

According to Lee the volume of migration varies with the diversity of people.-The diversity of people also affects the volume of migration. Where there is a great sameness among people-whether in terms of race or ethnic origin, of education, or income, or tradition-we may expect a lesser rate of migration than where there is great diversity. Discrimination among racial or ethnic groups is the rule rather than the exception, and the degree of discrimination varies from place to place. Though discrimination leads to the establishment of ghettos, it also operates to bring about vast movements of people from one area to another (Lee, 1966).

2.3 Variables Identified

Dependent Variable

- Migration

Independent variable

Demographic variables

- Age
- Sex

Social variables

- Caste and Ethnicity
- Education

Economic variables

- Occupation
- Remittance/income

CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents basic information on study area, sample size, data collection, case study and procedure of data analysis. The methodology is a combination of a broad range of qualitative and quantitative survey tools which allows for adoption of local conditions required when researching the often hidden and invisible aspects of the society.

3.1 Introduction to the Study Area

Dibrung VDC of Gulmi district is the study area lies in the hilly areas of Western Development Region. The VDC is located to the northern part of district head quarter, i.e. Tamghas. The VDC, study area, is surrounding by Arlankot VDC from the north west, Anpchour and Kurgha VDC from the south west, Bisukharka and Dhauladip VDC form the north east. The VDC is inhibited by people of all caste/ethnicity (Brahmin/Chhetri, Janajati, and Dalit) with different economic footing. Total population of Dibrung was 2504 (VDC Profile 2003).

The study area, Dibrung VDC, was selected purposively due to the several reasons. First, this study was only for the fulfillment of the partial requirements of master's degree in Population studies. Second, the study report should be submitted within certain time schedule of University. Third, this was the non-funding study. Hence, for obtaining the quick decision of the study in low cost within certain time, this small scale purposive study within certain area was selected purposively.

3.2 Research Design

An exploratory cum cross-sectional descriptive study was conducted to explore and to describe out migration and its impact on various socioeconomic factors by ethnicity.

3.3 Sample Design

Quantitative data were used for the analysis. Cluster sampling is applied to obtain the data from the study area. There are 9 clusters in the study area. Each ward within the VDC has taken as a cluster.

3.3.1 Determining Sample Size

Sample size is determined based on proportion of population attributed under consideration (P), Q=1-P, the finite universe (N), maximum acceptable error (se i.e. 3%), design effect (1.5) and response rate (assumed 94%). P is estimated on the basis of true proportion of inter zonal hill out migrants (68.9% or P=0.689) of Nepal found in Census 2001 and Q=1-P=1-0.689=0.311. The formula of sample size calculation is adopted from the Leslie Kish method of sampling i.e.

$\mathbf{n'} = pq/(se)^2 = 238.$

[Initial sample size determine by using the variance estimation formula]

Simple random sample for the n^{th} area is determined as:

$\mathbf{n_{srs}} = n'/[1+(n'/N)] = 148.$ (See Kish's book p.50).
(N=no. of house hold in the study area i.e., 391)

Now, the n cluster = n_{srs} × design effect = 222 (applied 1.5 as design effect)

At last, the target minimum sample size= $\mathbf{n}_{cluster}$ / RR = 222/0.94=237.
(Response rate assumed 94%).

3.3.2 Sample Allocation

Table 3.1: Sample Allocation for Migration Differentials by Ethnicity, DibrungVDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

Caste groups	Total Household	Percent	Sample allocation
Brahmin/Chhetri	187	47.7	(47.7*237)/100= 113
Janajati	114	29.2	(29.2*237)/100=69
Dalit	90	23.1	(23.1*237)/100=55
Total	391	100.0	237
Caste including Ethnicity within the Sample			
Brahmin/Chhetri	Kharel, Sapkota, Aryal, Kafle, Panthi		
Janajati	Magar, Gurung		
Dalit	Kami, Sarki		

Source: Field Survey 2010.

Among the 391 total household of the Dibrung VDC, Brahmin/Chhetri was 187 (47.7%) followed by Janajati 114 (29.2%) and Dalit 90 (23.1%) households. In this backdrop, sample is allocated proportionately to each ethnicity. Hence, the minimum sample of Brahmin/Chhetri household is measured 113, Janajati 69 and Dalit 55 respectively (Table 3.1).

3.2.2 Achieved Sample Size

Since every caste groups are not available in each cluster of the study area, hence the unavailable samples are taken where the household was greater than the target sample of that cluster. For required target household by ethnicity, Brahmin/Chhetri needed maximum 19 household, Janajati needed 13 household and Dalit needed 8 household from each cluster. Proportionate stratified sampling is applied to determine the sample household for each caste/ethnic groups (3.2).

Table 3.2: Achieved Sample Sizefor Migration Differentials by Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

Total Household of the Dibrung VDC					Sample Selected				
Ward	Brahmin / Chhetri	Janajati	Dalit	Total	Brahmin / Chhetri	Janajati	Dalit	Total	Percent
1	0	30	19	49	0	13	8	21	42.9
2	0	12	24	36	0	12	8	20	55.6
3	0	38	5	43	0	13	5	18	41.9
4	18	4	5	27	18	4	5	27	100.0
5	40	0	5	45	19	0	5	24	53.3
6	42	0	8	50	19	0	8	27	54.0
7	28	5	2	35	19	5	2	26	74.3
8	19	9	6	34	19	9	6	34	100.0
9	40	16	16	72	19	13	8	40	55.6
Total	187	114	90	391	***113***	***69***	***55***	***237***	***60.6***
Percent	47.8	29.2	23.0	100.0	47.7	29.1	23.2	100.0	100.0

Source: Field Survey 2010.

3.2.3 Household and Respondent Selection

The universe of the study is 391 household which is listed door to door visit before the implementation of the sample.Household information is obtained from the knowledgeable person of the household. Systematic sampling is applied where the household was more than target sample of that cluster to determine the sample household. However, census is applied to obtain the household where equal or less than target sample household of that cluster. Head of the household is taken as a respondent while in case of unavailability of household head during survey, the knowledgeable person of the household is taken as respondent.

3.3 Instrumentation and Field Operation

Close ended questionnaire is used to collect the primary data. Questionnaire has been designed as per the suggestion and guidelines of the thesis supervisor and also by reviewing the questionnaire of previous studies on the related topics and it has fully guided by the study objectives. Questionnaire included:

- Informed consent
- General information
- Filter question of the household
- Household information
- Socio-economic status of the family
- Demographic information of the respondent
- Migration related question
- Impact of migration on agriculture and labor

Household survey was carried out from 10th January to 5thFebruary 2010. Semi-structured questionnaire was applied to obtain the quantitative data by direct interview.

3.4 Data Management of Processing

The questionnaire are edited after the completing of each day's interview for the accuracy and completeness and if necessary revisit was also done after the second day of interview.

The whole questionnaire is scrutinized; and reediting and coding has done for accuracy and uniformity of the data. Coding and decoding has done properly to make data entry and analysis easy. Data are entered in SPSS program for the analysis.

3.5 Methods of Analyses

The cross table is one of the efficient and effective method of the presentation of data. The data on two or more variables has presented on a vertical and horizontal way for the comparison and for cross matching its value or the percentage of the value in cross table. In this study, two types of data are frequently presented on cross table. First, the data on background variables (Household, socio-economic, demographic information) are cross tabulated with sex and ethnicity, which helped to compare the actual condition of household or family in accordance with the ethnicity and sex. Second,

the data on migration, dependent variable, was presented with the demographic variables, social variables and economic variables, independent variables, from which the researcher easily able to compared the migration and its impact on agriculture and labor, dependent variables, on the basis of various independent variables.

Chi-square test was applied to determine the association between categorical independent variables and categorical outcome measures. In addition, ANOVAs test is used to compare the mean of the dependent variables by independent variables. Two tailed P value <0.05 were assumed statistically significant in all statistical analysis.

3.7 Consideration of Ethical Issues

An informed verbal consent has been taken from each respondent and participant before data collection. Before obtaining the consent, the respondents and participants are informed at least about the purpose of the study, potential risks and benefits of participating, procedure of maintaining confidentiality, and the right not to participate in the study. Working approval is also obtained from the Dibrung VDC.

3.8 Operational Definition

Migration:It refers to the mobility of people who leave the usual place of VDC

Migrants: The household members who were greater than 5 yearsand migrated at least 3 months prior to the survey. The migrant members himself/herself, are not the respondent of this study. Hence, the information of migrants is obtained from the head of the household head or knowledgeable member of the household.

Propensity to Migrants: The propensity to migration refers to the percentage of migrants with respect to their specific cohort.

CHAPTER FOUR

SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

This chapter presents basic information on socio-economic and demographic characteristics of the study population. It also provides the information on household facilities and assets, which in turn portrays the living standard of the population.

4.1 Demographic Characteristics

4.1.1 Distribution of Sample Population by Age and Sex

Table 4.1: Distribution of Sample Population by Age and Sex, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

Age	Sex				Total		Sex Ratio
	Male		Female		N	Percent	
	N	Percent	N	Percent			
0-4	90	10.5	93	11.5	183	11.0	96.8
5-9	66	7.7	50	6.2	116	7.0	132.0
10-14	101	11.8	83	10.3	184	11.1	121.7
15-19	101	11.8	91	11.3	192	11.5	111.0
20-24	91	10.6	121	15.0	212	12.7	75.2
25-29	91	10.6	66	8.2	157	9.4	137.9
30-34	65	7.6	59	7.3	124	7.5	110.2
35-39	56	6.5	44	5.5	100	6.0	127.3
40-44	34	4.0	42	5.2	76	4.6	81.0
45-49	38	4.4	38	4.7	76	4.6	100.0
50-54	34	4.0	28	3.5	62	3.7	121.4
55-59	19	2.2	26	3.2	45	2.7	73.1
60-64	21	2.5	19	2.4	40	2.4	110.5
65 +	50	5.8	46	5.7	96	5.8	108.7
Total	857	100.0	806	100.0	1663	100.0	106.3
Mean Age (SD)	27.09 (19.24)		27.40 (19.37)		27.24 (19.30)		

Source: Field Survey, 2010.

The total populations of the sample household are 1663. Mean age of the household population is 27.24 (SD 19.3) years. Under five children are 11 percent in study setting while 29 percent are child population including under five too. Adolescent population isaround 27 percent while 24 percent is youth population. Nearly 63 percent are economically active populations and 8 percent are old age populations.

