INDIAN DEVELOPMENT POLICY REVIEW
Vol. 3, No. 1, 2022, 67-80

URL : www.esijournals.com

Internal Migration and Education of Left-Behind Children: Evidence from Rural India

Ananda Meher[1] and Roshan Padhan[2]

[1]Ph.D. from School of Economics, University of Hyderabad, and working as a Research Fellow at IIPH, Hyderabad, E-mail: aanandameher@gmail.com
[2]Roshan Padhan, Ph.D. Scholar, School of Economics, University of Hyderabad, 500046, E-mail: roshanpadhan7377@gmail.com

Article History

Received : 19 March 2022
Revised : 20 April 2022
Accepted : 25 April 2022
Published : 18 June 2022

Citation

Ananda Meher & Roshan Padhan (2022). Internal Migration and Education of Left-Behind Children: Evidence from Rural India. *Indian Development Policy Review*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 67-80.

Abstract: The impact of migration on human development differs across developing countries. This paper analyses the impact of internal migration on children's education of migrant households in rural India. Child education is one of the critical variables to understand the future development path of any country. UNESCO's Global Education Monitoring Report 2019 acknowledges that internal migration has a severe influence on the educational achievement of children both at the destination and the source areas. This study has investigated the impact of cyclical migration on the dropout (from primary education) rate of left-behind children in source areas of rural India from 64th round of the NSS survey. The study has constructed a binary logistic regression to analyse the impact of migration on children dropout rate in rural India. The result of binary logistic regression suggests that the children of migrant households have a higher probability of dropout than the children of non-migrant households. The average predicted probability of dropout is also high among the children of cyclical migrant households compared to the children of non-migrant households over different socio-economic variables. The girls and boys of migrant households have a higher chance of dropout from primary education than the girls and boys of non-migrant households. Most girls are engaged in domestic duties after dropout, whereas the boys are engaged in agricultural activities. The Migration leads to the feminisation of agriculture, so the school going girl child takes responsibility of domestic duties of their family.

Keywords: Labour Migration, Children Education, Human Capital, Rural India.

JEL Code: R23, I25

I. INTRODUCTION

Migration for employment is explained either as an alternative or a better opportunity than the current availability. However, migration in a developing country is a matter of survival for the rural poor masses; they come out of agriculture and get stuck in urban informal jobs without any employment certainty and risk (Breman, 2009); (2013). The impact of migration on human development differs across developing countries. This paper analyses the impact of internal migration on left-behind children's education in rural India. Children education are one of the critical processes to understand the future development process. UNESCO's Global Education Monitoring Report, 2019, says that migration plays a vital role in determining education investment and interrupting the experience and outcome. It acknowledges that internal migration has a severe impact on children's educational achievement both at the destination and those left behind in the source areas. Even in some cases where educational opportunities are better in destination areas, due to the biases and stereotypes towards migrants, their children's quality of education is not good (UNESCO, 2019).

In most cases, the children are considered an additional workforce in the seasonal migrant families, and hence they drop out of schools and become child labour (Bengtsson & Dyer, 2017). A study of 600 Cambodian households by Vutha shows that the girl children left behind at the source area are at a greater risk of being dropout (Vutha, Pide, & Dalis, 2014). A study on the educational facility in the brick kiln side suggests that culture, language, lifestyle, cleanliness and clothing create major barriers to productive engagement between teachers and the children. Student absenteeism is a big challenge as most children are engaged in kilns, and the poor learning conditions in such schools also lead to teacher absenteeism (Reed, 2012).

Chandrasekhar and Bhattacharya found that children's educational level from high out-migration districts is lower than other districts in India. Using the 2011 Census and NSSO 2014 Education Survey, they calculated the Age-Specific Attendance Ratio (ARR), which is lower in high out-migration districts. Their estimate shows that states like Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Odisha, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal, where seasonal migration is very high, account for 79 per cent of children who are enrolled in schools but not attending. The main reason for the dropout of boys is to help their families by working outside, while in the case of girls, the primary cause of dropout is helping in domestic chores (Chandrasekhar & Bhattasharya, 2018). They have also identified the language barrier as one of the challenges in finding qualified teachers to deal with diverse students is also very challenging.

