

## **Ethnicity, Poverty, Migration and Inequality in Nepal**

**Tika Ram Gautam\***

*Many researches argue that poverty remains one of the major reasons of migration of individuals from one part of the world to another. However, this paper, argues that migration is not only common to individuals from poor households but also to the individuals from non-poor households of Nepal. Based on the third round of Nepal Living Standard Survey (NLSS) data this paper examines inequality based on the distribution of landholding size, poverty status, and migration across ethnicity using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). It also explains the relationship between ethnicity, landsize, poverty rate and migration applying binary logistic regression. The landholding size ranges from the smallest (.384 hectare) among dalits to largest (.964 hectare) among Madheshi. Similarly, the poverty rate ranges lowest (10.21%) among Brahman to highest (39.9%) among dalits. Interestingly, the proportion of households with absentee is highest among H/M Janajati (55.7%), Chhettri (55.24%), Tarai Janajati (54.76%) and Brahman (54.25%) and lowest among Newar (43.31%). However, the proportion of remittance receiving households is highest among Dalit (60.67%) and Tarai Janajati (60.42%) and the lowest among Newar (38.38%). The data reveals that the proportion of households*

---

\* Associate Professor and Former Head, Central Department of Sociology, Tribhuvan University, Kirtipur (Nepal) E-mail: <trgautam@mswtu.edu.np>

---

**JOURNAL OF NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, Vol. 34, No. 2 (Winter), 2021**  
**Peer Reviewed, Indexed & Refereed International Research Journal**

*receiving remittance/migration among poor households does not seem significantly higher among poor households compare to non-poor households. Therefore, the practice of migration/receiving remittance is not only determined by the poverty status ( =-.516) of individuals in the context of Nepal.*

[**Keywords :** Ethnicity, Landholding, Poverty, Migration, Remittance]

## **1. Ethnicity and Migration**

Ethnicity is defined and perceived in different ways. As mentioned by Gautam (2013 : 3), according to Wimmer (2008 : 973), ethnicity is “a subjectively felt sense of belonging based on the belief in shared culture and common ancestry”. Wimmer (2008 : 973) further writes that “this belief refers to cultural practices perceived as “typical” for the community, to myths of a common historical origin, or to phenotypical similarities” (cited in Gautam, 2013 : 3). Ethnicity in this sense can be understood as a common sense of belongingness perceived in terms of identical physical features or cultural affinity. Ethnicity understood as being synonymous with the physical features alone, of any group, is close to racial conception. Therefore, the concepts of ethnicity in terms of physical and cultural features are akin to the concepts of race and culture respectively (Gautam, 2013 : 3). For the purpose of this paper ethnicity is considered as the group of people belonging to a particular ethnic community.

Ethnic diversity is one of the main features of Nepal. It is because people from north, south, east and west including foreign countries immigrated here in the past. Only a few people have temporarily emigrated from Nepal. Most of them, who emigrated, were joined to Indian and British army and a few moved to Lahore as labour force (Gautam, 2008 : 147). But these days, almost young and adult males of all ethnic community are migrating to either urban centre within Nepal or to foreign countries. Migration has become a common phenomenon to all ethnic groups of Nepal. However, socio-cultural activities and practices across ethnicity in different parts of the world.

Evidences of different socio-cultural practices can be observed across ethnicity all over the world. Strully (2014) highlights on the fact that how do people in diverse socio-cultural setting manage their wants within and between race and ethnicity. Adolescents in racially and ethnically diverse schools may have several reasons for wanting to find same-race-ethnicity partners, despite the ready availability of

different-race-ethnicity partners in their school. Although public opinion data reveal large increases in people's stated approval of inter-racial-ethnic relationships in general (Qian, 2005), adolescents dating across racial-ethnic lines still appear to face stigma in their immediate communities and seem to negotiate this disapproval by behaving differently in their relationships. Strully (2014) writes, for instance, compared to adolescents in intra-racial ethnic relationships, adolescents in inter-racial-ethnic relationships are less likely to reveal their relationships in public (e.g., with public displays of affection) or meet their boyfriend's or girlfriend's parents, and adolescents involved in inter-racial-ethnic romances report more peer troubles at their schools (Vaquera and Kao 2005; Wang, Kao, and Joyner 2006; Kreager 2008). Tatum (2003, 2004) has also shown that, for black youth (cited in Strully, 2014). Thus, socio-cultural differences across ethnicity can be taken as a global phenomenon.

One of the studies carried out in the context of America can also be taken as an example of such global practice. However, in America the ethnicity is associated with race. This issue is, therefore, about race and inequality. Cobb, Perry, and Dougherty (2015) have examined such issue as race/ethnicity and American's racial attitude. Cobb, Perry, and Dougherty (2015 : 178) write, "Among white and black over the past few decades, a growing body of research has examined the link between race/ethnicity and Americans' racial attitudes, and particularly their attitudes on racial inequality. Results generally suggest that Blacks and Hispanics are more likely than Whites to attribute Black/White socioeconomic inequality to structural causes such as racial discrimination and/or unequal access to quality education". As mentioned by Cobb, Perry, and Dougherty (2015), their research further suggests that, when compared with Whites, Blacks are less likely to attribute Black/ White inequality primarily to individualist sources such as Blacks' alleged lack of motivation (Edgell and Tranby 2007; Hunt 2007; Krysan, 2000). Studies focusing on religious Americans in particular report similar findings. For example, when compared with religiously affiliated Whites, Blacks' understanding of racial inequality is more structural and less individualist (Emerson and Smith 2000; Hinojosa and Park 2004; Taylor and Merino 2011) (cited in Cobb, Perry, and Dougherty, 2015 : 179). This example shows how ethnicity plays role in creating identity and shaping people's attitude causing inequality.