Mean age of the female is 27.4 and male is 27.04 years. There is slightly higher proportion of under 5 children of female (11.5%) than male (10.5%). By contrast,

male is higher than female in child population. In adolescent population, malesare nearly 24 percent and femalesare nearly 22 percent. Just opposite to adolescent, female proportion (26.3%) is higher than male (22.4%) in youth population. Sixty four percent of female and 62 percent of male are economically active population (15-59 years). Around 8 percent old age population is observed from both male and female population.

The sex ratio 106 of overall household population is indicated the excess of males in the sample household while observed this sex ratio is greater than national sex ratio i.e. 100.3 (CBS, 2001). The sex ratio is differentiated among the age groups. Access of female population is found among the age groups 0 to 4, 20 to 24, 40 to 44 and 55 to 59. Except these groups, excess of male in the population is observed in all others age groups (Table 4.1).

4.1.2 Marital Status

Above five years population is eligible for obtaining the information of marital status. More than half of the household population are married (52.6%) followed by widow/widower (8.1%). Sex differential is observed in marital status of household population. Fifty five percent of female populations are married while 50 percent of male.

Table 4.2: Marital Status by Sex, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

Marital Status	Male		Female		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Unmarried	351	45.8	255	35.8	606	40.9
Married	384	50.1	394	55.3	778	52.6
Widowed	27	3.5	58	8.1	85	5.7
Separated/ Divorce	5	0.6	6	0.8	11	0.7
Total	767	100.0	713	100.0	1480	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2010.

Married female population (55.3%) is greater than unmarried female population (35.8%) whereas only around 5 percent higher of married male than unmarried. Widows are more than widower (Table 4.2).

4.1.3 Migration Status

Absentee populations are one third (32.8%) of the total population. Absentee male population (46.1%), as expected, found higher than female absentee population

(18.7%). Two-third (66.3%) of absentee population stayed in destination, with female proportion is lower than male.

As expected, 6 out of ten (59%) absentee populationshave leave home for working in destination followed by visiting relatives, education and travel respectively. Males (72.4%) are 3 times higher than females (23.8%) for leaving home to work.

Table 4.3: Migration Status by Sex, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

	Male		Female		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Currently Residing in Home						
Yes	462	53.9	655	81.3	1117	67.2
No	395	46.1	151	18.7	546	32.8
Total	857	100.0	806	100.0	1663	100.0
Duration of Staying Outside Home						
Less than 3 months	104	26.3	80	53.0	184	33.7
More than 3 Months	291	73.7	71	47.0	362	66.3
Total	395	100.0	151	100.0	546	100.0
Reasons for Absence						
Work	286	72.4	36	23.8	322	59.0
Education	51	12.9	45	29.8	96	17.6
Visit of relatives	39	9.9	61	40.4	100	18.3
Travel	19	4.9	9	5.9	28	5.1
Total	395	100.0	151	100.0	546	100.0
Place of Migration						
Same VDC	41	10.4	29	19.2	70	12.8
Other	108	27.3	86	57.0	194	35.5
Other country	246	62.3	36	23.8	282	51.6
Total	395	100.0	151	100.0	546	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2010

Female proportion is higher in leaving home for education and visiting relatives. More than half (51.6%) of the population migrated in other countries, with male is significantly higher than female. Interestingly, femalesare visited mostly in (same VDC=19.2%, and other VDC/Municipality-57%) within country (Table 4.3)

4.1.4 Eligible Member of Migration Analysis

Migrant members who have leave the home before more than 3 months and above 5 years of age during data collection are the eligibility criteria for the analysis. Absent migrants more than 3 months are 362 (Table 4.3) of them, 8 migrants are under 5 years of age. Thus, the information of migrants, has taken only 354 migrants

member. The migrant members himself/herself, are not the respondent of this study. Hence, the information of migrants has been obtained from the head of the household or the available knowledgeable person of the household. The information is eligible for around 21 percent of population. In addition, the information is eligible for male migrants have nearly 34 percent and female have nearly 9 percent (4.4).

Table 4.4: Eligible Member by Sex, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

Eligible Member	Male		Female		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Yes	292	34.1	62	7.7	354	21.3
No	565	65.9	744	92.3	1303	78.7
Total	857	100.0	806	100.0	1663	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2010.

4.2: Social Characteristics

4.2.1 Literacy and Education of Household Population

Above 5 years of age of the household populations are the eligible to obtain the literacy status. Eighty four percent of the household populations are literate. Sex differential is observed in literacy status. Around 92 percent males are literate whereas nearly 76 percent are females.

Mean year of schooling is 6.34 years (SD=3.69). However, female mean year of schooling 6.28 years is slightly lower than the total mean year of schooling while males are slightly higher. Female proportion is higher in primary level of education than the proportion fall down along with the increasing level of education whereas male proportion is higher in lower secondary level of education than it also fall down along with the increase in education. However, the proportion of male in intermediate level (6.3%) is higher than the female (3.9%) (Table 4.5).

Table 4.5: Literacy and Highest Education Levelby Sex, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

	Male		Female		Total	
Literacy status	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Literate	705	91.9	538	75.5	1243	84.0
Illiterate	62	8.1	175	24.5	237	16.0
Total	767	100.0	713	100.0	1480	100.0
Education Level						
Informal education	79	11.2	28	5.2	107	8.6
Primary	213	30.2	222	41.3	435	35.0
Lower Secondary	263	37.3	181	33.6	444	35.7
Secondary	106	15.0	86	16.0	192	15.4
Intermediate & +	44	6.2	21	3.9	65	5.2
Total	705	100.0	538	100.0	1243	100.0
Mean Year of Schooling (SD)	6.438(3.81)		6.28 (3.28)		6.34 (3.69)	

Source: Field Survey, 2010.

4.2.2 A Member's Highest Education Level within Household

Around 38 percent of any family member of the household hasgot secondary level of education followed by SLC (32%), intermediate (19.5%) and primary (11%).78 percent of Dalit family has achieved up to secondary level of education where as Janajati has 43 percent and Brahmin/Chhetri 37 percent has. Around 41 percent of Janajati and 35 percent Brahmin/Chhetri completed SLC while only 16 percent from Dalit.

Table 4.6: Highest Education Level of HH Member by Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

	Brahmin/Chhetri		Janajati		Dalit		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Primary	7	6.2	7	10.1	12	21.8	26	11.0
Secondary	35	31.0	23	33.3	31	56.4	89	37.5
SLC	39	34.5	28	40.6	9	16.4	76	32.0
Intermediate & +	32	28.3	11	15.9	3	5.5	46	19.5
Total	113	100.0	69	100.0	55	100.0	237	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2010.

In intermediate and above level, Brahmin/Chhetri has around 28 Percent followed by Janajati (15.9%) and Dalit (5.5%) in least respectively (Table 4.6).

4.3 Economic Characteristics

4.3.1 Land Holding Status

At the time of survey there are no household found without land and cultivable land. Total landholding status indicates the household having registered land whereas cultivable land indicates which isusing for farming at the time of survey. Out of total, 41 percent family has 11 to 20 ropani land while 23 percent has 6 to 10 ropani. Only 7 percent families have more than 30 ropani land. Nearly 47 percent Brahmin/Chhetri family has 11 to 20 ropani land followed by Janajati (40.6%) and Dalit (30.9%) respectively. Around 29 percent Dalit family has less than 5 ropani while only (6.3%) has Brahmin/Chhetri. Almost 10 percent Janajati has more than 30 ropanihas followedby Brahmin/Chhetri has almost (8.1%), while no any household found in the Dalit household.

Table 4.7: Land Holding Status by Ethnicity by Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

Total Land Holding Status	Brahmin/Chhetri		Janajati		Dalit		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Total land								
Up to 5 Ropani	7	6.3	9	13.0	16	29.1	32	13.6
6-10	22	18.9	15	21.7	18	32.7	54	23.0
11-20	53	46.8	28	40.6	17	30.9	97	41.3
21-30	22	19.8	10	14.5	4	7.3	36	15.3
More than 30	9	8.1	7	10.1	0	0.0	16	6.8
Total	113	100.0	69	100.0	55	100.0	237	100.0
Cultivated land								
Below 5 Ropani	20	17.1	21	30.4	25	45.5	65	27.7
5-10	65	57.7	29	42.0	26	47.3	119	50.6
More than 10 Ropani	28	25.2	19	27.5	4	7.3	51	21.7
Total	113	100.0	69	100.0	55	100.0	237	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2010.

Around half of the families have 5 to 10 ropani cultivated land followed by below 5 ropani and more than 10 ropani respectively. Proportion is higher in below 5 ropani cultivated land of Dalit while lower in more than 10 ropani. But Brahmin/Chhetri and Janajati clustered in 5 to 10 ropani cultivated land. One fourth of the Janajati and Brahmin/Chhetri have more than 10 ropani cultivated land respectively while only 7 percent Dalit (Table 4.7).

4.3.2 Food Sufficiency Level

Almost sixty two percent familieswith food deficiency in their production of cultivated land. Proportion is highest among Dalit (76.4%) followed by Janajati (59.4%) and Brahmin/Chhetri (55.8%) respectively.

Table 4.8: Food Sufficiency Level by Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

Food Sufficiency	Brahmin/Chhetri		Janajati		Dalit		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Yes	50	44.2	28	40.6	13	23.6	91	38.4
No	63	55.8	41	59.4	42	76.4	146	61.6
Total	113	100.0	69	100.0	55	100.0	237	100.0
Food Sufficiency in months								
Up to 3 months	3	4.7	13	31.7	18	42.9	34	23.3
4-6	38	60.3	13	31.7	16	38.1	67	45.9
7-11	22	35.0	15	36.6	8	19.0	45	31.8
Total	63	100.0	41	100.0	42	100.0	146	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2010.

Out of total 146 families with food deficiency, 46 percent families responded that their food production has sufficient for 4 to 6 months, while 32 percent has sufficient for 7 to 11 months and 23 percent has sufficient for up to 3 months. Around 43 percent of Dalit has sufficient for only 3 months while 19 percent sufficient for 7 to 11 months. By contrast, only 5 percent family of Brahmin/Chhetri has sufficient for up to 3 months and 60 percent sufficient for 4 to 6 months. Interestingly, Janajati found nearly equal proportion in up to 3 and 4 to 6 months of food sufficiency level (Table 4.8).

