

INTERSTATE MIGRATION IN INDIA: 1971-1981

A.S. Kadi

Karnatak University, Dharwad, India

and

M. Sivamurthy

Bangalore University, Bangalore, India

Résumé — Nous examinons le volume, les facteurs et les motivations de la migration entre états de l'Inde durant la période 1971-81. Les données sont de l'échantillon de 5 pourcent du recensement de 1981. Nous estimons qu'il y avait environ 11,37 millions de migrants entre états durant la période 1971-81, dont 5,93 millions étaient des femmes. Parmi les quatre types de mouvement entre régions urbaines et rurales, trois sont d'importance à peu près égale (rural à rural, rural à urbain, urbain à urbain) tandis que la quatrième (urbain à rural) était d'importance limitée. En ce qui concerne les motivations de la migration, l'emploi et la migration de la famille étaient importants pour les hommes, et le mariage et la migration de la famille pour les femmes. Les états qui reçoivent le plus d'immigrants sont ceux qui ont le plus de développement industriel, les plus grandes villes, le plus de développement en agriculture, et ceux qui sont favorisés dans les politiques gouvernementales.

Abstract — This paper is concerned with the volume, pattern and reasons for interstate migration in India during the decade 1971-81. The data used are from the 1981 census of India tabulated on a five per cent sample basis. It is estimated that there were about 11.37 million interstate migrants during the decade 1971-81, among

whom 5.93 million were females. Among the component flows between urban-rural areas, the three flows rural to rural, rural to urban, and urban to urban were almost equal in volume, while the urban to rural flow was comparatively quite small. As for the reported reasons for migration, "employment" and "family moved" are prominent for male migrants and "marriage" and "family moved" for female migrants. Finally, the link between migration and the socioeconomic situation in the 14 major states of India is examined. It is shown that the states with large industrial and urban bases, those experiencing agricultural development, and those which are favoured by government policies experienced significant immigration during the decade.

Key Words – volume of migration, pattern of migration, reasons for migration, socioeconomic development

Introduction

The present study is concerned with the interstate migration in India during the decade 1971-81. It attempts to highlight the volume, pattern and reasons for migration, and to link migration with the socioeconomic development in the Indian states.

Interstate migration in India has been studied before using data from the earlier censuses (Davis, 1951; Kumar, 1967; Kshirasagar, 1973; Sivamurthy and Kadi, 1983; Zachariah, 1964). Although some limited analysis of the 1981 census data on migration has been done by other researchers (Nair and Narain, 1985; Premi, 1983), detailed analysis of these data – especially the data on the reasons for migration, which were collected for the first time on the 1981 census – seems to have not yet been undertaken.

Data Used and their Limitations

The data used in the study come from the five per cent tabulation of the data collected in the 1981 census and refer to the 14 major states in India and to the country as a whole. The tabulations provide classification of migrants based on the place of birth (POB) and the place of last residence (PLR), duration of stay at the place of enumeration and reasons for migration.

For the first time in the Indian censuses, reasons for migration have been asked from the respondents, although these are categorized only broadly as (a) employment, (b) education, (c) family moved, (d) marriage movement and (e) others. The data are published by sex separately for rural and urban areas.

The limitations of the census data for migration studies are well-known in the literature (Sivamurthy and Kadi, 1983; United Nations, 1970; Zachariah, 1977). In particular, Willekens and Nair (1982) have written a special discussion on the Indian census data on migration emphasizing their uses and limitations. However, two particular limitations of the 1981 data at hand may be mentioned here: (a) The data are based on a sample and are subject to sampling errors; and (b) Detailed origin-destination flow data on migration are not yet available and hence the data permit the estimation of only the decade's volume of out-migration from the respective states.

Estimation of the Migration Volumes

First, the volumes of out-migration during 1971-81 were obtained from the tabulations of PLR data by duration of stay. Then net migration was estimated from the POB data using the following relationship:

$$\begin{aligned}
 NM_i(1971-81) = [LIM_i(1981) - LOM_i(1981)] \\
 - [S_i LIM_i(1971) - S_N LOM_i(1971)] \quad (1)
 \end{aligned}$$

where $NM_i(1971-81)$ = Volume of interstate net migration during 1971-81 to state i ,

$LIM_i(1981), LIM_i(1971)$ = Volume of interstate lifetime in-migration to state i , as per the census,

$LOM_i(1981), LOM_i(1971)$ = Volume of interstate lifetime out-migration from state i , as per the census,

$S_i = S_N (1 - DR_i) / (1 - DR_N)$ = Adjusted national census survival ratio for state i ,

S_N = the national census survival ratio, and

DR_i, DR_N = Crude death rate for state i and for nation.

