

OUT-MIGRATION FROM NORTH EASTERN REGION TO CITIES: UNEMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYABILITY AND JOB ASPIRATION

Reimeingam Marchang*

The paper examines the situation of out-migration from North Eastern Region (NER) especially to the cities of Bangalore and Delhi contextualising the unemployment situation, job aspiration and employability issues. It examines the levels and trends of out-migrants to cities and the associated reasons for out-migration from the region to cities such as Bangalore and Delhi in particular largely based on census of India data. It is evident that NE people have increasingly out-migrated to the rest of India (ROI) and to a city like Delhi and Bangalore in search of employment that is caused by unemployment problems at origin of migration. Additionally, primary data is used to underpin the situation of unemployment, job aspiration and employability for Tangkhul migrants from North East in Delhi. Out-migration is strongly associated with an educational development. Educational development has raised the aspirations of the North East people especially among the youth aspiring for a formal employment which are limitedly available at the origin. NE people after failing in getting their aspired job in their region gradually out-migrated to a city, largely a phenomenon of chain migration through social networking, to fulfil their job aspirations; while employability issues lingers.

Keywords: North East Migrants, Migration Reason, Bangalore, Delhi, Tangkhul.

INTRODUCTION

North Eastern Region (NER) has several serious problems ranging from social, underdevelopment, economic to political. The economies of NER are “underdeveloped agrarian societies with very weak industrial sectors and inflated service sectors” (Sachdeva 2000:13). Moreover, industrialization has failed to take off in the region (De and Majumdar 2014). Also the culture of bandhs in the region has created disorder with the education system (Sachdeva 2005). Hence, NE people migration is caused by rapid educational development, unemployment, underdeveloped economy and industrialisation, ailing educational system and infrastructure, socio-political unrest among other reasons. In the cities, many of them enter into labour market as apprentices and fresher, some enter in it by changing their job or having work experiences towards permanent or higher salaried job, and for some the employers turn away which raises the question of employability. NE migrants’ employability is a serious concern for new labour entrant, in metropolitan cities even if a diverse job opportunity is available, despite of odds of largely acquired general education. Issues on labour employability manifest recognition of Becker’s (1975) human capital theory.¹ Employability is essentially the capacity of the person to execute a job. It is the set of skills and abilities to find job, remain in job or obtain new job (Crossman and Clarke 2010).

The paper² examines the situation of out-migration from NER to the cities of Bangalore and Delhi contextualising the unemployment situation at origin and employability and job aspiration concerns at migration destination. NER includes Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Sikkim and Tripura. Migrant based on census data in this paper refers to those migrants defined by place of last residence (POLR) with all duration of residence including

*Assistant Professor at Institute for Social and Economic Change, Bangalore - 560072.

Email: reimeingam@isec.ac.in/ reimeingam@gmail.com

unspecified durations. POLR unclassifiable as rural or urban is included in the total. For data comparison the reason for migration such as family moved of 1991 was classified as moved with household category of 2001. The reason for migration namely natural calamities like drought, floods, etc is club in the category others in 1991. If the place of birth or POLR is different from the place of enumeration, a person is defined as a migrant (Marchang 2016a). The paper begins with a brief review of existing literature on migration emphasising on labour issues of North East migrants in the cities. Subsequently, the levels and trends of out-migration and reasons for out-migration from NER to the rest of India (ROI) and cities particularly Bangalore and Delhi is examined using secondary data namely census of India. Later, based on primary data (see Marchang 2008) the situation of unemployment, job aspiration and employability of Tangkhul migrants from North East in Delhi is examined. Finally, a conclusion is drawn.

BRIEF LITERATURE

Migration is to achieve maximum individual satisfaction through obtaining better employment or others (Santhapparaj 1996) or to maximise their welfare (Faggian and McCann 2006). In India, recent migrants do have a strong tendency to migrate to localities which had previously attracted natives of their region (Greenwood 1973) that is essentially a chain migration. Similarly, NE migration is also largely a chain migration (Marchang 2011). Remittances benefit the home economies and also lead to chain migration (Dimova and Wolff 2009). It benefit not only the money sent to families at home but also valuable information about their life, environment, work, education and information to guide other prospective migrants in the family or community to ease their journey. Further, numerous studies (Jackson 1969; Rossi 1980; Friedlander and Roshier 1966 as cited in Cote 1997) in Britain have found that the propensity to migrate increases with an increase in educational qualifications. In India, the rural to urban migration is the important flow for literate youth migrants (Sebastian 1989).