4.3.3 Sources of Income

Fifty seven percent households have the remittance as source of income while 32 percent of agriculture product. Wage labor asanother source of income is 21 percent of migrantshousehold followed by pension, service and business respectively. Remittance is the source of income of 62 percent household of Brahmin/Chhetri followed by Dalit and Janajati respectively. Similarly, agriculture isthe source of Brahmin/Chhetri household (48.7%) while wage labor is source of income of Dalit (61.8%). Around 38 percent of Janajati household has pension as a sourceof income whereas 16 percent of Dalit and 8 percent of Brahmin/Chhetri respectively (Table 4.9).

Table 4.9: Sources of Income by Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

	Brahmin/Chhetri		Janajati		Dalit		Total	
Sources	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Sale of agriculture product	55	48.7	17	24.6	3	5.5	75	31.6
Service	23	20.3	7	10.1	4	7.3	34	14.3
Business	8	7.0	6	8.7	1	1.8	15	6.3
Remittance	70	61.9	35	50.7	31	56.4	136	57.3
Wage labor	6	5.3	9	13.0	34	61.8	49	20.7
Pension	8	7.0	26	37.7	9	16.4	43	18.1
Total	113	100.0	69	100.0	55	100.0	237	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2010.

4.3.4 Annual Income

More than 65 percent of Dalit households are clustered in less than 50000 annual income while Brahmin/Chhetri 51 percent and Janajati 49 percent. If we look at the highest 2 categories of annual income, Janajati is 43 percent followed by Brahmin/Chhetriand Dalit respectively (Table 4.10).

Table 4.10: Annual Income by Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

	Brahmin/Chhetri		Janajati		Dalit		Total	
Households	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Up to 10000	24	21.6	5	7.2	5	9.1	34	14.5
10001-50000	33	29.7	29	42.0	31	56.4	93	39.6
50001-100000	18	16.2	5	7.2	6	10.9	29	12.3
100001-200000	27	24.3	21	30.4	10	18.2	58	24.7
200000+	9	8.1	9	13.0	3	5.5	21	8.9
Total	113	100.0	69	100.0	55	100.0	237	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2010.

4.3.5 Debt Status

Almost sixty one percent of householdsare debt with majority of Dalit family found debt (72.7%) followed by Janajati and Brahmin/Chhetri respectively. 79 percent respondent informed that debt is taken for household consumption while 16 percent informed due to the expenditure of marriage, festival and funerals. The same trend of debt is observed among the ethnicity in household consumption (around 79 to 80 Percent) while the proportion is slightly differed for taking the debt to festival, marriage and funerals. One fifth (21.4%) of the Janajati took debt for festival or marriage or funerals followed by Dalit and Brahmin/Chhetri respectively.

Table 4.11: Debt Status by Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

Debt of the HH	Brahmin/Chhetri		Janajati		Dalit		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Yes	62	54.9	42	60.9	40	72.7	144	60.8
No	51	45.1	27	39.1	15	27.3	93	39.2
Total	113	100.0	69	100.0	55	100.0	237	100.0
Main reason for indebtedness								
HH consumption	49	79.0	33	78.6	32	80.0	114	79.2
Festival, marriage, funerals	8	12.9	9	21.4	6	15.0	23	16.0
Maintenance of house	3	4.8	0	0.0	2	5.0	5	3.5
Buying fertilizer/ pesticides	2	3.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	1.4
Total	62	100.0	42	100.0	40	100.0	144	100.0
Duration of indebted								
Since generation	8	12.9	12	28.6	17	42.5	37	25.7
Less than 4 years	40	64.5	20	47.6	9	22.5	69	47.9
5-9 years	5	8.1	4	9.5	4	10.0	13	9.0
10-14 years	3	4.8	3	7.1	1	2.5	7	4.9
15 and above years	6	9.7	3	7.1	9	22.5	18	12.5
Total	62	100.0	42	100.0	40	100.0	144	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2010.

Around 48 percent household has taken debt since 4 years or less while 26 percent has since previous generation. Nearly 13 percent is taken since 15 year or more followed by 5 to 9 years and 10 to 14 years respectively. Proportion of debt automatically achieved through previous generation is highest among Dalit (42.5%) than Janajati and Brahmin/Chhetri respectively. By contrast, proportion of debt taken since 4 years or less was highest among Brahmin/Chhetri, Janajati in central position and Dalit was least proportion (22.5%). The debt since 15 years or more has found higher proportion among Dalit (Table 4.11).

4.3.6: Household Amenities

4.3.6.1: Sources of Drinking Waterand Cooking Materials

Piped water users are around 91 percent of household followed by river/canal, lake/pound, others sources and water fall respectively. Dalit users (83.7%) is the least in using piped water while Brahmin/Chhetri (93.8%) and Janajati (92.8%) is nearly equal for using piped water. Around 13 percent Dalit are using river/canal as drinking water sources. Equal 3 percent of Janajati household are using river/canal and others

sources for drinking water. Each 2 percent of Brahmin/Chhetriis using water fall, river/canal and lake/pound as source of drinking water.

Table 4.12: Sources of Drinking Water and Cooking Materials by Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

	Brahmin/Chhetri		Janajati		Dalit		Total	
Source of Drinking Water	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Piped water	106	93.8	64	92.8	46	83.7	216	91.1
Water fall	2	1.8	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.8
River/Canal	2	1.8	2	2.9	7	12.7	11	4.7
Lake/pound	2	1.8	1	1.4	2	3.6	5	2.1
Other	1	0.8	2	2.9	0	0.0	3	1.3
Total	113	100.0	69	100.0	55	100.0	237	100.0
Cooking Materials								
Open fire	103	91.2	65	94.2	50	90.9	218	92.0
Stove	3	2.6	0	0.0	0 0.0	0.0	3	1.3
Chulo	7	6.2	4	5.8	5	9.1	16	6.7
Total	113	100.0	69	100.0	55	100.0	237	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2010.

Main source of cooking material is open fire (92%) followed bychulo(6.7%) and stove (1.3%) respectively. More than 90 percent of each caste groups are still using open fire for cooking meal. Dalit (9.1%) is higher proportion in using chulo as cooking material while around 6 percent of Brahmin/Chhetri and Janajati. No one family of Janajati and Dalit using stove (Table 4.12).

4.3.6.2: Housing Condition

Information collected concerning with the materials of housing manufacturing. The materials are more common in each caste groups. Around 98 percent households areusing mud and stone to build their wall of the house. The percentage of household using slate is 57 percent for roof followed by straw (32.9%), tin (9.7%) and tile (0.4%) respectively. Sixty six percent Brahmin/Chhetri is using slate for roof while 58 percent Janajati and around 36 percent Dalit. By contrast, Dalit proportion is higher in using straw as roof of house while only 33 percent Janajati and 22 percent of Brahmin/Chhetri. No household is observed using tile as roof from Brahmin/Chhetri and Janajati (Table 4.13).

Table 4.13: Housing Condition by Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

Materials Used in Wall	Brahmin/Chhetri		Janajati		Dalit		N	Percent
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent		
Cement, stone , bricks	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.4
Tin	0	0.0	1	1.4	0	0.0	1	0.4
Straw	1	.9	1	1.4	0	0.0	2	0.9
Mud/stone	111	98.2	67	97.1	55	100.0	233	98.3
Total	113	100.0	69	100.0	55	100.0	237	100.0
Materials used in roof								
Tin	13	11.5	5	7.2	5	9.1	23	9.7
Straw	25	22.1	24	34.8	29	52.7	78	32.9
Slate	75	66.4	40	58.0	20	36.4	135	57.0
Tile	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.8	1	.4
Total	113	100.0	69	100.0	55	100.0	237	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2010.

4.3.6.3 Toilet Facilities

Table 4.14presents information on household sanitation facilities by types of toilet by caste groups. Almost (93%) of the study population used any types of toilet. Still, about (9%) Dalit and Janajati don't have a toilet facility in their homes respectively followed by Brahmin and Chhetri only (4.4%). Different types of toilet is used and it differed by ethnicity in study setting. More than half (52%) of the household is observed using closed pit for defeating followed by flush toilet (31.7%), water flow (11.8%) and open pit (4.5%) respectively. The safe toilet, by sanitation perspective, i.e. flush and water flow users is comparatively higher from Brahmin/Chhetri. A Brahmin/Chhetri (44.4%) user of flush toilet is more than 3 times higher than the flush toilet user of Dalit (12%). Seven out

Table 4.14: Toilet Facilities by Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

Toilet facilities	Brahmin/Chhetri		Janajati		Dalit		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Yes	108	95.6	63	91.3	50	90.9	221	93.2
No	5	4.4	6	8.7	5	9.1	16	6.8
Total	113	100.0	69	100.0	55	100.0	237	100.0
Types of Toilet								
Flush system	48	44.4	16	25.4	6	12.0	70	31.7
Water flow, general	15	13.9	6	9.5	5	10.0	26	11.8
Closed pit	42	38.9	37	58.7	36	72.0	115	52.0
Open pit	3	2.8	4	6.3	3	6.0	10	4.5
Total	108	100.0	63	100.0	50	100.0	221	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2010.

of ten (72%) household of Dalit is using close pit for defeating while six out ten from Janajati (58.7%) and four out of 10 from Brahmin/Chhetri (38.9%). Six percenthouseholds from Dalit and Janajati still have defeating in open pit.

4.3.4 Household Facilities

Information on basic households facilities are obtained from the caste and ethnic households. Table 4.15 indicates that almost 92 percent of the household in the study area have access to electricity. However, access to electricity in Dalit households (84%) has slightly lesser than Brahmin/Chhetri and Janajati households.

Table 4.15: Housing Facilities by Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010.

Facilities	Brahmin/Chhetri		Janajati		Dalit		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Electricity	108	97.3	63	91.3	46	83.6	217	92.3
Bio-gas	1	.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.4
Telephone	25	22.5	21	30.4	1	1.8	47	20.0
Mobile	63	56.8	41	59.4	17	30.9	121	51.5
Radio	104	93.7	56	81.2	49	89.1	209	88.9
TV	20	18.0	20	29.0	3	5.5	43	18.3
Sofa set	8	7.2	4	5.8	0	0.0	12	5.1
Table/chair	51	45.9	21	30.4	13	23.6	85	36.2

Source: Field Survey, 2010.