Finally, the volumes of in-migration were estimated using the relationship:

$$IM_i(1971-81) = NM_i(1971-81) + OM_i(1971-81) \quad (2)$$

where $IM_i(1971-81)$ = Volume of interstate in-migration to state i during 1971-81,

and $OM_i(1971-81)$ = Volume of interstate out-migration from state i during 1971-81.

The use of $OM_i(1971-81)$ from the PLR data in estimating $IM_i(1971-81)$ in equation (2) is justified from the observation that the enumerated volumes and the rates of out-migration in the 1971 and 1981 censuses using POB and PLR data were found to be almost same, except for West Bengal and Maharashtra. Even for these two states, the differences were found to be statistically not significant.

The estimates thus obtained are presented in Table 1 for males and females separately. These are more precise than the estimates derived by Premi (1983) or Nair and Narain (1985) because of the fact that the adjusted CSRs have been used here to take account of the mortality conditions in each state, and also because the migration data used for estimating net migration volumes do not contain the immigrants, as did the estimates prepared by Premi (1983). Further, these estimates are not inconsistent as were the estimates obtained by Nair and Narain (1985), in the sense that the estimates of in- and out-migration volumes for the 1971-81 decade are not found to be less than the corresponding volumes for the 1961-71 decade. Such results are rather difficult to justify given the expectation that the volume of migration should have increased in view of the relative developmental activities in the country.

Volume and Pattern of Migration

According to the 1981 census counts, there were 202 million lifetime internal migrants, forming 30.3 per cent of the 1981 total population. Among these, only 23.42 million (about 11 per cent of the total internal migrants) were interstate lifetime migrants. Compared to the position in the developed countries, this volume may be considered as probably small. Interstate socioeconomic and linguistic differences, as well as the comparatively low level of economic development in India, are thought to be the reasons for this low volume of interstate migration. However, it must be mentioned that the low level of interstate mobility had been noted in earlier studies (Davis, 1951; Zachariah, 1964) and also in other countries. The rural character of the population (74 per cent was rural as per the 1981 census), illiteracy (the literacy rate in 1981 was only 34 per cent) and poverty (about 48 per cent of the population was found to be below the poverty line) all seem to act in limiting the volume of interstate moves.

For the decade 1971-81, the volume of interstate migration was 11.37 million persons, which is about 49 per cent of the lifetime interstate migration in 1981. This indicates an increase of 2 million migrants during the decade 1971-81, as compared to the previous decade 1961-71.

TABLE 1. INTERSTATE MOVEMENT OF MIGRANTS BY STATES: 1971-1981

State	Out-migration*			Estimated Volume of Net-Migration			Estimated Volume of In-Migration		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8=2+5	9=3+6	10=4+7
	(Figures in 000's)								
Andhra Pradesh	265	288	533	-69	-90	-159	196	198	394
Bihar	628	419	1047	-139	-146	-285	489	273	762
Gujarath	171	195	366	136	79	215	307	274	581
Haryana	168	321	489	30	-30	0	198	291	489
Karnatak	313	360	673	10	34	44	323	394	717
Kerala	272	209	481	-54	-102	-156	218	107	325
Madhya Pradesh	307	430	737	-14	-42	-56	293	388	681
Maharashtra	331	397	728	464	341	805	704	738	1532
Orissa	117	115	232	91	104	195	209	219	428
Punjab	234	265	499	112	260	372	346	291	637
Rajasthan	310	359	669	11	3	14	321	361	682
Tamil Nadu	330	303	633	-152	-93	-245	178	210	388
Uttar Pradesh	1309	911	2220	-767	-351	-1118	542	559	1101
West Bengal	214	246	459	-88	46	-42	126	292	418

Source: * Census of India 1981, Series - 1, India, Part-II-Special Report and Tables based on 5 percent Sample data. Table D-2: Migrants Classified by place of last residence and duration of residence in place of enumeration - Total, Registrar General and Census Commissioner for India, New Delhi.

