CROSS-BORDER MIGRATION PROCESS OF NEPALESE PEOPLE TO INDIA

Laxman Singh Kunwar[*]

There is unique historical, socio-economic and political relationship between Nepal and India. Nepal and India has open boarder and there is long history of people's migration from one country to another by crossing the border. There is no need of any formal document documents (pass port, visa) for people of both country in cross border migration process Therefore, this study is confined to analyze the factors associated with cross border migration process of Nepalese people to India. In total, 809 households were randomly selected from studied VDC Daijee of Kanchanpur district. Structured questionnaires were designed to collect the information. In study Daijee VDC of Kanchanpur, out of 809 households, 426 households were cross border migrants households (current and returned). Ancestor's participation, information provided by friends, self-decision of migrants themselves and moving alone by crossing border were reported as main contributors in cross border migration process.

Keywords: Migrants, cross border, employment and remittances.

INTRODUCTION

Migrationis usually defined as the movement of people from one place to another seasonally, temporarily, and permanently, for a number of voluntary or involuntary reasons (WB, 2010). Migration promotes exchange in work skills and experiences, enhances development of individuals, influences the size and shape of families, and age and sex composition. Migration has both positive and negative impacts on migrants themselves in their place of origins and destinations. Contemporary migration in the world varies in volume, distance, and duration. It has become a challenge to policy makers in regulating migration and protecting migrants from abuse and exploitations (UN DESA, 2015).

The last two decades witnessed increase in the scale and complexity of international migration (Hugo, 2007). In 2005, the number of migrants worldwide was estimated at 185 to 192 million (IOM, 2005), representing approximately three percent of the world population. This figure has more than doubled since 1975. Castles and Miller (2003) call the "age of migration" people flows have become global and affect nearly all countries on earth, whether as sending, receiving or transit countries, or as a combination of these. Now, politicians and government's official are emphasizing international migration as a means to bring economic and social development in the countries of origin (Castles, 2008). Remittances have become focal point within the migration-development nexus. Remittances have been taken as a part of solution for development and poverty reduction strategy in sending or origin countries of migrants.

The history of foreign employment in Nepal dates back almost 200 years, when Britain began recruiting men from the hillsides of Nepal into the British armed forces. After India's independence in 1947, the Indian military also began to recruit Nepali men. Currently, about 3,500

[*] Dr. Kunwar is Associate Professor at Department of Population Studies, Patan Multiple Campus, Tribhuvan University, Lalitpur, Nepal.

Nepali soldiers serve in the British army and more than 50,000 Nepalese are enlisted in the Indian military. India was the first country to attract civilian migrants from Nepal. The inflow of working migrants to India has increased sharply since the 1950s and 1960s. India is the largest destination country for Nepalese migrants. The movement of people between Nepal and India is largely facilitated by the open bordersbetween the two countries. The open border has helped both countries to develop harmonious, socio-economic, cultural and religious relationships. However, it has made easier for weapons and drugs smuggling, cross-border terrorism, human trafficking, robbery, tax and custom evasion, loss of real national income and increasing security threat in both the countries (Seddon, 2005).

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

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

The armed conflicts for 'Gorkha Land' campaign, expulsion of Indian citizen of Nepali origin from Assam and Meghalaya and inflow of refugees from Bhutan to Nepal are other dimensions of cross-border. Cross-border movement of capital and goods as well as movement of people in South Asia is significant, countries of South Asia comprise sending, receiving and transit countries, some of which are both or all three. The purpose of this article is to find out the main factors associated in cross border migration of Nepalese people to India.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

According to Behra (2011), the nature of migration from Bangladesh and Nepal to India has been dissimilar because of their different historical backgrounds, geographical variants, ethno-religious affinities, political systems, and bilateral arrangements with India. Behra illustrates that geographical contiguity, socio-cultural affinity, the kinship factor, and historical reasons have left the Indo-Bangladesh and Indo-Nepal borders vulnerable to migration. Similarly, India and Nepal share an open and porous 1,900-km border that runs along the states of Bihar, Sikkim, Uttar Pradesh, and West Bengal. Migration between Nepal and India has been easy because of the open, porous border and strong familial links. As a result of a bilateral friendship treaty signed between India and Nepal in 1950, citizens of both countries can travel and work freely across the border. Their concentration is in the North-eastern states, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal, with scattered presences over the remainder of the country (Behra, 2011). According to recent estimates, there are approximately one million Nepalese working in India (CBS, 2004), and they mostly work as unskilled permanent or seasonal labourers. Most Nepalese respondents migrated for the first time between the ages of 16 and 20 years (Samuels et al., 2012). In Nepal, more men migrated with

their peers. In contrast, most women migrating to India have come with their spouse and children. While most Nepalese migrants moved on their own or with peers, migration among Bangladeshis is arranged largely by brokers (Samuels et al., 2012).