On this background, the main objective of this article is to verify the impact of internal cyclical migration on their children dropout rate in Rural India. Most cyclical

migration in rural India is distress in nature and a survival strategy for poor households (Breman, 2013); (Keshari & Bhagat , 2012); (2013). When a male working family member migrates out, someone from their family needs to replace in labour and mostly agricultural activities. The phenomenon of out-migration is closely associated with the feminisation of the agrarian workforce (Tumbe, 2015); (Desai & Benarji, 2008); (Raphael, 2013). The feminisation of agriculture again needs someone to work in domestic duty in their house. In most cases, the schooling-going girls replace the young female (those engaged in the agricultural field) in domestic duty. The schooling boys replace the migrant male member in labour and agricultural activity. Our theoretical construction explains a negative relationship between migration and the educational attainment of children of migrant households in rural India. Our null hypothesis suggests that migration does not (positive effect) have any impact on children education. The study constructs cross-tabulation and binary logistic regression analysis to verify the objective or nullify hypothesis. The following section illustrates the data and methodology and the basic idea of internal migration and its relation to education. The fourth section elucidates the result of binary logistic regression to substantiate migration's impact on the left-behind children's dropout rate and finally conclude with some policy remarks.

II. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

This study empirically investigates the impact of internal migration on the education of their children in Rural India. We have taken dropout among 6 to 14 years of age children as a proxy variable to measure access to education. When any household member migrates out, it generates higher income for the household, but it also creates a shortage of labour force in the households, pushing the school going children to partially or fully engage in household activities. We have used unit-level data from the 'employment, unemployment and migration survey' 64th round of NSSO to verify the hypothesis. The 64th round of NSSO has collected information from 125578 sample households. Out of the total sample households, we have included samples from rural India, consisting of 79091 sample households and 374294 individuals. For the cross-tabulation analysis, weightage has been used to calculate their respective percentages. The samples include internal cyclical migrant and non-migrant households and individual in this research. In logistic regression analysis, the study scrutinises the children's activity status in the age group of 6 to 14 years, whether they are going to school or engaged in other activities. If a child in the desired age group participates in other activities than education, we code it as a dropout. The total sample number of children in rural India is 75021, which is also the total number of observations in the cross-tabulation analysis.

METHODOLOGY

To analyse the impact of migration on the dropout rate in rural India, we have regressed children's activity status in 6 to 14 years with cyclical migrant households' dummy and some other socio-economic variables. The binary logistic regression model has been used to determine the dropout rate of children in the desired age group. Binary Logistic regression estimates the probability of an event that occurred for any given linear combination of Independent variables (Gujurati, 2004).

P = E(Y/X) (outcome of Interest/ all possible outcome)

Y= {1 if a child is dropout OR 0 if a child is going to school}

Odds- (P/(1-P)) = (Probability of occurring / probability of not occurring)

Logit is Natural Log of Odd- LN((P/(1-P)) = $LN\{P|(1-P\} = X\beta + U$

$$P\hat{}(X) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-X\beta}}$$

$$\text{Odd Ratio= (Odd (X+1)/Odd(X)) =} \frac{\frac{P\hat{}(X+1)}{1-P(X+1)}}{\frac{P\hat{}(X)}{1-P(X)}} = \frac{e^{(X+1)\beta}}{e^{(X\beta)}} = e^{\beta}$$

Activity status is the dependent variable (Binary as either child in the age group 6 to 14 years is going to school or dropout). Independent variables include the households' socio-economic characteristics as land possessed, social group, monthly per capita consumption expenditure (MPCE), occupational types of household, gender, age and education level of households' head and gender of schooling age children.

