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Table A1. Informal-sector Work Participation by Sex and Household Migration Status (Rural and Urban Contrasted)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sex | Rural/ Urban | Family members’ migration | Mean labour  force participation among respondents | Sample size | Standard error of the estimate of mean |
| Male | Rural | None | 0.784 (78%) | 32691 | 0.00 |
| Male | Rural | Yes | 0.818 (82%) | 1238 | 0.01 |
| Male | Urban | None | 0.398 (40%) | 20723 | 0.00 |
| Male | Urban | Yes | 0.474 (47%) | 234 | 0.03 |
| Female | Rural | None | 0.528 (53%) | 35160 | 0.00 |
| Female | Rural | Yes | 0.594 (59%) | 3043 | 0.01 |
| Female | Urban | None | 0.106 (11%) | 21039 | 0.00 |
| Female | Urban | Yes | 0.169 (17%) | 431 | 0.02 |

*Source*: IHDS -II, 2011/2

*Notes:* This table deliberately cover ages 18–60, only, to maximise comparability with the NFHS results; the key datum is the weighted percentage of informal labour force participation (ILFP) of the respondents in the informal sector (0=no involvement, 1=any involvement; hence the mean is a number between 0 and 1, and its standard error is shown to be very small); the ILFP % is shown too.

Table A2. Percentage of Migrants Workers in Rural and Urban Areas in 2011, by State

| State | % In-migrants (Urban) | % In-migrants (Rural) | Total no. of migrants (R + U) | Pop. 2011 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Jammu & Kashmir | 2.4 | 0.4 | 122,587 | 12,541,302 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 16.8 | 2.9 | 296,268 | 6,864,602 |
| Punjab | 8.7 | 1.9 | 1,244,056 | 27,743,338 |
| Chandigarh\* | 19.4 | 25.7 | 206,642 | 1,055,450 |
| Uttarakhand | 11.1 | 3.9 | 617,094 | 10,086,292 |
| Haryana | 11.6 | 1.9 | 1,333,644 | 25,351,462 |
| Nct Of Delhi | 12.2 | 8.8 | 2,029,489 | 16,787,941 |
| Rajasthan | 6.2 | 1.3 | 1,709,602 | 68,548,437 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 5.2 | 0.6 | 3,156,125 | 199,812,341 |
| Bihar | 3.6 | 0.3 | 706,557 | 104,099,452 |
| Sikkim | 15.3 | 5 | 46,554 | 610,577 |
| Arunachal Pradesh | 18.1 | 5.8 | 119,244 | 1,383,727 |
| Nagaland | 11.9 | 3 | 110,779 | 1,978,502 |
| Manipur | 1.4 | 0.5 | 22,750 | 2,855,794 |
| Mizoram | 8.6 | 2.6 | 62,828 | 1,097,206 |
| Tripura | 4.6 | 1.8 | 92,097 | 3,673,917 |
| Meghalaya | 6 | 0.7 | 52,797 | 2,966,889 |
| Assam | 7.2 | 1 | 572,064 | 31,205,576 |
| West Bengal | 4.3 | 0.6 | 1,656,952 | 91,276,115 |
| Jharkhand | 8 | 0.8 | 824,259 | 32,988,134 |
| Odisha | 8.6 | 0.7 | 851,363 | 41,974,218 |
| Chhattisgarh | 10.8 | 1.9 | 1,021,077 | 25,545,198 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 7.7 | 1.7 | 2,415,635 | 72,626,809 |
| Gujarat | 9.5 | 1.7 | 3,041,779 | 60,439,692 |
| Daman & Diu | 37.5 | 8.8 | 73,782 | 243,247 |
| Dadra & Nagar Haveli | 29 | 9.4 | 63,779 | 343,709 |
| Maharashtra | 12.1 | 2.8 | 7,901,819 | 112,374,333 |
| Andhra Pradesh | 9.6 | 1.8 | 3,737,316 | 84,580,777 |
| Karnataka | 9.4 | 1.8 | 2,887,216 | 61,095,297 |
| Goa | 9.9 | 4.7 | 115,870 | 1,458,545 |
| Lakshadweep | 9.8 | 8.5 | 6,135 | 64,473 |
| Kerala | 2.5 | 1.8 | 713,934 | 33,406,061 |
| Tamil Nadu | 7.8 | 2.1 | 3,487,974 | 72,147,030 |
| Puducherry | 6.7 | 3.4 | 70,721 | 1,247,953 |
| Andaman & Nicobar Islands | 16.1 | 12.3 | 52,129 | 380,581 |
| Total |  |  | 41,422,917 | 1,210,854,977 |