In the study area, the accesses of mobile user are better than telephone user. From where, almost (59%) Janajati households have mobile followed by Brahmin household (57%) and Dalit household constituted only (31%) respectively. This indicates that in the study area, so called higher caste groups have more access to housing facilities followed by Janajati and Dalit (Table 4.15).

4.4: Participatory Characteristics

4.4.1 Institutional Involvement

Respondents are asked whether you or family members are involved in any kind of institution, but only one fifth (22.4%) respondent informed that his/her family members are participating in institution. However, participation is higher among the household of Brahman/Chhetri followed by Janajati and Dalit respectively.

Out of household members involved in institutions, involvement is found mostly in community/government school (47.2%). The participation of so called higher caste,

Brahmin/Chhetri, is found in all of the pre coded information, but Janajati household participated in the institutions of road, school, women group and local club. Interestingly, involvement of Dalit is observed only in road and school. The participation in the political institutions are observed only from Brahmin/Chhetri households (11.8%) (Table 4.16).

Table 4.16: Institutional Involvement by Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

Institutional involvement of HH	Brahmin/Chhetri		Janajati		Dalit		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Yes	34	30.0	13	18.8	6	10.9	53	22.4
No	79	70.0	56	81.2	49	89.1	184	77.6
Total	113	100.0	69	100.0	55	100.0	237	100.0
Types of Involvement								
Drinking water	4	11.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	7.5
Road	1	2.9	1	7.7	3	50.0	5	9.4
School	14	41.2	8	61.5	3	50.0	25	47.2
Forest	4	11.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	7.5
Political party	4	11.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	7.5
Women groups	2	5.9	1	7.7	0	0.0	3	5.7
Local club	5	14.7	3	23.1	0	0.0	8	15.1
Total	34	100.0	13	100.0	6	100.0	53	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2010.

CHAPTER FIVE

MIGRATION DIFFERENTIALS

People do not migrate from origin without any causes. There are some factors which are already identified as factors responsible to push the people to migrate. However, in society, there may not be the fixed causes of migration. Hence, this study is attempt to identify the causes and consequences of out migrants as well as it also tried to find out the socio-economic and demographic characteristics of migrants and their family in changing scenario of the countryside of the state.

5.1 Socio-Economic and Demographic Characteristics of Migrants

5.1.1 Sex of Migrants

Around 21 percent population is migrated among the total population. Out of total migrants, the highest percentage of migrants are from Brahmin/Chhetri (44.07%) followed by Janajati (32.2%) and Dalit (23.7%) respectively.

Table 5.1: Sex of Migrants by Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

	Brahmin/Chhetri		Janajati		Dalit		Total	
Sex	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Male	130	83.3	91	79.8	71	84.5	292	82.5
Female	26	16.7	23	20.2	13	15.5	62	17.5
Total	156	100.0	114	100.0	84	100.0	354	100.0
Chi-square	χ^2=2.825, P=0.244							
Migrants								
Out of Migrants	156	44.07	114	32.20	84	23.73	354	100.0
Out of total Population	156	9.38	114	6.86	84	5.05	1663	21.29

Source: Field Survey 2010.

Most of the migrants are male (82.5%) while female migrants are (17.5%). Female migrants are higher among Janajati (20.2%) followed by Brahmin/Chhetri (16.7%) and Dalit (15.5%) respectively. By contrast, male migrants are higher among Dalit (84.5%) compare to Brahmin/Chhetri and Janajati respectively. However, there is not significant association between sex and ethnicity of migrants (χ^2=2.825, P=0.244) (Table 5.1).

5.1.2 Age of Migrants

Highest percent of migrants are found in age 35 years and above(26%)followed by age groups 25 to 29 (20.3%), 20 to 24 years (19.8%)respectively. While lower proportion is found between age groups less than 15 years (7.9%) followed by 15-19 years 11 percent,and almost 15 percent 30 to 34 years respectively.

Table 5.2: Age of Migrants by Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

Age	Brahmin/Chhetri		Janajati		Dalit		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
<15	14	9.0	10	8.8	4	4.8	28	7.9
15-19	21	13.5	12	10.5	6	7.1	39	11.0
20-24	31	19.9	27	23.7	14	16.7	70	19.8
25-29	35	22.4	16	14.0	21	25.0	72	20.3
30-34	22	14.1	14	12.3	16	19.0	52	14.7
35 &+	33	21.2	35	30.7	23	27.4	93	26.3
Total	156	100.0	114	100.0	84	100.0	354	100.0

Source: Field Survey 2010.

Highest percentof migrants belong to Janajati are almost 31 percentfrom35 years and above followed by Dalit (27.4%).Whereas highest proportion among Brahmin/Chhetrimigrants are found in age groups 25 to 29 (22.4%). Nearly equal proportion of out migrants' aged less than 15 year among Brahmin/Chhetri and Janajati (9% &8.89% respectively) is observed while lower proportion is found among Dalit (4.8%) respectively. Proportion of migrants by age is differed in accordance with ethnicities (Table 5.2).

5.1.3 Purpose of Migration by Age

Table 5.3: Purpose of Migration by Age, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

Age	Work		Education		Visit of relatives		Travel		Total	
	N	Row %	N	Row %			N	Row %	N	Row %
<15	0	0.0	27	96.4	1	3.6	0	0.0	28	7.9
15-19	20	51.3	19	48.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	39	11.0
20-24	56	80.0	12	17.1	1	1.4	1	1.4	70	19.8
25-29	60	83.3	7	9.7	4	5.6	1	1.4	72	20.3
30-34	48	92.3	2	3.8	2	3.8	0	0.0	52	14.7
35 &+	86	92.5	0	0.0	7	7.5	0	0.0	93	26.3
Total	270	76.3	67	18.9	15	4.2	2	0.6	354	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2010.

Around 76 percent migrants are migrated for work purpose in destination while nearly 19 percent for educational opportunity, around 4 percent for visiting relatives and less than one percent for travel. More than 90 percent of migrants from 30 years and above are leaved the origin for seekingbetter job opportunity followed by 83 percent from age 25- 29 years, 80 percent from 20 to 24 years, and 51 percent from 15 to 19 years. Nobody leaved for seeking job from age less than 15 years. By contrast, around 96 percent of ageless than 15 years is migrated for better educational opportunity. Interestingly, the proportion of population who leave for seeking better educational opportunities is decreased along with the increase in age (Table 5.3).

5.1.5. Propensity to Migrate

5.1.5.1 Propensity to Migrate by Sex

Outmigration population is around 21 percent of the household total population. However, huge differences of outmigration proportion between male and female in study setting. Male out migrants are around 5 times higher (34.1%) than the female (7.7) out migrants (Table 5.4).

Table 5.4: Propensity to Migrate by Sex,Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010.

Sex	Total Population	Number of Migrant	Percent
Male	857	292	34.1
Female	806	62	7.7
Total	1663	354	21.3

Source: Field Survey 2010.

5.1.5.2 Propensity to Migrant by Age

Table5.5: Propensity to Migrate by Age,Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

Age	Total Population	Number of Migrants	Percent of migrants
< 15	483	28	5.8
15-19	192	39	20.3
20-24	212	70	33.0
25-29	157	72	45.9
30-34	124	52	41.9
35 &+	495	93	18.8
Total	1663	354	21.3

Source: Field Survey 2010.

The most migrated age group is observed between age 25 to 29 years (45.9%) of that age group populations followed by 30 to 34 years (41.9%), 20 to 24 years (33%) respectively, while lower proportion is found among age groups 35 years and above (18.8%) and less than 15 years (5.8%) respectively (Table 5.5).

5.1.5.3 Propensity to Migrate by Ethnicity

Janajati population(22.8%) found higher proportion in out migration followed by Brahmin/Chhetri (21.1%) andDalit (19.8%)respectively in the out migrants among their household population (Table 5.6).

Table 5.6: Propensity to Migrate by Caste/Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

Caste/Ethnicity	Total Population	Number of migrant	percent
Brahmin/Chhetri	739	156	21.1
Janajati	499	114	22.8
Dalit	425	84	19.8
Total	1663	354	21.3

Source: Field Survey 2010.

5.1.3 Marital Status of the Migrants

Table 5.7: Marital Status of the Migrants by Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

	Brahmin/Chhetri		Janajati		Dalit		Total	
Marital status	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Unmarried	113	72.4	73	64.0	51	60.7	237	66.9
Married	41	26.3	41	36.0	30	35.7	112	31.6
Widowed	1	0.6	0	0.0	1	1.2	2	0.6
Separated	1	0.6	0	0.0	1	1.2	2	0.6
Divorce	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.2	1	0.3
Total	156	100.0	114	100.0	84	100.0	354	100.0

Source: Field Survey 2010.

Two-third of the out migrants are unmarried while widow, separated and divorcee has less than one percent. The proportion is higher among the unmarried out migrants from Brahmin/Chhetri (72.4%) followed by Janajati and Dalit respectively. Married proportion of out migrants of Janajati and Dalit has nearly equal while the Brahmin/Chhetri has lower (Table 5.7).

5.1.4. Education Status of Migrants

Around 66 percent of migrants are completed secondary or above education whereas only 5 percent were illiterate. Migrants from Informal education and primary education have around 29 percent.

Table 5.8: Education Status of Migrants by Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

Education	Brahmin/Chhetri		Janajati		Dalit		N	%
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Illiterate	7	4.5	5	4.4	6	7.1	18	5.1
Informal education	7	4.5	1	0.9	2	2.4	10	2.8
Primary	35	22.4	26	22.8	33	39.3	94	26.6
Secondary	60	38.5	58	50.9	32	38.1	150	42.4
SLC and above	47	30.1	24	21.1	11	13.1	82	23.2
	156	100.0	114	100.0	84	100.0	354	100.0
Chi-square (P value)	χ^2=20.795, P=0.008							

Source: Field Survey 2010.