X is the metrics of independent variables and â vector of regressor coefficient. In the model, land possess group and monthly per capita consumption expenditure (MPCE) explain households' economic status. Land possess divides into five categories as landless (less than 0.01 hectors), marginal farmer (0.011 to 1.00 hectors), Small farmer (1.001 to 2.00 hectors), medium Farmer (2.001 to 4.00 hectors) and large farmer (more than 4.001 hectors). The social category or caste represents the social status of the household, which is also of four categories as Schedule Caste (SC), Schedule Tribe (ST), Other Bacward Classes (OBC) and Other Castes (OC). Education is an essential factor in the awareness of children education. Hence, the education level of the household head has used as a proxy of educational awareness. The household size and age of the households head variable felicitates the household characteristics. The gender of the household head and children explains the gender impact on the dependent variable. Internal cyclical migration dummy has used to show the migration impact on child education.

Besides the regression analysis, this paper also uses cross-tabulation to show the migration rate and percentage distribution of migrant and non-migrant individual over education level across socioeconomic characteristics. The significant difference in the predicted probability of migrant and non-migrant households is verified through bivariate analysis. The t-test is used to examines the difference in the average predicted probability among migrant and non-migrant across socio-economic indicators. The percentage distribution of usual principal activities of dropout children again cross-tabulated across socioeconomic factors.

III. MIGRATION AND EDUCATION

We have used 64th round of NSSO 2007-08 to analyse the relationship between internal migration and children dropout in rural India. The study has taken internal migration from rural India for economic reason. The migration can be divided into three groups: seasonal migration or short-term migration, semi-permanent migration and permanent migration (Tumbe, 2015). There is a similar pattern in seasonal and semi-permanent migrant; both types of migrants engage in informal sectors of the economy, have a regular relationship with their home's socio-economic condition and return after some periods and migrate for their survival. Breman has defined these migrants as cyclical migration (Breman, 2013). If a working member of the households engages in cyclical migration for economic reason, we describe the households as migrant households. If a child in the age group of 6 to 14 define his work status other than education, we categories him as a dropout from school education.

Pattern of Migration

The individual and household migration rate across social groups and land possessed groups are presented in Table 1.1. Around 2.6 per cent of working individuals engage in seasonal migration, whereas 3.7 per cent in semi-permanent migration with remittance. Furthermore, both combined define cyclical migration, which is 6.3 per cent of the total working population in rural India. The ST and SC individuals positively engage in seasonal migration, and the OBC and OC individual's migration rate is high in semi-permanent migration. The percentage of cyclical migration across social groups is normally distributed. Across land possessed categories, marginal farmer households positively engage in all three types of migration, followed by the landless and small farmer. A similar migration rate found in the percentage of households engages seasonal, semi-permanent and cyclical migration. Around 5.9 per cent of rural households engage in seasonal migration, whereas 9.6 per cent of households depend on semi-permanent migration. So, the percentage of households dependent on cyclical migration is 15.2 per cent in rural India[3]. All the social groups depend on cyclical migration, but the

cyclical migration dominates by marginal and landless in the land possess groups. The poorest households rely heavily on cyclical migration in rural India.

Table 1.1: Migration rate of different types of migration across households and working individual rate over social groups and farm size groups

		Seasonal Migration		*Semi-permanent migration*		*Cyclical migration rate within India*	
		individual wise	*HH wise*	*individual wise*	*HH wise*	*individual wise*	*HH wise*
Social Group	ST	4.90	8.80	1.60	4.60	6.70	13.10
	SC	3.00	6.40	3.10	8.80	6.10	14.90
	OBC	2.40	5.50	3.60	10.50	6.00	15.80
	OC	1.80	4.70	3.50	11.10	5.30	15.50
Land Possessed group	LL	2.70	5.30	2.90	7.40	5.60	12.50
	MF	3.00	6.90	3.80	11.40	6.90	18.00
	SF	2.00	5.00	2.80	9.90	4.80	14.60
	MDF	1.50	3.80	2.60	9.40	4.00	12.90
	LF	1.10	3.00	2.20	9.60	3.20	12.00
Rural India		2.60	5.90	3.70	9.60	6.30	15.20

Source: Authors' calculation from NSS 64th round (2007-08) unit-level data

ST- Schedule Tribe, SC- Schedule Caste, OBC- Other Backward Class, OC- Other Castes, LL- Landless, MF-Marginal Farmer, SF- Small Farmer, MDF- Medium Farmer, LF- Large Farmer, RI- Rural India, HH- Households.