*Source*: Indian Census 2011

*Notes*: Migrants includes those residing in the place of enumeration for 0-9 years, and reporting work/employment as a reason for migration.

\*small base for rural

Table A3. Number of Labour Migrants by Destinations

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Region | Number of total in-migrants | | | | In-migration rate\* | | | |
| **Short-term** | **urban\_m** | **urban\_f** | **rural\_m** | **rural\_f** | **urban\_m** | **urban\_f** | **rural\_m** | **rural\_f** |
| Eastern | 109,487 | 19,437 | 112,982 | 84,462 | 0.4% | 0.1% | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| North Eastern | 25,104 | 6,293 | 54,874 | 41,171 | 0.6% | 0.2% | 0.3% | 0.2% |
| North Central | 375,870 | 58,690 | **595,634** | **441,279** | 0.6% | 0.1% | 0.4% | 0.3% |
| Southern | 368,113 | **94,850** | 267,269 | 195,369 | 0.7% | 0.2% | 0.4% | 0.3% |
| UT | 99,025 | 10,789 | 26,879 | 23,170 | 0.8% | 0.1% | 0.5% | 0.5% |
| Western | **468,503** | 67,216 | 458,629 | 324,008 | **1.1%** | 0.2% | **0.9%** | **0.7%** |
| **Long-term** | **urban\_m** | **urban\_f** | **rural\_m** | **rural\_f** | **urban\_m** | **urban\_f** | **rural\_m** | **rural\_f** |
| Eastern | 2,495,067 | 294,359 | 717,958 | 289,841 | 8.6% | 1.1% | 0.7% | 0.3% |
| North Estern | 483,564 | 90,562 | 340,597 | 78,119 | 11.3% | 2.2% | 1.8% | 0.4% |
| North Central | 6,716,209 | 772,354 | **2,392,471** | **882,273** | 11.5% | 1.5% | 1.4% | 0.6% |
| Southern | 6,278,580 | **1,293,090** | 1,910,999 | 613,539 | 12.2% | **2.5%** | **2.6%** | 0.8% |
| UT | 2,139,548 | 156,626 | 103,047 | 15,568 | 18.1% | 1.5% | 1.9% | 0.3% |
| Western | **7,438,400** | 798,577 | 1,444,699 | 457,226 | **18.2%** | 2.2% | 2.9% | **1.0%** |

*Source*: Indian Census 2011

Notes: this table includes migrations both within and outside states; work and employment as a reason, only; short-term=residing in this destination for less than one year; long-term=residing in this destination for one year or more.

Migrants are enumerated at their place of residence which is the destination residence here.

\* In-migration rate is defined as the percentage share of in-migrant (group) in the population at the place of enumeration.

***Regions:*****Union Territories (UT)**: Jammu & Kashmir, Chandigarh, Nct of Delhi, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Lakshadweep, Puducherry, Andaman & Nicobar Islands; **North & Central**: Himachal Pradesh, Punjab, Uttarakhand, Haryana, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Madhya Pradesh; **Eastern**: Bihar, West Bengal, Jharkhand, Odisha; **North Eastern**: Sikkim, Arunachal Pradesh, Nagaland, Manipur, Mizoram, Tripura, Meghalaya, Assam; **Western**: Gujarat, Daman & Diu, Maharashtra, Goa; **Southern**: Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, Tamil Nadu;

**urban\_m** : urban male, **urban\_f** : urban female, **rural\_m** : rural male, **rural\_f** : rural female