Also, a substantial volume of return migration seems to exist in India. For instance, the interstate lifetime migrants enumerated in the 1971 census were 18.85 million, and if the 11.37 million migrants for the decade 1971-81 are added to the same, it would mean that 30.22 million interstate lifetime migrants should have been enumerated in 1981. Allowing for the maximum effect of mortality during 1971-81, the expected number of lifetime interstate migrants enumerated in the 1981 census must have been about 29.76 million. But the actual enumerated volume was 23.42 million. This implies that a rough estimate of about 6.34 million migrants (about one-fifth of the expected volume) moved to another state or returned to their state of origin. Errors in the reporting of POB and/or PLR would have contributed to some extent to this figure. However, earlier studies have also shown the existence of substantial return migration in the Indian context (Sivamurthy and Kadi, 1984; Zachariah, 1967). Therefore, it appears useful and important to study the primary, secondary and return migration in order to gain more complete knowledge of migration in India. Towards this end, it would be most useful if the migration data are cross-classified by POB and PLR (along with duration of stay and/or age-sex, if feasible).

Regarding the migration of females, it is observed that in the intrastate migration females outnumber males to a greater extent — forming about 64 per cent (45 million) of the total intrastate migration — than in the interstate migration, where they form about 52 per cent (5.93 million) of the total migrants during 1971-81. Further, the intensity of female migration increased during 1971-81, as compared to the earlier periods.

The migration situation during 1971-81 in the 14 major Indian states can be studied from the estimates presented in Table 1. While Maharashtra, Gujarat, Orissa, Punjab, Karnataka, Rajasthan and Haryana show positive net balances, Andhrapradesh, Bihar, Kerala, Madhyapradesh, Tamil Nadu, Uttarpradesh and West Bengal have experienced negative net balances during the decade. Madhyapradesh and West Bengal have shifted their positions from net-gaining to losing states, whereas Punjab and Rajasthan have freshly entered the net-gaining group. Maharashtra, Gujarat and Orissa have been areas of strong attraction, with low outflows. On the other hand, Uttarpradesh, Bihar, Kerala and Tamil Nadu have experienced large outflows rather than inflows. For the last several decades, Uttarpradesh has remained in first place among the losing states, while Maharashtra has acquired first place among the gaining states only during this decade.

Another interesting picture of the pattern of interstate migration may be obtained by analyzing the component flows: rural to rural ($R \rightarrow R$), rural to urban ($R \rightarrow U$), urban to urban ($U \rightarrow U$), and urban to rural ($U \rightarrow R$), which

**TABLE 2. ANALYSIS OF THE MIGRATION COMPONENT
FLOWS: 1971-1981**

Type of Flow	% Share of Each Flow	Total Migrants in the Flow (Million)	Male Migrants in the Flow (Million)	Female Migrants in the Flow (Million)	Percentage of Males & Females in the Flow	
					Male	Female
Total Flow	100	11.37	5.44	5.93	47.85	52.15
R→R	31.57	3.59	1.21	2.38	33.70	66.30
R→U	29.29	3.33	1.96	1.37	58.86	41.14
U→U	29.99	3.41	1.73	1.68	50.73	49.27
U→R	9.15	1.04	0.54	0.50	51.92	48.08

Source: Table D-2; Migrants classified by place of last residence and duration of residence in place of enumeration - Total, Rural, Urban. Census of India 1981, Series - 1, India, Part II Special Reports and Tables based on 5 percent sample data, Registrar General and Census Commissioner, New Delhi.

are presented in Table 2. It may be observed from the table that the sizes of the R → R, R → U and U → U flows are approximately the same, while the size of U → R flow is fairly small. In India, the process of urbanization and its consequences are still in the initial stage, except in the case of a few metropolitan cities like Bangalore, Bombay, Calcutta and Madras, and therefore the U → R flow has not yet become significant, as in the case of Western cities (Aprodicio, 1983). Further, males outnumber females in the R → U and U → U flows, while females outnumber males in the R → R flow. This seems to be related to the fact that a majority of females migrate because of marriage (see below).

Reasons for Migration

Reasons for migration are more difficult to discern, as often it may not be possible even for the migrants to pinpoint the motive behind their moves. However, it may be expected that people report the most dominant reason for migration when asked about the same. In this section, the reasons reported by the respondents to the census questionnaire are analyzed.