The 2011 census provisional migration data reveals that the internal migration rates i.e. the ratio of migrants and population are relatively low in most of the NE states when compared with all-India figure of 37.5 percent.³ People are relatively more mobile in the cities of Bangalore and Delhi.⁴ The share of migration for employment in Delhi was larger (28 percent of total migrants) than in Karnataka (13 percent). Migration for employment is predominant for males. Delhi and Karnataka migrants are also contributed by NE migrants. Meanwhile, NSSO (2010) data shows that net migration rate (per 1000 population) was negative for Arunachal Pradesh (-20), Assam (-5), Manipur (-30), Meghalaya (-7), Mizoram (-1) and Nagaland (-5); and positive for Sikkim (+16) and Tripura (+17). It led to a negative net migration rate for NER (-4)⁵ suggesting a stronger push than pull factors of migration in the region.

Migration from NER to ROI especially in the big cities such as Delhi, Mumbai, Bangalore, Kolkata and Chennai has been noticeably increasing in recent times. ROI includes all states and UTs of India excluding eight NE states. As much as 1.19 percent of the NE people out-migrated to ROI (i.e. ratio between “migrants from NER to ROI” and “population of NER” in percentage) in 1991 that has increased to 1.94 percent in 2001. Similarly, 0.01 percent in 1991 and 0.02 percent in 2001 of the NE people out-migrated to Bangalore (i.e. ratio between “migrants from NER to Bangalore” and “population of NER” in percentage) and 0.05 percent in 1991 and 0.17 percent in 2001 of the NE people out-migrated to Delhi (i.e. ratio between “migrants from NER to Delhi” and “population of NER” in percentage). This shows NE people preferred Delhi, being the national capital, when compared to Bangalore, despite of pleasant living environment, as their migration destination. They migrate towards big cities because of concentration and availability of urban, particularly formal, employment. Similarly, Kundu (2007:353) has observed that “new

employment opportunities are coming up in selective sectors and in a few regions/urban centres". Migration can address labour shortages and skills shortages by making migrants in the labour pool more employable (International Organization for Migration, IOM 2015). Nevertheless, unemployment issues continue to exist. Under severe unemployment condition people trade down their job aspiration. For example, after spells of unemployment the educated unemployed after experiencing greater difficulty in finding work often obliged to trade down and accept second or third best job (Roberts 1985).

NE people are increasingly migrating towards different destinations such as the National Capital Region, Mumbai, Bangalore, Chennai to mention few in search of opportunities despite of prevalence of problems and racial discrimination. Many of them are youth and migration has substantially increased (Marchang 2008 and 2011). For example, Census of India (2001) recorded that half of the NE migrants to Delhi were youth (15-29 years). About 96 percent of the NE migrants to Delhi were youth (Marchang 2011). Usha and Shimray (2010) and Remesh (2012) estimated the youth (15-30 years) migrant population in Delhi to about 90 percent. Migrants from the NER to Delhi are largely educated people who have completed matriculation and above education (Marchang 2011 and Remesh 2012). Marchang (2008 and 2011), Usha and Shimray (2010), Chandra (2011) and Remesh (2012) concluded in their recent studies of NE migrants to Delhi that major push factors include lack of educational infrastructures, growing unemployment problems, social unrest and political tension.

In 2011, literacy rate ranges from about 67 percent in Arunachal Pradesh to 92 percent in Mizoram in the NE states. About 21 percent of the region's population (7+), against 25 percent for India, has matriculation and above but below graduate education while six percent of them have completed graduation and above education and the rest 73 percent (65 percent for India) had schooling below matriculation.⁶ Higher educational development (graduates and above) in NER (6 percent) is still below the national level (9 percent). Concerning unemployment, NSSO (2014) data reveals that level of unemployment is more severe in all the NE states, except Meghalaya and Sikkim, than Delhi and Karnataka especially for urban youth (15-29 years) and educated persons (15+ years).

NE people are increasingly migrating towards metropolitan cities in search of opportunities despite prevalence of various problems and racial discrimination (Chandra 2011). Racial prejudice and discrimination were common and obvious to them. Studies by Chandra (2011) concluded that in Delhi a racial discrimination against North East people has increased and social profiling is the root cause of racial discrimination from North East India.