The out migrants among the ethnicities have mostly above primary level of education. Majority of Migrants belong to Janajati has secondary level of education (50.9%) followed by primary (22.8%), SLC plus (21.4%), illiterate and informal education respectively. The proportion of out migrants of Dalit has nearly equal between primary (39.3%) and secondary (38.1%) level of education. The lower differences of the proportion of primary, secondary and above education out migrants are observed among Brahmin/Chhetri. The statistical analysis showed that there is significant association between education and ethnicity of out migrants (χ^2=20.795, P=0.008) (Table 5.8).

5.1.6 Job in Destination

Three-fourth (76.3%) of the out-migrants have involved in job. Interestingly, proportion of involvement in job among Dalits have higher (84.5%) followed by Janajati and Brahmin/Chhetri respectively.

The respondents are asked whether your family member has got the same job which was expected before out migration, 96 percent answered yes. However, comparatively Dalit out migrants have lower proportion to get the same job which was expected before migration (Table 5.9).

Table 5.9: Job in Destination by Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

Involved in job	Brahmin/Chhetri		Janajati		Dalit		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Yes	114	73.1	85	74.6	71	84.5	270	76.3
No	42	26.9	29	25.4	13	15.5	84	23.7
Total	156	100.0	114	100.0	84	100.0	354	100.0
Chi-square	χ^2=4.225, P=0.121							
Involved Same Job Which Was Expected Before Migration								
Yes	111	97.4	83	97.6	66	93.0	260	96.3
No	3	2.6	2	2.4	5	7.0	10	3.7
Total	114	100.0	85	100.0	71	100.0	270	100.0

Source: Field Survey 2010.

5.1.7 Remittance after Migration

Remittance analysis is done only to those migrants who are migrated for the working purpose only. Around 66 percent of the migrants are sent remittance. Among the out migrants who migrated for working purpose, 71 percent Brahmin/Chhetri cent remittance

Table 5.10: Remittance status by Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

	Brahmin/Chhetri		Janajati		Dalit		Total	
Remittance status	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Sent Remittance	81	71.1	52	61.2	44	62.0	177	65.6
Working Purpose Migrants	114	42.2	85	31.5	71	26.3	270	100.0
Amount of Remittance								
Up to 5000	2	2.5	7	13.5	7	15.9	16	9.0
5001-20000	17	21.0	13	25.0	18	40.9	48	27.1
20001-50000	28	34.6	21	40.4	12	27.3	61	34.5
50001-100000	21	25.9	3	5.8	3	6.8	27	15.3
More than 100000	13	16.0	8	15.4	4	9.1	25	14.1
Total	81	100.0	52	100.0	44	100.0	177	100.0
Mean Remittance	73027.16		51953.85		35268.18		57449.72	
Standard Deviation	98323.17		73128.64		52597.95		82846.02	
Anova Test	F= 3.302, P=0.043							

Source: Field Survey 2010.

in their home while around 62 percent Dalit and 61 percent Janajati migrants sent remittance. Nearly 35 percent of out-migrants have sent income between 200001 and 50000 Nepalese currencies while around 14 percent had sent their income for more than 100000. Nine percent has sent up to 5000 only.Total yearly mean remittances

sent by the out migrants have NRs. 57449 ± 82846. There is a huge difference among the ethnicities in mean remittances.

The mean remittance of Brahmin/Chhetri has significantly higher (NRs. 73027.16) than the Janajati and Dalit respectively (F= 3.302, P=0.043) (Table 5.10).

5.1.8. Sent Cash to Migrants

One out of ten (11.3%) out migrants received money in destination from home. The proportion who received cash among the migrants of Brahmin/Chhetri has significantly higher than Dalit and Janajati respectively. Statistical analysis showed that there is significantassociation between the 'status of sent cash to migrants' and ethnicity of migrants (χ^2= 10.094, P=0.006) (Table 5.11).

Table 5.11: Sent Cash for Migrants by Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

	Brahmin/Chhetri		Janajati		Dalit		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Yes	27	17.3	7	6.1	6	7.1	40	11.3
No	129	82.7	107	93.9	78	92.9	314	88.7
Total	156	100.0	114	100.0	84	100.0	354	100.0
Chi-square/Significance	χ^2= 10.094, P=0.006							

Source: Field Survey 2010.

5.1.9. Consensus and Encouragement of Migration

Eighty seven percent of out-migrants received consensus by family for migration. If we look at the ethnicity, Brahmin/Chhetri migrants (91.7%)are higher proportion for receiving consensus by family followed by Janajati 85 percent and Dalit (82.1%) respectively. However, the association between receiving consensus for migration and ethnicity among migrants are not found statistically significant (χ^2= 5.197, P=0.074). Respondents are asked who is encourage to the migration of your family member, 48 percent give information that relatives/friends encouraged to migration followed by father (34.5%), spouse (10.7%), mother (4.8%) and self migrants respectively only 2 percent. Nearly equal proportion of migrants among Janajati and Dalit encouraged by relatives/friends (52.7% & 52.4% respectively) whereas 42 percent migrants of Brahmin/Chhetri by friends/relatives. Moreover, 37 percent father of Brahmin/Chhetri encouraged their son/daughter for migration while 33 percent father of Janajati and 32 percent of father of Dalit. Spouse is the third person for encouraging to the migration of their counterparts from all three ethnicity (Table 5.12).

Table 5.12: Consensus and Encouragement of Migration by Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

	Brahmin/Chhetri		Janajati		Dalit		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Consensus of Family for Migration								
Yes	143	91.7	97	85.1	69	82.1	309	87.3
No	13	8.3	17	14.9	15	17.9	45	12.7
Total	156	100.0	114	100.0	84	100.0	354	100.0
Chi-square	χ^2= 5.197, P=0.074							
Encourage person for migration								
Father	58	37.2	37	32.5	27	32.1	122	34.5
Mother	10	6.4	2	1.8	5	6.0	17	4.8
Self	3	1.9	3	2.6	1	1.2	7	2.0
Spouse	19	12.2	12	10.5	7	8.3	38	10.7
Relatives/ Friends	66	42.3	60	52.7	44	52.4	170	48.1
Total	156	100.0	114	100.0	84	100.0	354	100.0

Source: Field Survey 2010.

5.1.10 Returns during Migration and Duration of Stay

One fifth of (20.2%) migranthave notback to home after migration. Forty nine percent of migrants are returned home after 2/3 years of leaving home during migration followed by once in a year, 2/3 times in a year respectively. Less than one percent back more than 3 years after leaving home.Proportion of back after 2/3 years of migration is higher among Dalit (56%) whereas Janajati is 51 percent and Brahmin/Chhetri is 44 percent. However, there is not statistical relation between returns time during migration and ethnicity (χ^2=10.374, P=0.240).

Forty one percent of migrants stayed at home when back during migration followed by a week to a month, and less than 7 days respectively. Nearly 15 percent migrant have not back after migration. The migrants among Brahmin/Chhetri and Janajati have almost equal proportion to stay at one week to a month and to stay more than a month while Dalit is observed lower proportion (31% and 39.3% respectively) for staying during migration. Nonetheless, Chi-square test don't support to the ethnic differential of duration of staying when back to home during migration (χ^2=7.392, P=0.495) (Table 5.13).

Table 5.13: Returns during Migration and Duration of Stay by Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

	Brahmin/Chhetri		Janajati		Dalit		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Returns Home during Migration								
Never visited since the first move	28	17.9	26	22.8	18	21.4	72	20.3
After 2/3 years	69	44.2	58	50.9	47	56.0	174	49.2
Once in a year	32	20.5	21	18.4	10	11.9	63	17.8
2/3 times in a year	26	16.7	9	7.9	9	10.7	44	12.4
3+ year	1	.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	.3
Total	156	100.0	114	100.0	84	100.0	354	100.0
Chi-square	χ^2=10.374, P=0.240							
Duration of Staying								
No Returns	20	12.8	21	18.4	11	13.1	52	14.7
Less than one week	11	7.1	5	4.4	10	11.9	26	7.3
One week to one month	55	35.3	39	34.2	26	31.0	120	33.9
More than one month	66	42.3	47	41.2	33	39.3	146	41.2
Other	4	2.6	2	1.8	4	4.8	10	2.8
Total	156	100.0	114	100.0	84	100.0	354	100.0
Chi-square	χ^2=7.392, P=0.495							

Source: Field Survey 2010.

5.1.11 Availability of Friends/Relatives and Living Status of Migrants in Destination

Ninety eight percent of migrants have their relatives/friends in destination. Implicitly it can be say that the following tendency of out migrants to the previous migrants/relatives in destination. All of Janajati migrants have friends/relatives in destination whereas 99 percent of Dalit and 96 percent of Brahmin/Chhetri.

Eighty five percent respondent informed that easy living status have his/her family members in destination whereas 7 percent informed that they do not know and nearly 7 percent informed uneasy living status of out migrants in destination. Chi-square test showed that there is significant relation between ethnicity and living status of out migrants in destination (χ^2=10.926, P= 0.027) (Table 5.14).

Table 5.14: Availability of Friends/Relatives andLivingStatus of Migrants in Destination by Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

	Brahmin/Chhetri		Janajati		Dalit		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Relatives/Friends in Destination								
Yes	150	96.2	114	100.0	83	98.8	347	98.0
No	6	3.8	0	0.0	1	1.2	7	2.0
Total	156	100.0	114	100.0	84	100.0	354	100.0
Living Status of Migrants in Destination								
Easy	132	84.6	104	91.2	65	77.4	301	85.0
Uneasy	15	9.6	5	4.4	7	8.3	27	7.6
Don't know	9	5.8	5	4.4	12	14.3	26	7.3
Total	156	100.0	114	100.0	84	100.0	354	100.0
Chi-square	χ^2=10.926, P= 0.027							

Source: Field Survey 2010.

5.1.12 Living Interest Permanently and Reason for Living

Eighty five percent of out-migrants are not live permanently in destination while 15 percent live permanently. Seventeen percent migrants of Brahmin/Chhetri wants settle permanently in destination followed by Janajati and Dalit respectively. However, there is not significant association between ethnicity and desire of living permanently in destination. The limitation of this information is that the respondents are not directly migrants.