Methods

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

Determining sample size

A simple formula was used to determine the number of households for the study purpose[1]. This does not include design effect as the sample had to be drawn from a single VDC using systematic random sample technique):

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

where,

SS= Sample size (number of households to be selected for the study)

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

p = Prevalence of cross-border migrants

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

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

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

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

---

1 http://macorr.com/sample-size-methodology.htm, accessed on 28 February 2011.

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

where,

Final SS = Final sample size (number of households to be selected for the study)

HH   = Total households in the VDC

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

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

Sampling frame

After finalizing, total required sample size of 809households the migration status of 423 (52.3%) households were non-migrants, 231 (28.6%) households were current migrants, 115 (14.2%) households were return migrants and 40 (4.9%) were households having both current and return migrants (Table 1).

Table 1: Ward-wise distribution of sample households by cross-border migration status

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

Source: Field Survey, 2011.

RESULTS

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

Involvement of ancestors in cross-border migration

Among, 426 cross-border migrant households, 172 (40.4%) migrant's ancestors were found participating in cross-border migration to India, which composed 62 (36%), and 110 (64%) return and current migrants (Table 1).

Among the total of 172 migrants' ancestors, 13.4 percent had participated in cross-border migration since the time before grandfathers, 39 percent participated since the time of grandfather, and 48 percent from the time if their fathers. More than two thirds of migrant's ancestors participating in cross-border migration are indicative of high degree of continuity of cross-border migrants through generations. This represents the inter-generational transmission of negative and positive experiences of cross-border migration. Many migrant sending households have a migration 'tradition' which is passed from one generation to the next (Table 2).

Table 2:Distribution of migrants according to their ancestors participated in cross-border migration

Participation of ancestors in cross-border migration	Return migrants		Current migrants		Total migrants	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	62	40.0	110	40.6	172	40.4
No	93	60.0	161	59.4	254	59.6
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0
If yes, since when?						
Before my grandfather's time	9	14.5	14	12.7	23	13.4
During my grandfather's time	25	40.3	42	38.2	67	39.0
From my father's time	28	45.2	54	49.1	82	47.6
Total	62	100.0	110	100.0	172	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2011.

Source of information of cross-border migrants

The social process of network growth helps to explain the migration. Migrant networks are about 40 percent of cross-border migrants, friends were their source of information followed by family members (26.5%), relatives and about 9 percent of previous migrants (Table 3). The sources of information also were from Meith who receives commission from both employers and migrants.

Table 3: Distribution of cross-border migrants according to their sources of information

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

Source: Field Survey, 2011.

Social networks create the transferability of social capital to incoming migrants and yield a better circulation of necessary information, which fosters mobility. Such network effects can result in either benefits (positive externality) or costs (negative externality) for the host country and its citizens (Massey et al., 1993). Positive externalities imply that the utility of the migrant will be larger in the host country, when social networks of peers are well-developed and maintained.

Migration networks are an influential factor in the migration decision (Fawcett, 1989). Migration networks serve to reduce the costs and risks of migration, making it a more attractive option (Wilpert, 1992). Networks further facilitate migration by giving assistance before, during and after the migration, not only by giving information, but also by, for instance, financing travel costs or helping to find housing or a job (Hugo, 2007). In this way networks make international migration attractive as a strategy for survival or to improve one's situation (Massey et al., 1993).

Cross-border migrants and their fellows while joining work

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

Out of total 426 total migrants, about 36 percent reported that they joined alone in their working place in India, 31 percent were accompanied by friends, 17 percent accompanied by relatives, 15 percent accompanied by family members and only nearly two percent by Meiths (Table 4). This shows possibility of exploitation in cross border migration from Nepal to India is low because near about 98 percent cross border Nepalese migrants have secured accompanies (self, friends, relatives, family members) for joining their working place in India.