Further, Marchang (2008 and 2011), Usha and Shimray (2010), Chandra (2011) and Remesh (2012) concluded that pull factors of migration from NER to Delhi include Delhi's better environment of educational and diverse employment opportunities. Concurrently, they found that NE people migrated to Delhi mainly due to lack of educational infrastructures, growing unemployment problems, social unrest and political tension in NER. They established that many of them were students or employed in formal and informal salaried employments including retail sectors, hospitality, business process outsourcing (BPO), etc. Globalisation has widened employment opportunities in BPO, hospitality industries, shopping malls etc. A large number of NE people were employed in organised as well as unorganised sectors such as in hospitality, retail and BPO jobs out of an estimate of 2.5 lakh⁷ NE people in Bangalore (Gooptu and Sengupta 2012). Moreover, migrants from NER to Delhi were from relatively rich segment, better economic condition and better educational background (Remesh 2012).

OUT-MIGRATION FROM NER TO ROI

Out-migration from NER to the rest of India has increased by two-fold from 3.8 lakh persons in 1991 to 7.5 lakh in 2001 which must have substantially increased in 2011. In 2001, the share of migrants from NER to ROI (i.e. states and UTs in India excluding the eight NE states) was 1.9 percent that has increased from 1.5 percent in 1991. The share is measured as the ratio between “out-migrants from NER to ROI” and “migrants in ROI” in percentage. ROI figures include migrants from NER; however, the total states of ROI exclude NER. ROI in 1991 excludes J&K and eight NE states of India; and in 2001 all eight NE states are excluded. The 2011⁸ population census would also show an increase of out-migration from the region as the socio-economic development level remains underdeveloped in the region and social and political unrest continue to prevail in some NE states like Manipur. Most importantly, industrialisation remains underdeveloped. For example, according to Marchang (2016b), during 2012-13 close to two percent of India’s factories and factory workers were in NER. At the same time, the output value per factory was about Rs.15 crore in NER as against Rs.27 crore in India. The per capita factory worker production was Rs.32 lakh for NER which was considerably lower than that for India of Rs.60 lakh. Additionally, only two percent of higher educational institutions (such as universities, deemed universities, colleges and others including institute of national importance and research institutes) of India were in NER during 2012-13. This situation, compounded with growing educational development, has pushed out people from the region to ROI for higher scholarship and employment.

Moreover, not surprisingly, most of these out-migrants continue to originate from rural areas (57 percent in 1991 and 65 percent in 2001) as majority of the region’s population live in rural areas (86 percent in 1991, 84 percent in 2001 and 82 percent in 2011). The region’s systematic decline of rural population probably would result an increase of out-migration in 2011.

NE people have become increasingly mobile as the share of out-migrants from NER in the population of the region rose from 1.2 percent in 1991 to 1.9 percent in 2001. The share is measured as the ratio between “migrants from NER to ROI” and “NER population” in percentage. ROI in 1991 excludes J&K and eight NE states of India; and in 2001 all eight NE states are excluded. An increase of NE people mobility was attributed by a significant increase among the female migrants who have migrated largely for marriage. The size of female (2.1 lakh in 1991 and 5.1 lakh in 2001) migrants became large in number when compare to males (1.7 lakh in 1991 and 2.5 lakh in 2001), resulting to a favourably high sex ratio of 1259 in 1991 and 2042 in 2001 indicating there is no gender discrimination for migration. Females are experiencing severe difficulties in getting job at their place of origin and sought their preferred job elsewhere presumably for a higher wage. This is supported empirically by the NSSO (2014) that unemployment rates of females were considerably higher than males. It is also possible that they are increasingly enrolling in higher studies outside their region.

People migrated outside NER for various reasons and the reasons are not uniformly distributed for males and females. NE people migrated to the ROI mainly due to the migration along with the household and for marriage. Empirical evidence shows that about 30 percent of the migrants from the region to the ROI migrated due to the migration along with their household in 1991 (Table 1). Such type of migration occurs when transfer of job arises, parents or main income earner migrates and spouse migrated along with spouse and or children. About 29 percent migrated for marriage. Migration for employment and business was about 17 percent. The share of migrants for education was prevailing at just over four percent. And the remaining share migrated for various reasons that are not included in the aforementioned reasons. Migration from the region to the ROI for marriage

has increased drastically to 44 percent in 2001 which arises mainly with a high female mentioning marriage as their reason for migration. A very insignificant proportion of males migrated for marriage. In 1991 just over two percent of the males migrated for marriage which has gone down to just over one percent in the following decade.