Table 5.15: Living Interest Permanently and Reason for Living by Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

	Brahmin/Chhetri		Janajati		Dalit		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Interested Living Permanently								
Yes	27	17.3	17	14.9	11	13.1	55	15.5
No	129	82.7	97	85.1	73	86.9	299	84.5
Total	156	100.0	114	100.0	84	100.0	354	100.0
Chi-square	χ^2=0.788, P=0.674							
Reason for Living Permanently								
Working Opportunity	16	59.3	6	35.3	6	54.5	28	50.9
Better educational opportunity	6	22.2	10	58.8	4	36.4	20	36.4
Transportation/Information	5	18.5	1	5.9	1	9.1	7	12.7
Total	27	100.0	17	100.0	11	100.0	55	100.0

Source: Field Survey 2010.

Out of 55 respondents who informed his/her family member wants live permanently in destination are ask reason for living permanently in destination. Among these, 51 percent informed due to the working opportunities (better job opportunities), 36

percent informed due to the better educational opportunity and 13 percent due to the transportation and information facilities are the main reason for living permanently by out migrants in destination (Table 5.15).

5.1.13 Uses of Remittance

Higher proportion, eight out of ten (79.3%), respondent informed that remittance is using for buying for clothes followed by buying food (58.6%), for payment debt (39.6%), for making toilet and tap (34.3%), for buying livestock (31.4%), for making building starts business and buying land respectively in his/her family.

Around eighty six percent Janajati &Brahmin/Chhetri and 66 percent Dalit family are using remittance for buying cloths while higher proportion of Dalit (68.4%) is using for buying food followed by Janajati and Brahmin/Chhetri respectively. Dalit proportion is found higher for making building and for buying land by using remittance (Table 5.16).

Table 5.16: Uses of Remittance by Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010.

	Brahmin/Chhetri		Janajati		Dalit		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
BuyLand	3	3.7	1	2.0	3	7.9	7	4.1
BuildBuilding	6	7.4	2	4.0	8	21.1	16	9.5
Made Tap/Toilet and other	30	37.0	19	38.0	9	23.7	58	34.3
Buying Food	40	49.4	33	66.0	26	68.4	99	58.6
Payment of Debt	30	37.0	20	40.0	17	44.7	67	39.6
Starts Business	8	9.9	2	4.0	1	2.6	11	6.5
Buying Cloths	66	81.5	43	86.0	25	65.8	134	79.3
Buying Livestock	24	29.6	17	34.0	12	31.6	53	31.4
Total	**81**	**100.0**	**50**	**100.0**	**38**	**100.0**	**169**	**100.0**

Source: Field Survey 2010.

5.1.14 Land Holding Status Before and After Migration

Out of 169 out migrants family having own land for cultivation, nearly 40 percent have 5 to 10 ropani followed by up to 5 ropani and more than 10 ropani respectively. Ethnic differential is observed in land holding status before migration. The proportion is higher among Dalits (60.5%) in up to 5 ropani followed by Janajati and Brahmin/Chhetrirespectively while the proportion is higher of Brahmin/Chhetri in more than 5 ropanies land holding than Janajati and Dalit respectively.

Table 5.17: Land Holding Status Before and After Migration by Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

	Brahmin/Chhetri		Janajati		Dalit		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Before migration								
Up to 5 Ropani	21	25.9	18	36.0	23	60.5	62	36.7
5-10	36	44.4	20	40.0	11	28.9	67	39.6
More than 10	24	29.6	12	24.0	4	10.5	40	23.7
Total	81	100.0	50	100.0	38	100.0	169	100.0
Anova Test	F=5.736, P=0.004							
After migration								
Up to 5 Ropani	16	19.8	15	30.0	24	63.2	55	32.5
5-10	41	50.6	21	42.0	10	26.3	72	42.6
More than 10	24	29.6	14	28.0	4	10.5	42	24.9
Total	81	100.0	50	100.0	38	100.0	169	100.0
Anova Test	F=5.981, P=0.003							

Source: Field Survey 2010.

However, there is significant association between landholding status of family before out migration of member and ethnicity (F=5.736, P=0.004). Negative impact of migration is found in land holding status among Dalit while positive impact is observed among Brahmin/Chhetri and Janajati family after migration. The increased proportion of Dalit found in lower categories of land holding status (up to 5 ropanies) whereas decreased of Brahmin/Chhetri and Janajati. Interestingly, 4 percent family of Janajati increased for holding more than 10 ropanies after migration (24 to 28 %). Statistical analysis showed significant association of these changes landing holding status after migration and ethnicity (F=5.981, P=0.003) (Table 5.17).

5.1.15 Impact of Migration on Agriculture and Labor

Fourteen percent of migrant's families have rented to land for cultivation before migration. The proportion is higher among Dalit followed by Brahmin/Chhetri and Janajati respectively for renting to cultivate. However, there is significant association between land rent to cultivate before migration and ethnicity.

The proportion decreased by around 7 percent of land rent to cultivation after migration than before migration. Family of Dalit migrants decreased by more than 66 percent (from 34.2% to 10.5%) land rent to cultivate after migration whereas Janajati family decreased by 50 percent (from 8% to 4%) after migration. Family of Brahmin/Chhetri remained constant before and after migration to land rent to

cultivate. However, there is no statistical relation between land rent to cultivate after migration and ethnicity of migrants (χ^2=1.493, P=0.474).

Table5. 18:Impact of Migration on Agriculture and Labor by Ethnicity, Dibrung VDC, Gulmi District, Nepal 2010

	Brahmin/Chhetri		Janajati		Dalit		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Land rent to cultivate before migration								
Yes	7	8.6	4	8.0	13	34.2	24	14.2
No	74	91.4	46	92.0	25	65.8	145	85.8
Total	81	100.0	50	100.0	38	100.0	169	100.0
Chi-square	χ^2=16.119, P=0.000							
Land rent to cultivate after migration								
Yes	7	8.6	2	4.0	4	10.5	13	7.7
No	74	91.4	48	96.0	34	89.5	156	92.3
Total	81	100.0	50	100.0	38	100.0	169	100.0
Chi-square	χ^2=1.493, P=0.474							
Feel lack of labor in your family								
Yes	24	29.6	11	22.0	7	18.4	42	24.9
No	57	70.4	39	78.0	31	81.6	127	75.1
Total	81	100.0	50	100.0	38	100.0	169	100.0
Chi-square	χ^2=2.049, P=0.359							
Leave land without cultivation due to migration								
Yes	6	7.4	5	10.0	1	2.6	12	7.1
No	75	92.6	45	90.0	37	97.4	157	92.9
Total	81	100.0	50	100.0	38	100.0	169	100.0
Chi-square	χ^2=1.799, P=0.407							

Source: Field Survey 2010

One fourth (24.8%) of the respondent informed that his/her family has feed lack of agricultural labor in family. However, proportion is higher among Brahmin/Chhetri (29.6%)family followed by Janajati and Dalit respectively. Chi-square analysis shows that there is no any significant relation between feelings of lack of agriculture labor in family and ethnicity of migrants (χ^2=2.049, P=0.359).Seven percent of migrant's families are leave land without cultivation after migration. Proportion is higher among Janajati (10%) followed by Brahmin/Chhetri and Dalit respectively. However, there is not significant association between leave land without cultivation and ethnicity of migrants (χ^2=1.799, P=0.407) (Table 5.18).

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Summary of Findings

6.1.1 Findings of Household Characteristics

The economically active population (62.7%)is the highest proportion followed by child population (29.1%), under 5 populations (11.0%) and old age population (8.2%) respectively among the total household populations.

Among the study population (1663 population), male populations (51.5%) are higher than the female populations (48.5%) and the sex ratio is (106.3%).More than half of the household populations are married (52.6%). Married female population (55.3%) is greater than unmarried female population (35.8%).

Eighty four percent populations of 5 years and above are literate. Around 92 percent male are literate whereas nearly 76 percent are female. Within the castes groups, any member's of the household highest education level of Dalit family (78%) proportion is higher in primary level of education than the proportion fall down along with the increasing level of education whereas Brahmin/Chhetri (35%) and Janajati (41%) proportion is higher in SLC level of education than it also fall down along with the increase in education are observed.

At the time of survey there are no household found without land and cultivable land. One fourth of the Janajati and Brahmin/Chhetri have more than 10 ropani cultivated land respectively while only 7 percent Dalit.Almost sixty two percentfamilies with food deficiency in their production of cultivated land with highest proportion among Dalit 76 percent. Majority of households (57.3%) have remittance as source of income. Sixty one percent of households are debt with majority of Dalit family found debt (72.7%) followed by Janajati and Brahmin/Chhetri respectively.

Almost 92 percent of the household in the study area has access to electricity. However, access to electricity in Dalit households (84%) slightly lesser than Brahmin/Chhetri and Janajati households. Almost (93%) of the study population used any types of toilet. The safe toilet, by sanitation perspective, i.e. flush and water flow users is comparatively higher from Brahmin/Chhetri. Brahmin/Chhetri (44.4%) user

of flush toilet is more than 3 times higher than the flush toilet user of Dalit (12%). There are not many differences of the sources of drinking water within the caste groups. Housing manufacturing materials are more common in each caste groups.

6.1.2 Findings of the Characteristics of Sample Population

The information of migrants who have leaved the home before more than 3 months and above 5 years of age during data collection is the eligibility criteria for the analysis. Around 21 percent populations have been migrated among the total population. Out of total migrants, highest propensities of migrants are from Janajati (22.8%) followed by Brahmin/Chhetri (21.1%) and Dalit (19.8%)of their own caste group populations respectively. Whereas male migrants constitute nearly 34 percent and female has nearly 8 percent among the total male and female sample population of the study area.

Highest proportion of migrants is found in age group 25-29 years (45.9%)while lower proportion is found between age groups less than 15 years (5.8%)of their age groupsrespectively. Proportion of migrants by age is differed in accordance with ethnicities.

Almost 95 percent migrants are literate. Majority of migrants member belong to Janajati has secondary level of education (50.9%) while Dalit constitute only 38 percent. Almost 30 percent of Brahmin/Chhetri migrants member finished their SLC and above level of education while Janajati and Dalit occupies 21 and 13 percent respectively. The statistical analysis shows that there is significant association between education and ethnicity of out migrants.

Two-third of the out migrants are unmarried while widow, separated and divorced has less than one percent. Married proportion of out migrants of Janajati and Dalit have nearly equal while the Brahmin/Chhetri has lower (26%).