Table 4: Distribution of cross-border migrants according to their accompanies while joining to work in India

Accompanies of cross-border migrants while joining to work	Return migrants		Current migrants		Total migrants	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Alone	53	34.2	100	36.9	153	35.9
Friends	56	36.1	75	27.7	131	30.8
Relatives	24	15.5	48	17.7	72	16.9
Family members	17	11.0	45	16.6	62	14.5
Meith	5	3.2	3	1.1	8	1.9
Total	155	100.0	271	100.0	426	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2011.

Decision makers of cross-border migrants while joining work

Demographic attributes, life-cycle stage, attachment to place, social capital and environmental values, drive migration decisions. An individual moves with an expectation for being better off

elsewhere. Family is the decision-making unit because household income rather than individual income is the appropriate concept for studying income influences on migration.

Cross-border migrants themselves are mainly responsible to carry out decision in migration process. Out of total cross-border migrants, almost two thirds made their own decision to migrate for work in India. Parents and spouse together account for about one third of the cross-border migrants to decide to migrate to India for work (Table 5).

Table 5: Distribution of decision maker of cross-border migrants in migration process

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

Source: Field Survey, 2011.

DISCUSSION

Todaro & Maruszko (1987) analyzed individual's decision to migrate when legal migration is prohibited, to set forth the equilibrium conditions under which illegal migration would cease and to examine the quantitative effect of USA immigration law. The conclusion of study was undocumented Mexican immigrants had created a trouble in American labour market. The flow of illegal migrants into USA could be reduced through the imposition of employer penalties and through tight border control. Similarly, Bean et al. (1988) examined the effect of undocumented Mexican immigrants on the earnings of other workers in different market, with the help of 1980 census of USA. Push factors in Mexico were stronger than pull factors in the USA in predicting the rate of out-migration. In Mexico, wages, commodity prices, farm productivity, and levels of investment in agriculture raised due to out-migration to the USA (Jenkins, 1977).

Using the data collected by the International Organization of Migration (IOM) of 213 women (who were trafficked or migrated to China and had lived in for time and had returned to their origin community by the time of study in Ha Long city, Mong Cai town, and Yen Hung district of Quang Ninh province of Vietnam). Duong et al. (2005) analyzed the main motivating factor for Vietnamese women who go to China crossing the border is for finding a husband and having a child. Because of its proximity to China with convenient transportation and cross-border trade, the Vietnamese provinces have been important source and transit provinces for international migration to China in the past few years.

The sheer scale of the cross-border movements of people has led to a growing interest in understanding their welfare effects. Migration affects welfare through two main channels. Firstly, a typical migrant moves from a low-labour-productivity country to a high-labour- productivity one. This has a direct impact on the migrants themselves, as well as on the remaining natives of

emigration countries through remittances. The second channel is that an inflow of migrants increases the size of the labour force, thereby increasing the mass of varieties available for consumption and as intermediate inputs.

The movement of people from rural areas in developing countries to cities and across borders, primarily in search of employment, is an inescapable consequence of development and the globalization process. Labour migration has become a persistent and accelerating reality in many developing countries. There is growing interest in understanding and quantifying the costs and benefits of migration. These cross-border flows have led to concerns in both sending and receiving countries.

The migration process, which is regarded as one of the key component in migration research has not been able to receive priorities in both governmental as well as nongovernmental level.

 In the context of Nepal, among cross border migrants' household's, 40 percent household's ancestors have already joined in cross border migration to India. Therefore, there has been significant contribution of intra generational flow in cross border migration to India. Similarly, nearly 40 percent cross border migrants have received information about opportunities to work in India through their friends, nearly 36 percent have crossed the border alone and more than 66 percent have decided themselves to joined work in India.

Limitations

There is no sufficient literature on cross border migration process. In addition the existing geographical, historical, cultural and political situation and relation between Nepal and India has unique one. Therefore, the findings of this study may not represent in cross border migration process between other countries.