Migration along with the movement of their household or family continues to be significant even in 2001 with a share of about 23 percent. NE people specifically migrated for education decline from 4.6 percent in 1991 to 2.9 percent in 2001. Similarly, migration for employment and business declined. Females do not migrate for education, employment and business as much as the male counterparts. Migration for education, employment and business among the males and females has declined for the same period. Except an increase of migration for employment for males from about 26 to 31 percent during the same period that implies that unemployment issue in their region was becoming a major reason for migration.

Table 1: Share (%) of Reason for Migration for Migrants from NER to the ROI

Reason	1991			2001		
	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female
Work/employment	13.3	25.8	3.4	11.4	31.0	1.8
Business	3.3	5.6	1.4	1.1	3.0	0.2
Education	4.6	7.3	2.4	2.9	6.5	1.2
Marriage	29.2	2.5	50.4	44.5	1.4	65.6
Moved after birth	--	--	--	1.2	2.1	0.7
Moved with household	30.5	32.5	28.9	22.5	28.6	19.6
Others	19.2	26.4	13.5	16.4	27.5	10.9
All (Nos. in lakh)	3.8	1.7	2.1	7.5	2.5	5.1

Note: ROI includes all states of India excepting J&K and eight NE states in 1991 and eight NE states in 2001. -- not available.

Source: Author's calculation based on Census of India (1991 and 2001).

OUT-MIGRATION FROM NER TO CITIES

In 2001, over six thousand people from NER have migrated in Bangalore while over 67 thousand NE people have migrated in Delhi. NE migration was increasingly dominated by males in Bangalore (989 females per thousand males in 1991 and 685 in 2001) and in Delhi (868 in 1991 and 784 in 2001). However, it was relatively more favourable for females in Delhi than Bangalore in the year 2001 which implies that females prefer the national capital Delhi than Bangalore city likely due to distance and multi-culture factor. NE migrants to Bangalore showed a slight improvement in migration rate, measured as the ratio between "migrants from NER to Bangalore" and "all-migrants from outside Karnataka to Bangalore" in percentage, from 0.77 percent in 1991 to 0.80 percent in 2001. Similarly, the rate of migration from NE to Delhi, measured as the ratio between "migrants from NER to Delhi" and "all-migrants from outside Delhi to Delhi" in percentage, has improved from 0.5 percent in 1991 to 1.3 percent in 2001. An increase of migration from NE to cities is attributed by better availability of opportunities, facilities and services such as employment, education, infrastructure, amenities etc.

Moreover, larger share of the migrants coming to Bangalore are from urban areas that seems to be relatively more informative, educated and affluent. About 66 percent each in 1991 and 2001 of

NE migrants in Bangalore originated from urban areas. This phenomenon partially arises due to a forward migration when people initially migrated from rural to urban areas in their respective state or region; further migrated to Bangalore in urban areas in search of better job, better education, transfer of job, family moved, etc. City migration is largely urban phenomenon that is contrary to ROI migration pattern. Similarly, NE migration to Delhi was mostly originated from urban areas with a share of about 74 percent in 1991; however, later in 2001 it was overtaken by rural migration (54 percent). It shows that there is no reservation for migration, especially to Delhi, for rural people and the rate of migration far exceed for people living in rural areas as the rural areas are less underdeveloped than the counterpart urban areas.

Only one percent of the entire NE out-migrants migrated to Bangalore, measured as the ratio between “migrants from NER to Bangalore” and “migrants from NER to ROI” in percentage, in 1991. The size of migrants in number swelled up; however, the share has marginally dropped to 0.9 percent in 2001. The reason is simple that females do not migrate as much as the males to Bangalore. It indicates either NE migrants are gradually relinquishing Bangalore or do not prefer Bangalore as their migration destination. In 2001, more than half (52 percent) of the NE migrants in Karnataka live in Bangalore i.e. the ratio between “migrants from NER to Bangalore” and “migrants from NER to Karnataka” in percentage. The level of NE migration in Delhi, being national capital, is much greater. As much as 4.2 percent of the NE people migrated to Delhi, measured as the ratio between “migrants from NER to Delhi” and “migrants from NER to ROI” in percentage, in 1991; which has substantially increased to 8.9 percent in 2001. This reaffirms that NE people preferred Delhi over Bangalore as their migration destination.