Out of total Out-migrants, 76 percent has involved in any kinds of work in destination. Interestingly, proportion of involvement in job among Dalit has higher (84.5%).More than 90 percent of migrants from 30 years and above are leaved the origin for seeking better job opportunities. While nobody leaved for seeking job from age less than 15 years. By contrast, around 96 percent of age less than 15 years is migrated for better educational opportunity. Survey noted that Brahmin/Chhetri (91.7%) migrantsare higher proportion for receiving consensus by family followed by

Janajati (85.1%) and Dalit (82.1%) respectively. Relatives and friend (48%) are dominated to encourage for migration of each castes group while motherconstitute only (4.8%) respectively.

Almost 50 percent migrants have been returned home after 2/3 years of leaving home during migration followed by once in a year, 2/3 times in a year respectively. Less than one percent back more than 3 years after leaving home. From where, Proportion of back after 2/3 years of migration was higher among Dalit (56%).

Out of the total migrants member 15 percent interested to live permanently in destination. Seventeen percent migrants of Brahmin/Chhetri wants settle permanently in destination followed by Janajati and Dalit respectively. Out of the total migrants the most dominated interest to live permanently in destination is working opportunities (51%) followed by better educational opportunity and transportation/information facilities respectively. Interestingly 59 percent Janajati wants settle permanently in destination due to better educational facilities followed by Dalit (36%) and Brahmin/Chhetri (22%) respectively.

6.1.3 Findings of Migration and its Impact of Agriculture and Labor

Among the out migrants who migrated for working purpose, 71 percent Brahmin/Chhetri sent remittance in their home while around 62 percent Dalit and 61 percent Janajati migrants sent remittance.The mean remittance of Brahmin/Chhetri has significantly higher (Nrs. 73027.16) than the Janajati and Dalit respectively. On the other hand, also, sent cash from Brahmin and Chhetri households to their out migrants has significantly higher than Dalit and Janajati respectively.

In the case of using remittance, highest proportion, eight out of ten (79.3%) were used for buying for clothes followed by buying food , for payment debt, for making building, while very few number of households are starting business (6.5%) by using remittance. Which indicates in the rural areas, significant amount of remittance are using only for household consumption.

Fourteen percent of migrant's family has rented to land for cultivation before migration. The proportion is higher among Dalit followed by Brahmin/Chhetri and Janajati respectively for renting to cultivate. However, there is significant association between land rent to cultivate before migration and ethnicity.

The proportion decreased by around 7 percent of land rent to cultivation after migration than before migration. Family ofDalit migrants decreased by more than 66 percent (from 34.2% to 10.5%) land rent to cultivate after migration whereas Janajati family decreased by 50 percent (from 8% to 4%) after migration. Family of Brahmin/Chhetri remained constant before and after migration to land rent to cultivate. However, there was no statistical relation between land rent to cultivate after migration and ethnicity of migrants.

6.2 Conclusions

Highest propensity of migrantsare from Janajati (22.8) followed by Brahmin/Chhetri and Dalit respectively. Almost 95 percent of migrants are literate. Male migrants have higher than female.Most of the migrants are male (82.5%) while female migrants are around 17 percent. Female migrants are higher among Janajati. Unmarried occupied two-third of the total migrants. Almost half of the migrants return home within 2/3 years during migration.

The working purpose of the migrants has clearly visualize in the study, 76 percent has been working in destination. Almost half of the migrants sent remittance in home with Brahmin/Chhetri has higher mean remittance followed by Janajati and Dalit respectively indicating that Brahmin/Chhetri has better job in destination. Most of remittance in rural area is using for household consumption including buying clothing, food, making building and payment of debt indicating that almost migrants were from poor or middle class family.

Among the variables the education of migrants, status of cash sending in home, living status in destination, land holding status before and after migration, and land rent to cultivate before migration established signification relation with ethnicity of migrants. However, age, sex, marital status, job involvement in destination, family consensus for migration, returns home during migration, duration of staying at home during migration and interest living permanently in destination found insignificant relation with ethnicity of migrant.

6.3 Recommendations

Based on the conclusion derived from this study, following recommendations have been made for future area of research and policy implications.

6.3.1 Recommendations for Future area of Research

- The findings of this study are generalized based on small area of research and small sample size. The macro level study gives the glimpse of national scenario of migration situation in Nepal. On the other hand, the micro level studies in various parts, rural and urban, hill, mountain and Tesrai, of nations gives the trends, pattern and impact related to migration in rural area.
- There is also need of qualitative research for migration study and its impact on household activities, labor shortage and its impact on agriculture.

REFERENCES

Akand, Md. M. Kamal (2005). Cultural adoption of the ethnic migration to an urban setting: An anthropological study of Rajshahisity in Bangladesh. Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Rajshahi.

Alexander R. Jr. (2010). Historical impact of race and ethnicity upon immigration in the United States: Theoretical perspectives and the application to contemporary Latinos. College of Social Work, Ohio State University. Retrieved from: (www.forumonpublicpolicy.com) accessed at 5th January 2010.

Bajracharya, B. (1994). Gender issues in Nepali agriculture: A Review. *Warnock International Research Report Series No. 25*. HMG, Ministry of Agriculture, Kathmandu, Nepal. P 45.

Bennett L., Dahal R. D. &Govindasamy P. (2008). Caste, ethnic and regional identity in Nepal: Further analysis of the 2006 Nepal Demographic and Health Survey. Calverton, Maryland, USAID: Macro international Inc.

Bhende, A. &Karmitkar, T. (1998). Principles of Population Studies, Reprint New Delhi:Himalaya Publishing House.

Bogue, M. (1961-1969). Migration and characteristics of economic, social and demographic aspects.

Bruslé, T. (2010). Who's in a labour camp? A socio-economicanalysis of Nepalese migrants in Qatar. *Published in European Bulletin of Himalayan Research*, , n°35-36, p.154-170.

Center for Economic Development and Administration. (1979). Migration in Nepal, Migration of Spatial development. (Kathmandu, CEDA).

Center of Nepal and Asian studies (CNAS). (2000). Retrieved from www.cnastu.org.np/CV/sushila_cv.pdf

Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS). (2004) National Planning Commission Secretariat, Government of Nepal .Nepal Living Standard Survey.

Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS).(2003). Population Monograph of Nepal Vol.2. Kathmandu: CBS.

Chaurasia, C. P. (1990). *Migration of Labor in Nepal: Its Causes and Consequences*. (Unpublished Thesis).Master Degree in Commerce and Business Administration. PP 7-10, 66-72.

Conway, D. &Shrestha, N. (1981). Urban growth and urbanization in least-developed countries: The experience of Nepal, 1952–71.*Asian Profile 8:5477–494*. Retrieved from: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/

Grung, Y. B. (2008). Migration from Rural Nepal. A Social Exclusion Framework Central Department of Population Studies. Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu.Retrieved from www.cmi.no/file/?638.

Haider, K.. U. S. (2010). Factors of Migration on Urban Bangladesh: An Empirical Study of Poor Migrants in Rajshahi City. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS) Vol. 30, No. 2 (December 2010), pp. 307-323.*

Haque, S. (2005).Migration Trends and Patterns in South Asia and Management Approaches and Initiatives.*Asia pacific population journal vol.20, no.3*. Bangkok

International Organization for Migration, (2010). World migration report 2010: The future of migration building capacities for change. Geneva: IOM.

Jha, H. (1993). The Terai community and national integration in Nepal. Centre for Economic and Technical Studies. PP 34-35, 39,43.

KC, B. K. (1998).Trends, patterns and implications of rural-to-urban migration in Nepal.

Kc, B. K. et al. (1997).Migration situation in Nepal. Report submitted to Ministry of Population and Environment, Nepal (MOPE/N). UNFPA Nepal and CDPS, TU, Kathmandu, Nepal.

Kish, L. (1995). Survey sampling.A Wiley-International Publication John Wiley and Sons, INC. New York.

Lee, E.S. (1966). "*A Theory of Migration*," *Demography*, Vol.3, No. 1,

Mabogunje, A. L. (1972)., “System Approach to a Theory of Rural Urban Migration”, Geographical Analysis, Vol.2, pp. 1-18.

Nepal Institute of Development Studies & National Centre of Competence in Research North-South .(2010). Nepal Migration Year Book 2010.NIDS/NCCR, Kathmandu, Nepal.

Nepal Ministry of Health and Population (MOHP). (2007) Nepal Population Report, Population Division Ramshahpath, Kathmandu, Nepal p.54

Pandey, H. H. (1998). Migration decision making a case study of Kathmandu city, unpublished thesis , CDPS, TU, Kathmandu.

Pokharel, J. R. (2006). “A policy study in urban housing in Nepal”, economic policy network.Government of Nepal & Asian Development Bank, Nepal Resident Mission Kathmandu.Policy Paper 26 Pp3.

Pradhan, R.&Sherestha A. (2005). “ Ethnic and caste diversity: Implication for development”. *Working Paper Series No. 4.*Nepal Resident Mission June 2005 (ADB).

Ravenstine, E.G. (1985).“The Low of Migration”.*Journal of the Royal Statistical Society.Vol. 48, No.1.*

Samuel, S. (1960). Intervening opportunities and competitive migrants.*Journal of Regional Science I. vol. 2.Pp 1-26.*

Seddon, D. (2005). Nepal's dependence on exporting labor.University of East Anglia.Migration Information Source.Retrieved from www.migrationinformation.org/USfocus/display.cfm?ID=277.

Silwal, U. K. (1995).Population growth and agricultural change in Nepal.VikasPublishing HousePvt. Ltd. India. Pp. 55, 56,73, 85-86.

Singh J. P. (1986). Patterns of rural urban migration in India. Intra India Publication, New Delhi.

Suwal B. R. &Adhikari, K. P. (2007). "Foreign labour migration and remittance in Nepal".*Population Magazine Vol. 5*, CDPS. TU, Kathmandu.

Todaro, M. P. (1976). Internal migration in developing countries: A review of theory, evidence, methodology and research priorities. ILO, Geneva.

Tsujita, Y. &Oda, H. (2012). Caste, land and migration: A preliminary analysis of a village survey in an underdeveloped state in India, *Idea Discussion Paper no.334.*Institute of Developing Economies (IDE).Jetro, Japan.

United Nation. (1973). Multilingual Demographic Dictionary (New York: The United State).