Educational Pattern and Consumption Expenditure

How does this cyclical migration affect the health and education expenditure of the households? Most of the literature suggests that migration generates income, and the migrants are better than their origin place over their socio-economic groups. The projects aimed at improving rural livelihoods must recognise the importance of migration as a deliberate household strategy. There is a need to move away from simplistic negative analyses that view migration as a symptom of distress and start developing ways to maximise its benefits for poverty reduction (Deshingkar, Kumar, Chobey, & Kumar, 2006) (Deshingkar, 2017). Further, Parida & Mohanty have found a positive impact of semi-permanent migration and their remittance on households' MPCE[4]. The Seemingly Unrelated Regression (SUR) model recalculated the impact of remittance on MPCE and their respective expenditure share on health and education. The remittance positively affects the health and education expenditure of the households (Parida, Mohanty, & Ravi, 2015); (Mohanty, Dubey, & Parida, 2014).

Table 2: MPCE, MPCE on education and their gap among cyclical migrant and non-migrant households, across social groups and Farm size groups

Social Group	*MPCE*			*MPCE on Education*			*MPCE on Education as percentage of total MPCE*		
	CM	*NM*	*Gap (Percentage Gap)*	*CM*	*NM*	*Gap (Percentage Gap)*	*CM*	*NM*	*Gap (Percentage Gap)*
ST	764.6	758.9	5.65 (0.74)	25.6	26.4	-0.85 (-3.22)	2.7	2.9	-0.2 (-5.54)**
SC	653.5	670.0	-16.44 (-2.45)***	18.7	19.2	-0.5 (-2.61)	2.4	2.4	-0.03 (-1.23)
OBC	724.5	774.6	-50.05 (-6.46)***	23.7	28.3	-4.55 (-16.08)***	2.7	2.9	-0.15 (-5.21)**
OC	896.3	1000.5	-104.24 (-10.42)***	39.2	50.2	-11.01 (-21.92)***	3.6	3.9	-0.25 (-6.48)***
RI	759.1	808.3	- 49.17 (-6.08)***	26.8	31.7	-4.86 (-15.33)***	2.9	3.0	-0.16 (-5.26)***

Source: Authors' calculation from NSS 64th round (2007-08) unit-level data

Note: ST- Schedule Tribe, SC- Schedule Caste, OBC- Other backward class, OC- other Caste, CM- Cyclical Migration, NM- Non-Migrant. Parenthesis value explains the percentage gap, ***, **, * explain 1%, 5%, and 10% level of significance respectively.

We have constructed the cross-tabulation from the NSSO survey data on MPCE and expenditure on education. Table-2 shows the MPCE, MPCE on education and their gap among cyclical migrant and non-migrant households. The average MPCE of the internal cyclical migrant is significantly lesser than their counterparts across social and land possess categories. Except, Schedule Tribe, small farmer and medium farmer, the mean difference is positive but insignificance.

Cyclical migrant households have also spent less on education as compared to non-migrant households. The mean difference of MPCE on education among migrant and non-migrant households is also significantly negative across social and land possess groups. The absolute amount and share of MPCE on education in total MPCE are less among migrant households than the counterpart. In the comparison of MPCE among internal migrant and non-migrant households, we are facing an endogeneity problem. The less MPCE among migrant may be due to a higher rate of migration from poor households than the economic status of non-migrant households. So, we have focused on the educational outcome variable, i.e., school-going children's dropout rate. The

study has thus checked how migration affects the children's education of migrant households.