Table 2: Share (%) of Reason for Migration of Migrants from NER to Bangalore/Delhi

Reason	NER to Bangalore						NER to Delhi					
	Person		Male		Female		Person		Male		Female	
	1991	2001	1991	2001	1991	2001	1991	2001	1991	2001	1991	2001
W o r k / Employment	16.1	19.9	28.4	29.9	3.7	5.2	26.1	32.9	44.3	53.6	5.0	6.4
Business	2.4	2.1	3.2	3.1	1.6	0.7	3.5	0.9	5.7	1.5	1.0	0.2
Education	15.1	28.5	22.6	32.8	7.5	22.2	5.8	5.9	7.1	7.3	4.2	4.2
Marriage	11.1	4.3	1.6	0.2	20.7	10.3	10.4	11.7	1.3	0.2	20.9	26.3
Moved after birth	--	1.8	--	1.6	--	2.1	--	2.1	--	2.2	--	2.0
Moved with household	45.8	28.9	35.3	17.0	56.4	46.3	47.1	36.8	33.7	24.3	62.5	52.7
Others	9.5	14.6	9.0	15.5	10.1	13.2	7.2	9.7	7.9	10.8	6.4	8.2
All (Nos. in '000)	3.8	6.4	1.9	3.8	1.9	2.6	15.8	67.0	8.5	37.6	7.4	29.5

Note: -- not available.

Source: Same as Table 1.

More NE migrants increasingly migrated to Delhi for employment (26 percent in 1991 and 33 percent in 2001) than Bangalore for the same (16 percent in 1991 and 20 percent in 2001) (see

Table 2). It could be attributed by distance, culture and language factors. Similar was the situation for business in 1991; however, in 2001 the share of NE migrants for it was greater for Bangalore with about two percent when compared to Delhi with less than one percent. Migration for education is greater in Bangalore (29 percent in 2001) than Delhi (six percent in 2001) perhaps attributed by conducive educational environment. During 1991-2001, migration for education has shown a substantial increase particularly for NE migrants in Bangalore. Nevertheless, it shows the prevalence of serious problem in the educational system in NE that relates to the law and order problem, strikes, bandhs, etc. Male migrants dominated for employment, business and education in both the cities. Females prominently migrated along with their household in both the cities. It indicates that females are largely dependent to males for their livelihood and are unlikely to support their family economically. A significant share of females migrated for marriage in Delhi (26 percent in 2001) and in Bangalore (10 percent in 2001) despite of cultural differences. It is possible that considerable size of females migrated after their marriage to join their husband; specifically migrated for marriage; and joined in migration as a dependent to the main income earner of their family.

Table 3: Rural-Urban Distribution (%) of Migrants by Reason from NER to Bangalore/Delhi

Course of migration	Year	Last residence	Total migrants	Work/employment	Business	Education	Marriage	Moved after birth	Moved with household	Others
NER to Bangalore	1991	Total*	3.8	0.6	0.1	0.6	0.4	--	1.7	0.4
		Rural	27.8	19.7	44.4	31.6	38.1	--	26.0	27.8
		Urban	66.1	70.5	55.6	59.7	54.8	--	69.4	69.4
	2001	Total*	6.4	1.3	0.1	1.8	0.3	0.1	1.9	0.9
		Rural	27.4	29.6	19.3	21.8	28.0	31.3	33.7	23.2
		Urban	66.3	67.7	77.0	75.3	70.6	64.4	64.6	47.1
NER to Delhi	1991	Total*	15.8	4.1	0.6	0.9	1.7	--	7.5	1.1
		Rural	25.7	32.9	25.5	21.6	27.0	--	21.7	26.6
		Urban	73.9	66.6	73.9	78.2	72.7	--	77.9	71.9
	2001	Total*	67.0	22.0	0.6	4.0	7.8	1.4	24.7	6.5
		Rural	54.0	65.7	26.6	28.4	57.1	60.0	50.4	40.7
		Urban	41.6	32.0	70.0	69.5	40.4	36.1	46.8	37.8

Notes: *Total figures are in numbers in '000. Figures may not sum up to 100 due to the exclusion of unclassifiable migrants in rural or urban. -- not available.

Source: Same as Table 1.