As mentioned earlier, the reasons for migration (in broad categories) were asked for the first time in the Indian census of 1981. Table 3 displays the dis-

TABLE 3. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF INTERSTATE MIGRANTS ACCORDING TO REASONS: 1971-1981 (CURRENT FLOWS)

Type of Flow	Male						Female					
	E	ED	FM	MR	OS	TOTAL	E	ED	FM	MR	OS	TOTAL
Total Flow	47	5	25	5	18	100	6	2	37	41	14	100
R→R	41	3	30	2	24	100	6	1	25	54	14	100
R→U	59	6	21	1	13	100	6	3	44	34	13	100
U→U	47	6	26	13	15	100	6	4	42	35	13	100
R→R	37	3	28	1	31	100	7	2	37	35	18	100

Notations: E = Employment; ED = Education; FM = Family Move; MR = Marriage; OS = Others.

Source: Table D-3: Migrants by sex, place of last residence, duration of residence and reasons for migration - Total, Rural, Urban. Census of India 1981, Series - 1, India, Part-II Special Reports and Tables based on 5 percent sample data, Registrar General and Census Commissioner, New Delhi.

tribution of interstate migrants during 1971-81 in the different component flows by reasons for migration. It may be observed that a large number of males (about 47 per cent of the total male migrants) had moved for employment reasons, while a large number of females (about 41 per cent of the total female migrants) had moved for "marriage" reasons. Migration because "family moved" is also found to be significant and occupies second place, with 25 per cent of the male migrants and 37 per cent of the female migrants reporting to have moved for this reason. However, it may be noted that there could be some confusion between the reasons "marriage" and "family moved," especially in the case of females, for whom the two reasons together account for about 78 per cent of the decade's migrants.

Examining the distribution of migrants in the component flows by reasons (presented in Table 3), it may be observed that in the urbanward flows a larger proportion of migrants had moved for "employment" reasons than in the ruralward flows. Further, migrants to urban areas seem to have taken a fewer number of dependents than did migrants to rural areas. Uncertainty in the urban job market, housing problems and the high cost of living may be the factors discouraging these migrants from taking their dependents with them, at least in the early days of migration.

TABLE 4. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANTS
ACCORDING TO REASONS: PAST MIGRANTS
(10 + YEARS DURATION OF STAY)

Type of Flow	Male						Female					
	E	ED	FM	MR	OS	TOTAL	E	ED	FM	MR	OS	TOTAL
Total Flow	55	2.5	24	1.5	17	100	3	1.0	22	67	7	100
R→R	33	2	38	4	23	100	2	0.2	10	84	3.8	100
R→U	67	3	16	0.6	13.4	100	5	1	32	53	9	100
U→U	54	3	26	0.8	16.2	100	4	2	34	50	10	100
U→R	34	2	32	2	30	100	3	0.5	18	71	7.5	100

Notations: See Table 3

Source: See Table 3

Table 4 presents the distribution of past migrants (that is, stayers among past migrants, with duration of stay of more than 10 years) in the component flows by reasons for migration. An important point that is apparent in comparing the distributions in Table 3 and 4, is that in the R → U and U → U flows, the proportion of males moving for “employment” reasons has substantially decreased, while in the R → R and U → R flows it has increased. Increasing unemployment in urban areas, preference for locals in employment, and the recent government emphasis on rural development all seem to have contributed to this situation. Also, the growing interest in education appears to be inducing a larger number of male migrants to move for “education” purposes. However, the limitation in this comparison must not be overlooked: that the stayers among past migrants are the migrants who survived and did not move from their destinations.

In the case of female migrants, there has been a very substantial decrease in the proportion of those moving for “marriage” and “family moved” reasons, whereas the proportions moving for “employment” and “education” have increased. These observations are in line with the expectations, in view of the development taking place in the country.

If we consider the rural-urban pattern in reasons for migration in each state (data not presented here), it is found that more than 60 per cent of male out-migrants from rural areas in Uttarpradesh, Bihar and Kerala – which are com-

paratively less developed — have moved to urban areas of other states, and among them 60 per cent have migrated for “employment” reasons. Also, more than 70 per cent of male migrants from urban areas of these states have chosen urban areas of other states and have moved for “employment” reasons. The proportion moving for “employment” reasons is comparatively less among male out-migrants from Maharashtra, Gujarat and Punjab, which are relatively more developed.