Education level of the migrant and non-migrant individuals

Across education groups, illiterate and below the primary level persons positively engage in seasonal migration (Keshari & Bhagat , 2012) and primary educated in the semi-permanent migration (Parida & Madheswaran, 2011). Table 3 presents the education level of cyclical migrant and non-migrant individuals. Among the migrants, around 45 per cent are illiterate, and 68 per cent are up to primary education. But 63 per cent of non-migrants have educated up to primary education. The cyclical migrants' education level is less than the non-migrant individuals in their respective social and land possess groups.

Table 3: Percentage distribution of Migrant and non-migrant individuals over Education Level across Social groups and farm size groups

Social Group	*Cyclical migration with remittance*				*Non-Migrant*			
	Not literate	*below primary and Primary*	*upper primary*	*secondary and above*	*Not literate*	*below primary and Primary*	*upper primary*	*secondary and above*
ST	52.2	24.4	14.7	8.8	47.8	27.6	15.0	9.6
SC	53.1	21.5	14.5	10.9	47.3	24.0	15.4	13.3
OBC	47.5	22.5	15.3	14.8	38.6	23.9	19.1	18.4
OC	28.8	26.6	18.4	26.1	25.6	24.5	20.5	29.4
RI	44.4	23.5	15.8	16.3	38.2	24.5	18.2	19.1

Source: Authors' calculation from NSS 64th round (2007-08) unit-level data

Note: ST- Schedule Tribe, SC- Schedule Caste, OBC- Other backward class, OC- other Castes, LL- Land less, MF-marginal Farmer, SF- Small Farmer, MDF- Medium Farmer, LF- Large Farmer, RI Rural India

How does this migration imitate their children education? The study analyses the school dropout rate among the 6 to 14 years age children to verify the impact of migration on education. We found that the dropout rate among the 6 to 14 years age children is higher among migrant households than non-migrant households in their respective socio-economic category. Table-4 explains children's activity status in the age group of 6 -14 years across migrant and non-migrant households over socio-economic variables. The school dropout rate is highest among ST and SC children, landless and marginal farmer groups in rural India, migrant and non-migrant households. Girls have a higher proportion of school dropout than the boys in rural India, cyclical migrant and non-migrant households. The school dropout rate is 15.8 per cent among children of migrant

household compared to 12.4 per cent among the children of non-migrant households. Across social, land possess and gender groups, the school dropout is higher among the children of cyclical migrant households than non-migrant households.

Table 4: Educational dropout rate in the age group 6 to 14 years across Internal Cyclical migrant and non-migrant households over different socio-economic variables

Variable	*Category*	*Cyclical Migrant HH*		*Non-migrant HH*		*All Children*	
		Education	*Drop Out*	*Education*	*Drop Out*	*Education*	*Drop Out*
Social Group	ST	77.7	22.3	84.4	15.6	83.5	16.5
	SC	80.9	19.1	85.2	14.8	84.5	15.5
	OBC	85.4	14.6	87.7	12.3	87.3	12.7
	OC	87.6	12.4	91.3	8.7	90.7	9.3
Land Possess	LL	77.8	22.2	84.2	15.8	83.2	16.8
group	MF	85.8	14.2	88.2	11.8	87.8	12.2
	SF	88.1	11.9	90.5	9.5	90.1	9.9
	MDF	92.4	7.6	92.1	7.9	92.2	7.8
	LF	89.4	10.6	93.5	6.5	93	7
Sex	Boys	86.6	13.4	89.8	10.2	89.3	10.7
	Girls	81.5	18.5	85.1	14.9	84.5	15.5
Rural India		84.2	15.8	87.6	12.4	87	13.0

Source: Authors' calculated from NSS 64th round (2007-08) unit-level data

Note: ST- Schedule Tribe, SC- Schedule Caste, OBC- Other backward class, OC- other Castes, LL- Land less, MF-marginal Farmer, SF- Small Farmer, MDF- Medium Farmer, LF- Large Farmer, RI Rural India.