Migrants mostly originated from urban areas for all the reasons for migration for migrants to Bangalore 1991 and 2001 and to Delhi in 1991 (Table 3) indicating that urban people are more informative about the migration destination concerning the possible employment availability, educational system etc. However, it was not the case for NE migrants to Delhi in 2001 particularly for employment, marriage, moved after birth, moved with household and others reasons. In other words, migrants for employment in particular have been dominated by rural migrants who have migrated to Delhi in 2001. It suggests that rural people of NE are increasingly mobile especially for Delhi irrespective of economic background.⁹ It also indicates that affluent urban people had a higher

tendency to migrate irrespective of the distance between origin and destination of migration to Bangalore in particular; and rural people had also increasingly determined to migrate for employment to Delhi. Moreover, majority of migrants for education originated from urban areas that usually are better off than rural counterpart for financing their education.

JOB ASPIRATION, UNEMPLOYMENT AND EMPLOYABILITY: STUDY OF TANGKHUL MIGRANTS IN DELHI

According to Marchang (2008) Tangkhuls migrants, mostly unmarried youth, are increasingly migrating from Ukhrul district of Manipur to NCT Delhi due to unemployment problems and increase in educational contest. Primary data, based on random sampling technique, collected in Delhi in 2007, result shows that youth (15-29 years) constituted majority of migrants (96 percent) out of 323 migrants (170 males and 153 females). Migrants mostly migrated after the completion of matriculation and above education which were largely motivated by self. The nature of migration is chain migration. Migrants mostly considered Delhi provides and facilitates better educational system to fulfil their aspiration of employment opportunities. Most of them were a recent migrant who have come in recent years for education and job which implies that migrants do not migrate for permanent. Most of them studied arts subject, specifically general courses, followed by science, commerce and vocational that exacerbate the problem of educated unemployment. Importantly, acquiring government job after completion of education is the major aspirations of the student migrants. Therefore, most of the males after completing their education continue to stay back in Delhi and seek their aspired government jobs through competitive examination.

Employability of migrant was evident that majority of the employed with a share of 42 percent got job within one month of seeking employment, 35 percent got job within one to three months, 16 percent within three to six months time, three percent within six to twelve months time and the rest three percent after seeking for more than a year. This situation reflects the complexity of employability issue and economic pressure which is adjusted with job and income expectation. However, migrant workers mostly keep on changing their job as 60 percent of the employed are not in their first job that shows the job insecurity and unsatisfactory.

Male predominant work in call centres (62 percent) which fetches relatively higher salary. Similar is the case for female, graduates, (27 percent) indicating that increased in educational level enables to meet their aspiration in terms of earning. Large number of females migrated specifically for employment after secondary education portraying females withdraws from educational system at a younger age as compared to the males some due to economic pressure and some because of reluctance to pursue higher education. Females mostly work in private shops, hotels, restaurants, parlours and alike with about 62 percent of the workforce. They are employed due to the economic circumstance or economic pressure or to supplement economic satisfactory or to meet their unmet needs or lack of interest in acquiring higher education. Large share (62 percent) of migrants earns a monthly income below Rs.10000. There are migrant worker who earn less than Rs.5000 per month (13 percent). This situation shows the economic pressure on them that essentially arises due to severe unemployment problems at migration origin.

Employment rate (work participation rate) for females (48 percent) far exceeds than males (31 percent) basically due to variation in the flexibility in choosing the job, withdrawal from educational system, level of aspiration for government job and economic pressure. In fact the situation was due to the prevalence of severe unemployment problems in general and high job aspiration among the males. Many of the employed (34 percent) were unsatisfied with their present job as they were seeking for new jobs because they aspire for more remunerative job especially government job and are working in an unpleasant working hours (call centres).

The problem of unemployment was more severe for males with 40 percent unemployment rate when compared to females' unemployment rate of 17 percent. Unemployment rate is measured as the ratio between "persons seeking/available for work among the non-workers i.e. unemployed" and "labour force i.e. workers plus unemployed" in percentage. It is due to high government job preference and aspiration (46 percent males and 47 percent females) also coupled with the un-employability as a result of too general or theoretical educational background. Unemployed migrants prefer employment largely in public sector (46 percent) which will give a sense of permanency and security than private sector than self-employment. Majority of the unemployed (94 percent) were new entrant in the labour market who has never worked before.

Un-employability of migrants is depicted with the fact that majority of unemployed with a share of 26 percent have been seeking employment for less than one month, 18 percent for one to three months, 12 percent for three to six months, 26 percent for six to twelve months and 18 percent for more than a year. This reflects to an intensity of job, particularly government, aspiration and continuous entry into labour market. The situation was more or less similar for males and females. Un-employability issue is serious when the unemployed are involuntary.