On the other hand, more than 60 per cent of female migrants from rural areas of Bihar, Madhyapradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Rajasthan and West Bengal have chosen rural areas of other states as their destinations, while more than that percentage among female migrants from rural areas of Gujarat, Haryana, Kerala and Uttarpradesh have moved to urban destinations. Also, while a large proportion of female migrants from rural origins have moved for “marriage” reasons, those from urban origins have moved due to “family move”. This may just be the result of rural people preferring nearby places in matrimonial relationships.

Migrations and Socioeconomic Development

In this section, an attempt is made to review the association of in- and out-migration in each state with corresponding socioeconomic development of the state, using the indicators: literacy rate, percentage of urban population, population size, density, number of factories, employment and per capita income. The relevant data are presented in Table 5.

From these figures, it may also be said that the large number of in-migrants to Maharashtra and Gujarat states are mainly due to their high degree of urbanization and industrialization. Cities like Bombay and Poona of Maharashtra, and Ahamadabad and Surath Kheda of Gujarat, are considered to be industrially developed centres (Mahesh Chand and Puri, 1983). According to the 1974-75 figures (see Table 5), these two states alone accounted for about one-third of all factory employment, per capita income and gross output of industry.

High in-migration into Punjab and Haryana, on the other hand, may be attributed to their sound economic conditions resulting from agricultural development; the per capita average food grain production was 529 kg, and 410 kg, respectively, and about 80 per cent of all gross cropped areas of these two states had irrigation facilities. In industrial development, these states rank fourth and sixth.

TABLE 5. DEMO-SOCIO-ECONOMIC INDICATORS BY STATE

State	Population Size 1981 (Million)	Density 1981 (per Km ²)	Per-centage Urban Popula-tion 1981	Literacy Rate 1981	Number of Factories 1974-75	Employment (in 00's) 1974-75	Gross Output in Industry Per Capita (in Rs.) 1975-76	Per Capita Income at Current Prices (in Rs.) 1975
Andhra Pradesh	53.6	195	23.3	29.9	5542	4399	3616	897
Bihar	69.9	402	12.5	26.2	2528	3017	325	669
Gujarath	34.1	174	31.1	43.7	6860	5639	1014	1236
Haryana	12.9	291	22.0	36.1	1243	1203	672	1514
Karnataka	37.1	194	28.9	38.5	3978	2928	387	1038
Kerala	25.4	655	18.3	70.4	2583	2435	374	1000
Madhya Pradesh	52.2	118	20.3	27.9	2562	2549	273	790
Maharashtra	62.8	204	35.0	47.2	10835	11659	1301	1455
Orissa	26.4	169	11.8	34.2	914	984	215	834
Punjab	16.8	333	27.7	40.9	3707	1641	688	1688
Rajasthan	34.3	100	20.9	24.4	1399	1222	247	873
Tamil Nadu	48.4	372	33.9	46.8	6957	6031	653	997
Uttar Pradesh	110.9	377	18.0	27.2	4819	5072	212	727
West Bengal	54.6	615	26.5	40.9	5854	5773	705	1100
India	685.2	216	23.7	36.2	64215 (total)	60528 (total)	500	918

Source: Tables 1.1, 1.2, 1.5 India, 1984 - A Reference Manual (1985) Publication Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Govt. of India, New Delhi.
 Table - 6: Selected indicators of development for different states of India; Mahesh Chand and V.K. Puri (1983), Regional Planning in India, Allied Pub., New Delhi.

The state of Karnataka improved economically after the second Five Year Plan (1956-57 to 1961-62) through agriculture and industrial development and raised its per capita income to Rs. 1038 in 1975 (US \$86 according to the 1975 exchange rate). As a consequence, the state has started attracting more migrants from other states.

Among the gaining states, it is rather difficult to explain the in-migration into Orissa and Rajasthan. These two states have been recognized as economically backward areas. However, in recent years the central government has allocated more funds and issued many licences to start industries in these two states. During the period 1971-81, for instance, these two states experienced a remarkable increase in their population of urban areas, the change in the proportion urban being 68 per cent in Orissa and 57 per cent in Rajasthan — significantly higher than the national level of urbanization of 46 per cent. These factors seem to have caused the high in-migration into these states.