IV. IMPACT OF MIGRATION ON DROPOUT RATE

The impact of migration on dropout rate is verified through a binary logistic regression, in which the children activity (in school or dropout) is the binary dependent variable. The socio-economic indicators and internal cyclical migration status of the households are independent variables. The result of the logistic regression is presented in Table 5. An increase in MPCE and households size have a negative impact on the probability of dropout. When HH size increases, more labour available in the households, so the young child does not need to drop out for any household activity. Across social groups, STs have the highest chance of dropout, followed by SCs, OBCs and Others. The dropout rate negatively relates to the land possess groups and education of the households' head. The increase in landholding of the households significantly reduces their child dropout rate. The same result also found in the education level of households' head. If the household head is female, the probability of dropout is less than in male-headed households. It may be because of females giving more importance to their children's health and education than the male counterpart. The gender of the child is

also significantly affecting the dropout rate; girls have a high chance of dropout than boys, which clearly explains gender discrimination in education. Cyclical migrant households have a significantly high probability of dropout rate than non-migrant households.

The average predicted probability of dropout across social groups, land possessed groups and gender of the child over migrant and non-migrant households are presented in Table 6. It clearly explains that the dropout rate is significantly high among the children of cyclical migration households compared to non-migrant households over different socio-economic variables. The gap in average predicted probability of dropout among the child of cyclical migrant and non-migrant household is highest in OBCs, followed by SCs across social groups. And it is highest among landless, and the gap declines with increasing landholding. The gap in average predicted probability of dropout is also higher among the girls than boys. So, the dropout rate is higher among the children of cyclical migrant households than the non-migrant households. The gap in average predicted probability of dropout among the children of cyclical migrant and non-migrant households is high among the socioeconomically marginalised section and girl children than their respective counterpart.

Table 5: Result of Binary Logistic regression

N= 75021		*Odd Ratio*
LN_MPCE	0.424 (-24.7)*	
HH Size	0.983 (-3.12)*	
Age of HH head	0.989 (-9.56)*	
Social Group	ST	1
	SC	0.892 (-3.02)*
	OBC	0.818 (-5.69)*
	OTHERS	0.593 (-11.7)*
Farm Size group	Landless	1
	Marginal Farmer	0.881 (-4.59)*
	Small farmer	0.857 (-3.26)*
	Medium Farmer	0.892 (-1.72)***
	Large Farmer	0.895 (-1.09)
HH Type	Self-employed in non-agriculture	1
	Agricultural labour	1.182 (4.49)*
	Other labour	1.032 (0.71)
	Self-employed in agriculture	0.942 (-1.47)
	Others;	0.793 (-4.3)*

Religion	Hindu	1
	Muslim	1.892 (18.83)*
	Others	0.09 (-1.91)**
Sex of the HH head	Male	1
	Female	0.674 (-10.4)*
Sex of the Child	Boy	1
	Girl	1.456 (16.54)*
Cyclical Migration with in India	No	1
	Yes	1.165 (6.36)*
Education level of the HH Head	Illiterate	1
	Up to Primary	0.4 (-31.09)*
	Upper Primary	0.269 (-28.37)*
	Secondary and Above	0.227 (-26.16)*
Constant	95.42 (20.24)*	
Log-likelihood	51953 (230.9)*	
Nagelkerke R Square	0.15	

Source: Authors' calculated from NSS 64th round (2007-08) unit-level data.

Note: ST- Schedule Tribe, SC- Schedule Caste, OBC- Other backward class, OC- other Castes. The value inside the parenthesis explains the calculated t-value. *, **, *** explain 1%, 5%, and 10% level of significance respectively.

Table 6: Average Predicted Probability of Drop out Across cyclical migrants and non-migrants over different socio-economic variables

		Average Predicted Probability of Dropout of schooling-age children		*Mean difference (Percentage change in PP)*
		Non-Migrant HH	*Cyclical migrant HH*	*(Cyclical Mig) - (Non-Mig)*
Social Group	ST	0.1319	0.1547	0.023 (17.28) *
	SC	0.1543	0.1814	0.027 (17.54) *
	OBC	0.1208	0.1511	0.030 (25.06) *
	OC	0.0833	0.1097	0.026 (31.76) *
Sex	Boys	0.1020	0.1279	0.026 (25.39) *
	Girls	0.1417	0.1719	0.030 (21.31) *
Rural India		0.08328	0.10973	0.026 (31.76) *

Source: Authors' calculation from NSS 64th round (2007-08) unit-level data

Note: The value inside the parenthesis explains the percentage gap in the mean of predicted probability. *, **, *** explain 1%, 5%, and 10% level of significance respectively.