Most of them were seeking employment for more than half year suggesting a difficulty in getting a job due to tougher competition or upholding their job aspiration or having financial support in being unemployed. The above condition suggests changing an approach of education to and a need of a professional and jobbing oriented education. Additionally, migration is due to the problem of unemployment at origin because most of the employed people (61 percent) opined that they were willing to return to Manipur if an employment opportunity is guaranteed at origin.

CONCLUSION

NE people have increasingly out-migrated to a city such as Delhi and Bangalore, despite of job uncertainty, racial prejudice and discrimination, in search of employment opportunities causes by unemployment problems at origin. Involuntary unemployment appears to be widespread due to a lack of employment opportunities primarily resulted from underdevelopment and slow economic growth. Migration, to city like Bangalore, for employment and education increases indicating an inadequacy of employment and educational opportunities and its poor system in NE. Education has raised the aspirations of the people especially the youth aspiring for a formal employment which are limitedly generated in the region. NE people after failing to get their aspired job migrated to the cities outside their region, largely a phenomenon of chain migration through social networking, expecting to get their aspired formal job. The mismatch of educational development and employment growth has rendered unemployment and the issue of employability has emerged.

NOTES

- 1 Becker's (1975) human capital theory is an attempt to promote the growth of the stock of human capital through the state machinery. In which investment, in terms of time, effort, money and other characteristics, on education and training is the function for future income earning and employment. Increase in level of education enhances the skills, knowledge, ability, capability, employability and also job aspirations. Employability question arises as the nature of labour supply varies with the type of labour demand amidst the rapidly changing knowledge based economy. The perception of employability for a prospective employee and employer depends upon employment related traits such as morale, motivation, performance, reliability, effectiveness, aspirations, biases and attitudes towards the employment of a person (Bricout and Bentley 2000). Perhaps employability is a psycho-social construct in the globalised economies including India.

- 2 A revised paper that was presented with a title “Out-migration from North East to cities: unemployment, employability and job aspiration” at national seminar on “Borderland migration, neo-liberal India and borderland identity” organised by Centre for North East Studies and Policy Research, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi on March 8-9, 2017.
- 3 Migration rates rank (ascending order) among 35 Indian states/UTs: Manipur 2nd lowest (25.9%), Meghalaya 3rd (26.2%), Nagaland 5th (28.3%), Assam 10th (32.5%), Tripura 11th (33.6), Mizoram 12th (34.6%), Sikkim 21st (43.4%) and Arunachal Pradesh 23rd (44.0%).
- 4 Karnataka data is used as proxy for Bangalore since it is within Karnataka. District level D-5 series is not yet available. Migration rate for Karnataka is ranked (ascending order) at 18th (41%) and Delhi at 26th (46%).
- 5 Author’s calculation based on NSSO (2010:158).
- 6 Author’s calculation based on Census 2011 data (Table C-8).
- 7 This figure seems to be overestimated when compared with the size and trend of census data. However, a recent study by the Centre for North East Studies and Policy Research, Jamia Millia Islamia, entitled as “Discrimination and Challenges before Women from North East India: Case Studies from four metros - New Delhi, Mumbai, Kolkata and Bengaluru” estimated migrants from NER to Delhi, Mumbai, Kolkata, Bengaluru, Hyderabad, Pune and Lucknow to be over 414850 (India Tomorrow News 2014). For women migrants, the study concluded that Delhi is the most unsafe place (81% responded they were harassed or discriminated) followed by Bangalore (60%) and Kolkata; and Mumbai the safest city.
- 8 The 2011 census migration data is available only for D-5 (provisional) till date. D-3 tables of 2011 are not yet released.
- 9 In Bangalore, unlike in Delhi where one month rent is sought in advance, tenants deposit rent for 10 months in advance as security of house on leased to the house owner which is a disincentive for modest economic background rural people. It might have led to choose other than Bangalore as a destination for migrants particularly originated from rural areas from NE.