United Nation.(1970). Method of measuring internal migration. Manual P7, population studies No. 47 (Now York, UN)

Upreti, H.C. (1998). Social organization of a migrant group: A sociological study of hill migrants from Kumaon region in the city of Jaipur.Himalaya Publication House Mumbai, p.102, 136 and 242.

Wiley J. & Sons. (1961). A geography of world population: World patterns.Inc New York, 1969. p.136

Zelinsky.(1971). "The hypothesis of mobility transitional".*The geographic review, Vol. 61* p.219-249.

Zipf.(1946). "P1/P2 D hypothesis in the Inter city movement".*American Sociological Review, Vol. 11.*Pp 667-86.

APPENDIX

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSTIY
CENTRAL DEPARTMENT OF POPULATION STUDIES
Kritipur, Kathmandu

A Survey on Caste/Ethnic Differentials of Migration
(A case study of Dibrung V.D.C. Gulmi District)

2010

Questionnaire

Section A: General Information

1. VDC Name _____
2. Ward No. ☐
3. Name of locality (Tole)_____
4. Household serial No._____ ☐☐
5. Name of household head_____
6. Name of respondent_____
7. Caste/Ethnicity of the household head_____ ☐

   Brahmin\Chhetri…….....1
   Magar ……..….2
   Grung ……..3
   Dalit……..4
   Newar ……..5
   Other (specify)_____6 ☐

8. Religion of household head_____

Hindu……..…….....…..1
Buddhist……..……2
Kirant…….....3
Islam……....4
Christian …….……5
Other (specify) _____6

S N.	**Questions**	**Coding specification**	**Skip**

S.N	Name	Relationship with the head of the household	Gender: Male=1 Female=2	Age in completed years	Literacy status: Literate...1,illiterate...2	Ask if more than 5 years: What is the highest grades/he has completed?	Ask if more than 5 years: Marital Status (see code)	Ask if more than 5 years: Main Occupation (see code)	Ask if more than 5 years: Is this person currently at home yes..1, no...2	If no, for how long ,s/he has been out of home?<=3 months…1 ,>3months…2	Main reason for leaving home (see code)	Where is s/he now? Same VDC…1, other VDC/ municipality..2, other country..3	Circle I D of the person who has been out of home for more than 3 months and crossed the own VDC
201	***202***	***203***	***204***	***205***	***206***	***207***	***208***	***209***	***210***	***211***	***212***	***213***	***214***
01													
02													
03													
04													
05													
06													
07													
08													
09													
10													
11													
12													
13													
14													
15													

Section B: Household Schedule

Code for Q NO. 203:	Code for Q NO. 207:	Code for Q NO. 208:	Code for Q NO. 209:	Code for Q NO. 212:
Head……..….1 Spouse…….……2 Son/daughter…….3 Daughter-in-law….4 Grandson/ Daughter…….5 Father/mother…..6 Brother/sister…...7 Nephew/Niece……8 No relation……..9 HH helper……..1 Other (specify)……	Never schooling / Failed in1 class… .00 1-9 completed...01-09 Test pass……..10 SLC pass……..11 CL pass or Equivalent…….12 Bachelor or plus……13	Unmarried…….1 Married …….2 Widow/ Widower…….3 Separated…….4 Divorce ……5	Own Agriculture..……..1 Cottage industry……..2 Service ……3 Business…….4 Daily wages in Agriculture……5 Daily wages in non Agricultural sector….6 Domestic work…….7 Cannot work due to physical disabilities…8 Student……..9 Do not work……10 Other (specify) _____	Work ……1 Education…2 Visit..of relatives …..3 Travel…….4 Other (specify)……

Coding of Questions

215	What is the highest level of education received by the member of the family? (code same as Q No. 207 of group B)	----------	
216	Do you have the health facilities in this ward?	yes ……..…1 No……...2 →	Q. No 218
217	If yes, what types of health facility are there?	PHE……...1 HC……..2 Hospital ……..3 Private clinic ….4 Others (specify)….	
218	What is the main source of drinking water in your household?	Piped water…...1 Water Fall ……..2 River/Canal …..3 Lake/Pond …….4 Other (specify)__	
219	In this household, is food cooked on an open fire, a stove or chulo?	Open Fire……..…1 Stove……...2 Chulo ……...3	
220	What is the main type of materials used in the wall of this building?	Cement, stone, bricks ……1 Tin ……...2 Wood including plywood ….3 Bamboo ……...4 Straw ……5 Mud/stone/bricks(baked)	
221	What is the main type of material used in the roof of this building?	Concrete, bricks (slab)……..1 Tin ……..2 Straw……..3 Mud/slate/stone……...4 Tile ……5 Other (specify)_____	
222	Is there any type of latrine in the household used?	Yes ……1 No ……...2 →	Q. No 224
223	If yes, mention the main type of latrine used?	Flush system……1 Water flow (General)……..…2 Closed pit……..3 Open pit……..….4 Other (specify)_____	
224	Does your household have the following facilities? (Multiple answer possible)	HH facilities / yes / No Electricity 1 2 Bio-gas plant 1 2 Telephone 1 2 Mobile 1 2 Radio 1 2 Television 1 2 Sofa set 1 2 Table\Chair 1 2	
225	How much do you have total land?	Ropani, Ana, Paisa	
226	How much do you have cultivated land?	Ropani, Ana, Paisa	
227	Have you enough to eat for a year from your total production of crop harvest?	Yes ……..1 → No ……..2	Q. No. 230
228	If not how many months does it last?	Months 1, 2, 3 …	

229	Have you or your family member are engaged or have been a member of any of the social or political institutions?	Yes …….1 No ……..2 →	Q No. 232
230	If yes what is the name of the institution?	_____(specify)	
231	Does any member of this household have a bank/cooperative or other saving account?	Yes …….1 No ……..2	
232	What is the main source of cash income of the household? (Multiple answer possible)	Sale of Agri. product……..1 Service ……..….2 Business/ Trade …….3 Remittance……....4 Wage labor……..5 Other (specify)_____	
233	How much did you earn from these sources during the last 12 months period?	NRS_____	
234	Does your HH owe any debt in cash/kind?	Yes…….1 No……..2 →	Go to next sec.
235	What is the main reason for indebted?	HH consumption ……...1 Festival/Marriage/Funerals…2 Maintenance of house …….3 Baying fertilizer/pesticides….4 Buying of livestock…….5 Other (specify)_____	
237	For how long your HH has been indebted?	Since generation…..…1 <4 years……..2 5-9 years…….3 10-14years……..…..4 15years above……..5 →	Go to Next section

Section C: Out Migration Schedule

If yes, why s/he likes to live permanently in this place? (See code)		323							
Is s/he interested to live permanently in the place of migration? Yes…1, No…2. QN. 324 →		322							
How s/he has been filings to stay in migration place? Easy…1, Uneasy…2, Don't know…3		321							
Are there any relatives/friends with (Name)? Yes…1, No…2.		320							
If s/he visits the HH, how long they stay on average? (See code)		319							
How frequently does your migrant member communicate /visit the HH? (See code)		318							
Who mainly decided (his/her) migration? (See code)		317							
Who encourage her/him to migrate? (See code)		316							
Did s/he leave the hose with consultation of family? Yes…1, No…2.		315							
Did you send any cash or kind your migrant member during last 12 months? Yes…1, No…2.		314							
If yes, how much cash did s/he send during last 12 months? (in Rs) (Worth of cash if it is kinds).		313							
Did (Name) send any cash or kinds during last year? Yes…1, No…2.		312							
If no, why (Name) is not doing the same job as s/he expected to do? (See code).		311							
If yes, (Name) involved in same kinds of work what s/he is expected before leave the HH? Yes…1 Go to QN.315, no…2 →		310							
Are (Name) involved in any kinds of jobs in destination? Yes…1, No…2.		309							
What was this person (name) major occupation before migration? (see code of QN. 209 of section B)		308							
What is he marital status of the migrants member at the time of leaving HH (see code of QN. 208 of section B)		307							
Education	What is the highest grate completed is this person at the time of migration? (See code of QN.207 of section B)	306							
	Literacy Status: Literate ….1, Illiterate….2.	305							
Age	How old was this person at the period of migration? (in completed year)	304							
Gender	Male…1, female…2	303							
Name		302							
ID No.		301							

Coding of Questions

Code for QN.311	Code for QN.316/317	Code for QN.318	Code for QN.319	Code for QN.323
No opportunity For work…….1 No opportunity For higher education ……....2 No cultivate land…….…....3 Due to poverty….4 Other _____ (specify)	Father ……1 Mother …..2 Self ……...3 Relatives....4 Friends …..5 Spouse.....6 Other____ (specify)	Never visited since the first move……..1 After 2/3 yrs……..2 Once in a year……3 2/3 times in a Year…..……4 Other____ (specify)	Less than 1 week……...1 One week to One month.…2 More than one One month.…3	Opportunities for work are better there…..…1 Better educational Opportunities……2 No cultivate land (Here)……..3 Transportation /information Facilities.....4 Other____ (specify)

SN.	Questions	Coding specification	Skip
324	Did you buy the land by using money which was send by the migrant member?	Yes……..1 No……2	
325	By using this money, are you making building?	Yes……..1 No……2	
326	Did you make Tab/Toilet or other infrastructure?	Yes……..1 No……2	
327	Have your HH sufficient food and clothes before family member migrate?	Yes……..1 No……2	
328	Is there any change in food sufficiency status?	Yes……..1 No……2	
329	Is there sufficient food and cloths now?	Yes……..1 No……2	
330	Are you repayment of debt by using the money which sent by migrants member?	Yes……..1 No……2	
331	Any member of the family initiation of any business/trade by suing this money?	Yes……..1 No……2	
332	Before family member went how much cultivated land did your family have?	Ropani, Ana, Paisa	
333	After family member went how much cultivated land does your family have?	Ropani, Ana, Paisa	
334	Before family member went did you land rent to cultivate?	Yes……..1 No……2	
335	After family member went did you land rent to cultivate?	Yes……..1 No……2	
336	After family member went did you feel lack of labors for the family?	Yes……..1 No……2	
337	Did you buy any livestock using from remittance? (Multiple answer possible)	Cow/Buffalo Goat/Lamb Horse Chicken/Duck	
338	Do you leave any land without cultivation due to family member absent?	Yes……..1 No……2	
339	If yes, mention how much cultivated land do you leave?	Ropani, Ana, Paisa	