Among the net out-migrating states, Uttarpradesh and Bihar share the highest levels of out-migration in India. But to a large extent, these states have also been compensated by a large number of in-migrants possibly containing a large number of return migrants, as has been observed for the period 1961-71 (Sivamurthy and Kadi, 1984). High out-migration from these two states seems to be due to a large concentration of population and low economic development. According to the 1981 census, these two states together accounted for 26 per cent of the total population of the country; economically they rank fourteenth and sixteenth among the 17 states studied (Mahesh Chand and Puri, 1983).

Another state experiencing large out-migration is Kerala, but the reasons in the case of Kerala appear to be different. It is a densely populated state with 655 persons per square kilometre, has less agricultural land and low urbanization, and the proportion literate is about 70 per cent — the highest among all the states in India. These act as push-factors causing high out-migration from this state. Similar push-factors seem to be applicable to Tamil Nadu, though to a lesser extent. Madhyapradesh, on the other hand, is a state experiencing high out-migration in spite of low density of population. This out-migration is probably due to the lower level of socioeconomic development in the state.

West Bengal state deserves a special mention because, having been consistently a high in-migrating state in India, it has shown a net out-migration of males during the decade 1971-81. Also, about 70 per cent of the in-migrants to this state had moved into the metropolitan city, Calcutta, which is an industrially well-established city in India (Sivamurthy and Kadi, 1983). According to the 1981 census, Calcutta had an overflowing population of 10 million —

accounting for 64 per cent of the state's urban population – experiencing high unemployment, congestion, housing shortages, air pollution, slums and inadequate city services. These factors might have contributed in initiating the outward flow from the state. However, this needs to be examined further with more adequate data than are available here.

Acknowledgments

We express our thanks to the two anonymous referees for their valuable comments and suggestions to an earlier draft of this paper.

References

- Aprodicio, L. 1983. Complexities of migration. *POPULI* 10:6-16.
- Davis, K. 1951. *The Population of India and Pakistan*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kumar, J. 1967. The pattern of internal migration in India during 1951-61. In contributed papers, Sydney Conference, Australia, 21-25 August, International Union for the Scientific Study of Population.
- Kshirasagar, S. 1973. Pattern of internal migration of males in India. *Artha Vijnana* 15:161-179.
- Mahesh Chand and V.K. Puri. 1983. *Regional Planning in India*. New Delhi: Allied Publishers.
- Nair, P.S. and V. Narain. 1985. Internal migration in India: Demographic knowledge and policy issues. Paper presented in the Seminar on the Use of Demographic Knowledge for Policy Formulation, Implimentation and Evaluation: The Case of South: East and South-east Asia, organized by International Union for the Scientific Study of Population, Indian Association for the Study of Population, and International Institute for Population Sciences, at Bombay, India.
- Premi, M.K. 1983. Migration and population distribution in India. Paper presented at the IX Annual Conference of the Indian Association for the Study of Population, held at Jaipur, December.
- Ravenstein, E.G. 1885. Laws of migration. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* 48:167-227.

- _____. 1889. Laws of migration. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* 51:241-301.
- Sivamurthy, M. and A.S. Kadi. 1983. Interstate migration in India: 1961-71. *Demography India* 12:239-258.
- _____. 1984. Interstate return migration in India: 1961-71. *Janasamkhya* 2:91-104.
- United Nations. 1970. *Manual VI: Methods of Measuring Internal Migration*. ST/SOA/Series A/47. New York: United Nations.
- Willekens, F. and P.S. Nair. 1982. The data base for migration analysis in developing countries: With emphasis on India. Working Paper No. 28. Netherlands, Voorburg: Netherlands Inter-University Demographic Institute.
- Zachariah, K.C. 1964. *A Historical Study of Migration in the Indian Sub-Continent: 1901-1931*. Bombay: Asia Publishing House.
- _____. 1967. Estimation of return migration from place of birth and duration of residence data. In *Contributed Papers, Sydney Conference, Australia, 21-25 August, International Union for the Scientific Study of Population*.
- _____. 1977. Measurement of internal migration from census data. In A.A. Brown and E. Neuberger (eds.), *Internal Migration*. New York: Academic Press.

Received June, 1985; revised July, 1986.