References

- Chandra, Madhu (2011): North East Migration and Challenges in Mega Cities, (accessed on 22.06.2012 > <http://nehelpline.net/?p=490>).
- Cote, Guy L. (1997): Socio-economic Attainment, Regional Disparities, and Internal Migration, *European Sociological Review*, 13(1).
- Crossman, Joanna Elizabeth and Marilyn Clarke (2010): International experience and graduate employability: stakeholder perceptions on the connection, *Higher Education*, 59(5).
- De, P and M Majumdar (2014): Developing Cross Border Production Networks between North Eastern Region of India, Bangladesh and Myanmar. Delhi: RIS.
- Dimova, Ralitzka and Wolff, Francois Charles (2009): Remittances and Chain Migration: Longitudinal Evidence from Bosnia and Herzegovina, Discussion Paper, Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA).
- Faggian, Alessandra and McCann, Philip (2006): Human Capital Flows and Regional KnowledgeAssets: A Simultaneous Equation Approach, *Oxford Economic Paper* 52.
- Becker, Gary S. (1975): *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis with Special Reference to Education*, National Bureau of Economic Research, New York.

- Bricout, John C. and Kia J. Bentley (2000): Disability status and perceptions of employability by employers, *Social Work Research*, 24(2).
- Gooptu, Biswarup and Sengupta, Devina (2012): North East Exodus: Bangalore businesses facing the impact, *The Economic Times*, (accessed on 17.09.2014> <http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/politics-and-nation/north-east-exodus-bangalore-businesses-facing-the-impact/articleshow/15525819.cms>).
- Greenwood, M. J (1973): The Influence of Family and Friends on Geographic Labor Mobility in a Less Developed Country: the Case of India, *Review of Regional Studies*, in Levy, Mildred B. and Wadycki, Walter J. (1973): The Influence of Family and Friends on Geographic Labor Mobility: An International Comparison, *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 55(2).
- India Tomorrow News, (January 2014): 81% of North East women harassed in Delhi: Survey, India Tomorrow, (accessed on 24.09.2014> <http://www.indiatomorrow.net/eng/81-of-north-east-women-harassed-in-delhi-survey>).
- IOM (2015): *World Migration Report 2015: Migrants and Cities: New Partnerships to Manage Mobility*, IOM, Geneva.
- Kundu, Amitabh (2007): *Mobility of Population*, in Kaushik Basu (ed), *The Oxford Companion to Economics in India*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi.
- Levy, Mildred B. and Wadycki, Walter J. (1973): The Influence of Family and Friends on Geographic Labor Mobility: An International Comparison, *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 55(2).
- Marchang, Reimeingam (2008): *Educated Unemployed Youth and Migration from North Eastern Region: A Case Study of Migrants from Ukhrul District to Delhi*, Thesis Unpublished, JNU, Delhi.
- Marchang, Reimeingam (2011): *Unemployment, Job Aspiration and Migration: A Case Study of Tangkhul Migrants to Delhi*, *Eastern Quarterly*, 7(3&4).
- Marchang, Reimeingam (2016a): *Migration from North Eastern Region to Bangalore: Level and Trend Analysis*, Working Paper No.371, ISEC, Bangalore.
- Marchang, Reimeingam (2016b): *Report on Impact of Education and Employment on the Economy of Scheduled Tribes in North East India*, Sponsored by ICSSR, Delhi.
- NSSO (2010): *Migration in India 2007-2008*, Report No.533 (64/10.2/2), MOSPI, Delhi.
- NSSO (2014): *Employment and Unemployment Situation in India*, Report No.554(68/10/1), MOSPI, Delhi.
- Remesh, Babu P. (2012): *Migration from North-East to Urban Centres: A Study of Delhi Region*, NLI Research Studies Series, No. 094/2012, V.V. Giri National Labour Institute, Noida.
- Roberts, Kenneth (1985): *Youth And Leisure*, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London.
- Sachdeva, G (2000): *Economy of the North-East: Policy, Present Conditions and Future Possibilities*. Delhi: Konark Publishers.
- Sachdeva, G (2005): *Preparing the Northeastern Economy for the Future*, *Eastern Quarterly*, 3(3).
- Santhapparaj, A. Solucis (1996): "Job Search and Earnings of Migrants in Urban Labour Market: A Study of Madurai Metropolis," *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 39(2).
- Sebastian, A. (1989): *Youth Migrants for Employment in India*, in Nair, P.S., Vemuri, H.D., Farijdar & Ram. (Eds.), *Indian Youth: A Profile*, Mittal Publications, Delhi.
- Usha, Devi M.D. and Shimray, U.A. (2010): *Report on "Migration from the North Eastern Region: A Study of Educated Youth from NER in Bangalore and Delhi"*, ISEC, Bangalore.