When a child dropout, the next question arises where does she/he engage after dropout. The table-7 presents the usual principal activity of migrant adults and dropout children across social groups and gender of the children in rural India. Most dropout boys replace their migrant person's working activity, whereas girls absorb in domestic activity. The phenomenon of out-migration is closely associated with feminisation of the agricultural work (Tumbe, 2015); (Desai & Benarji, 2008); (Raphael, 2013). The girl children of the migrant household are replacing her mother in domestic duties. Across social groups, wherever there is a high migration of employed individuals, the dropout children engage in similar activities. Across social groups, 88.9 per cent of ST migrants worked before migration; compatibly, 70 per cent of dropout children of ST migrant households have engaged in work activity. It is 75.9, 73.7, and 68.5 per cent of SC, OBC and OC migrant were working before migration, so 56.2, 53.6 and 50.1 per cent of dropout child of SC, OBC and OC migrant households engage in work activity. A similar result also found across land possess groups. A higher proportion of employed individual migrates, a higher proportion of dropout children of migrant households engaged in the working activities. A higher proportion of domestic duty persons (female) engage in migration, a similar proportion of dropout children of migrant households engaged in domestic duty across social and land possessed groups.

Table 7: Percentage distribution of usual principal activity of the adult migrant and the dropout children across social groups, land possessed groups and gender in rural India

Variable	*Category*	*Usual Principal Activity Status of Migrant Adults*					*Usual Principal activity status of Drop out children among Migrant Households*		
		Working	*Unemployed*	*Education*	*Domestic Duties*	*Others*	*Working*	*Domestic Duties*	*Others*
Social	ST	88.9	1.5	1.5	5.0	3.1	70.0	21.6	8.4
Group	SC	75.9	1.1	2.7	14.3	6.0	56.2	32.2	11.6
	OBC	73.7	1.2	2.3	16.3	6.5	53.6	35.4	11.0
	OC	68.5	1.3	2.6	18.0	9.6	50.1	39.8	10.1
Land	LL	66.8	1.1	3.1	18.9	10.2	50.2	35.1	14.8
possess	MF	76.5	1.2	2.1	14.6	5.6	54.8	35.4	9.9
group	SF	83.5	1.4	1.7	9.2	4.2	61.4	31.1	7.5
	MDF	77.8	2.4	3.1	12.1	4.6	61.1	31.8	7.1
	LF	79.7	0.9	2.9	9.4	7.1	60.3	29.6	10.1
Sex	Male	89.3	1.7	2.6	0.7	5.8	86.2	1.8	12.0
	Female	44.3	0.3	2.0	44.8	8.6	29.0	61.5	9.5
Rural India		74.6	1.3	2.4	15.0	6.7	55.0	34.4	10.6

V. DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

UNESCO's Global Education Monitoring Report, 2019 acknowledges that internal migration has a severe impact on children's educational achievement both at the destination and those who are left behind in the source areas. In India's case, Chandrasekhar and Bhattacharya (2018) have found that children's educational level from high out-migration districts is lower compared to other districts. We have found a negative relationship between education level and migration. The children dropout rate is higher among the cyclical migrant households compared to non-migrant households. The result of logistic regression suggests that the children of migrant households have a higher probability of dropout than non-migrant households. The average predicted probability of dropout is significantly higher in cyclical migration than the non-migrant households across socioeconomic indicators. Dropout children's activity status explains that most dropout boys replace their migrant workers in their households, whereas girls are engaged in domestic activity.