CONCLUSION

Cross border migration issue of Nepalese people to India has a unique history. There has been much more discussions about causes and consequences of cross border migration but there is scanty of cross border migration process on Nepalese people to India. Participation of Ancestors' in cross border migration has contributed significantly to continuing new generation's migration to India. Network build with friends to receive information about working place in India, and moved alone to join work were reported as main contributing factors in migration process to India. Out of total cross border migrants only

Acknowledgements

REFERENCES

Bean, F.D., Loweell, B.L.,&Taylor, L.J. (1988). Undocumented Mexican immigrants and the earnings of other workers in the United States.*Demography*, 25(1),35-52.

Behra, S. (2011).*Trans-border identities: A study on the impact of Bangladeshi and Nepali migration to India*. ICRIER Policy Series, No. 1. New Delhi: Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations.

Casteles, S. (2008). *Development and migration-migration and development: What comes first?* A paper presented to Social Science Research Council Conference, 28 February-1 March, New York. Retrieved from<u>www.essays.ssrc.org/developmentpapers/wp-conten t/uploads/2cCastels.pdf</u>, accessed on 10 January 2011.

Casteles, S., & Miller, M.J. (2003). *The age of migration*. New York: Guilford Press.

_____ (1993). *The age of migration, Chicago area transportation study, 1959*. Final report.New York*:* Guilford.

Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) (2011). *Nepal living standard survey 2010-2011*. Kathmandu: CBS.

_____ (2004). *Nepal living standards survey 2003-2004*. Kathmandu: CBS.

_____ (2003). *Population monograph of Nepal*. Kathmandu: CBS.

_____ (1995). *Population monograph of Nepal*. Kathmandu: CBS.

Duong, L.B.,Belanger, D., &Hong, K.T. (2005). *Transnational migration, marriage and trafficking at the China-Vietnam border*. CEPED-CICRED-INED seminar on female deficit in Asia: Trends and perspectives, Singapore, 5-7 December. Retrieved from<u>www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/.../08-china-immigrants-shen, accessed on 20 May</u>2009.

Fawcett, J.T. (1989). Networks, linkages and migration systems. *International Migration Review*, 23(2),671-80.

Hugo, G. (2007). *International migration and development in Asia*. Presentation to 8th International Conference of the Asia Pacific Migration Research Network on the theme of migration, development and poverty reduction, Fuzhou, China, 25-29 May. Retrieved from <u>http://apmrn.usp.ac.fj/conferences/8thAPMRNconference/1.Hugo.pdf</u>, accessed on 18 January 2010.

International Organization for Migration (IOM). (2005). *Cross-border labour migration flows, Croatia-Italy: Focus on shipbuilding*. Geneva: IOM.

Jenkins, J.C. (1977). Push/pull in recent Mexican migration to the U.S. *International Migration Review*, 11(2),178-89.

Jha, H. (1999). *Status of informal sectors workers: The other side of economy In Nepal*. Kathmandu: Center for Economy and Technical Studies.

Massey, D.S., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouaouci, A., Pellegrino, A., &Taylor, J.E. (1993). Theories of international migration: A review and appraisal. *Population and Development Review*, 19(3),431-66.

Samuels, F.,&Wagle, S. (2011).*Population mobility and HIV and AIDS: Review of laws, policies and treaties between Bangladesh, Nepal and India*.London:Overseas Development Institute.

Sheddon, D. (2005). *Nepal's dependence on exporting labour*. Washington D.C.: Migration Policy Institute.

Seddon, D., Adhikari, J.,& Gurung, G. (2001). *The new lahures: Foreign employment and remittance economy of Nepal*. Kathmandu: Nepal Institute of Development Studies.

Thieme, S. (2006). Social networks and migration: Far-west Nepalese labour migrants in Delhi. *Münster*, 36-40.

Todaro, M.P., &Maruszko, L. (1987). Illegal migration and US immigration reform: A conceptual framework. *Population and Development Review*, 13(1),101-14.

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs(UN DESA). (2015).*Trends in international migrants stock*.Retrieved from POP/DB/MIG/Stock/Rev.2015.

Wilpert, C. (1992). The use of social networks in Turkish migration to Germany.In Kritz, M.M., Lin, L.L., & Zlotnik, H. (eds.) *International migration systems*. London: Clarendon Press, 199-215.

World Bank. (2010).*Migration and development.*BriefNo. 24.Press release of 13 April 2015.