Our results support the finding of Chandrasekhar and Bhattacharya (2018) and oppose the results of Parida & Mohanty (2015). Migration is significant and negatively relates to education and human capital creation. The temporary migrant households cannot improve the education and alternative opportunity for their children. The temporary migration is tireless mobility that repeats over time, rarely rewarded by getting skilled or bringing back savings that can be used for productive investment leading to a more secure economic condition. Circulation is the best survival strategy, a route taken to cope with the threat of unemployment and the lack of means needed to keep the household going (Breman, 2009).

Notes

3. Around 0.2 percent of households have engaged in both seasonal and semi-permanent migration.
4. This study compares the MPCE of semi-permanent migrant households with rest households (considered as non-migrant households), but these rest households also includes seasonal migrant households.

References

Bengtsson, S., & Dyer, C. (2017). *Ensuring High Quality Primary Education for Children from Mobile Population: A Desk Study*. Berlin: Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Breman, J. (2004). Developmentalism: Towards A New Regime. *Economic and Political Weekly, 39*(29), 3221-3223.

Breman, J. (2009). MYTH OF THE GLOBAL SAFETY NET. *New Left Review, 59*, 29-36.

Breman, J. (2013). *At Work in The Informal Economy of India: A Perspective from the bottom up*. New Delhi, Delhi, India: Oxford University Press.

Chandrasekhar, S., & Bhattasharya, L. (2018). *Understanding the Scope of the Challenge and Moving towards a Coherent Policy Framwork for Education for Seasonal Migrant at the State Level in India.* Global Education Monitering Report. Paris: UNESCO.

Desai, S., & Benarji, M. (2008). Negotiated Identities: Male Migration and Left Behind Wives in India. *Journal of Population Research, 25*(3), 337-355.

Deshingkar, P. (2017). Towards Contextualised, Disaggregated and Intersectional Understandings of Migration in India. *Asian Population Studies, 13*(2), 119-123.

Deshingkar, P., Kumar, S., Chobey, H. K., & Kumar, D. (2006). *The Role of Migration and Remittances in Promoting Livelihoods in Bihar.* London: Overseas Development Institute.

Gujurati, D. N. (2004). *Basic econometrics (4th ed.).* The McGraw-Hill Companies.

Keshari , K., & Bhagat , R. B. (2012). Temporary and seasonal migration: Regional Pattern, characterstics and associated factors. *Economic & Political Weekly, XLVII*(4), 81-88.

Keshari, K., & Bhagat, B. R. (2013). Socioeconomic determinants of temporary labour migration in India . *Asian Population Studies, 9*(2), 175-195.

Mohanty, S. K., Dubey, M., & Parida, J. K. (2014). Economic well-being and spending behaviour of households in India: does remittances matter? *Migration and Development, 3*(1), 38-53.

Parida, J. K., & Madheswaran, S. (2011). Determinants of Migration and Remittance in India: Empirical Evidence. *Indian Journal of Labour Economics, 54*(3), 561-578.

Parida, J. K., Mohanty, S. K., & Ravi, K. R. (2015, june). Remittances, Household Expenditure and Investment in Rural India: Evidence from NSS data. *Indian Economic Review, 50*(1), 79-104.

Raphael, S. (2013). International Migration, Sex Ratios and the Socio-economic Outcomes of Non-migrant Mexican Women. *Demography, 50*(3), 971-991.

Reed, M. N. (2012). *Meeting the Educational Needs of Seasonal Migrant Children: An Analysis of Educational Programs at Brick Kilns in India.* International Studies. Tucson: University of Arizona.

Tumbe, C. (2015). Missing men, migration and labour markets: evidence from India. *Inian Journal of Labour Economics*, 245-267.

UNESCO. (2019). *Migration, Displacement and Education: Building Bridges not Wall.* Global Education Monitoring Report. Paris: UNESCO.

Vutha, H., Pide, L., & Dalis, P. (2014). *The Impact of Adult Migration on Children Well being: the case of Cambodia.* Phnom Penh: Cambodia Development Resource Institute.