Harnois (2015) writes in detail about ethnicity and its relationship with identity including political consciousness. Existing research emphasizes the importance of group identification and perceived similarity in the development of group consciousness. Intersectionality suggests that for many women, a political consciousness of gender may also stem from experiences with race, ethnicity, and sexuality and may be interconnected with a consciousness of other forms of inequality (Harnois, 2015). This kind of ethnicity based identity and inequality can be observed at wider level including gender, class, and so on. This study by Harnois (2015) analyzes data from a recent national survey to investigate how race, ethnicity, and sexuality intersect with women's gendered political consciousness. Analyses reveal no support for the proposition that membership in racial, sexual, and ethnic minority groups significantly reduces women's gendered political consciousness. In addition, women who perceive high levels of racial, ethnic, or sexuality-based discrimination are more likely than other women to hold a strong political consciousness of gender. Results challenge the idea that gendered political consciousness emerges primarily from perceived similarity and highlight the need to conceptualize gendered political consciousness within the context of multiple inequalities. However, the concept of ethnicity and inequality can be discussed in other many dimensions such as poverty, migration, income, and so on at individual, household and community level.

## **2. Poverty and Migration**

There could be a number of reasons behind people's migration from one part of the world to another. The migration could be within and beyond a country in terms of geographical territory. Gautam (2005 : 147) highlights on the fact that "emigration is considered as a response of the people to the existing socio-economic and political conditions of a country. Many people who are unable to fulfill their needs with the environment around them and find it convenient to emigrate rather than fight for a change". It is observed that generally most unemployed young males from all households; either poor or non-poor, of all ethnic community are migrating to different parts of the world within and beyond Nepal. However, many literatures show the people from poor households are more likely to migrate in search of income to sustain their livelihoods.

Sabates-Wheeler, Sabates, and Castaldo (2008) mention some important points on why do people migrate leaving their household and family. Throughout the world, individuals and households use migration as a livelihood and income diversification strategy. However, it is possible that the poor, and especially the chronic poor, are less likely to be able to migrate due to the overwhelming costs of moving and risk related to foregone domestic product (Banerjee and Kanbur 1981; Adams 1993). As mentioned by Sabates-Wheeler, Sabates, and Castaldo (2008) empirical research suggests that when the poor do migrate it is in response to relative deprivation (Stark and Taylor 1989), rural poverty and the introduction of labour replacing technologies (Lipton 1980, cited in de Haan 1999: 26; Ndegwa et al. 2007), structural adjustments with favourable conditions for urban livelihoods (Pomeroy and Jacob 2004), or conflict (Black and Schifer 2003). The ability to adopt migration as a livelihood strategy is also affected by the degree of social inclusion/exclusion, reflected in access to and control over resources (Kothari 2002). From this discussion, we can understand that migration is not simply a voluntary choice rather it is shaped by a number of socio-economic factors at individual and household level. However, poverty is considered as one of the primary reasons of migration.

Sabates-Wheeler, Sabates, and Castaldo (2008) reported the reasons behind the migration of poor people. In cases where the poor do migrate voluntarily, it is not clear whether they are able to use the migration experience to their benefit, that is to improve their livelihoods, and whether this result is nuanced by the severity of poverty of the migrant. Very few studies have investigated these issues and results are mixed. Some evidence suggests that international migration significantly reduces the level, depth and severity of poverty in developing countries (Adams 1993; Adams and Page 2005). Rosenzweig and Stark (1989) find that internal migration for the purpose of inter-village marriages enable households to reduce variation in food consumption. On the other hand, Nord (1998) finds that the migration patterns of the poor maintain and reinforce the pre-existing concentration of poverty. This is because the net migration of the poor tends to be into high poverty areas. Kothari (2002) investigates the paths by which migration can both sustain poverty and also help people to move out of poverty. De Haan and Rogaly (2002) emphasize the contextual specificity of the relationship between migration and poverty

(Sabates-Wheeler, Sabates, and Castaldo, 2008). These all evidences draw out attention to understand how migration could be one of the measures of livelihood generation among poor people/households. However, it does not mean that migration is common to poor only.

### **3. Poverty and Migration**

As cited and discussed by Keshri and Bhagat (2010 : 25) migration from one area to another in search of improved livelihoods is a key feature of human history (Srivastava and Sasikumar, 2003). These moves might be of short to long distance as well as of short to long duration (Kosinski and Prothero, 1975; Massey, 1990; Stone, 1975). It is evident from the available literature that there is a widespread occurrence of temporary and seasonal migration for employment in developing countries (Brau, 2007; Deshingkar and Farrington, 2006; Hugo, 1982; Lam et al., 2007; Mberu, 2006; Yang, 1992). Temporary migration is also one of the most significant livelihood strategies, adopted among the poorest section in rural India, predominantly in the form of seasonal mobility of labour (Breman, 1978; Breman, 1996; Deshingkar and Farrington, 2009a; Deshingkar and Start, 2003; Haberfeld et al., 1999; Mosse et al., 2005; Rao and Rana, 1997; Rogaly, 1998; Rogaly et al., 2001). This kind of migration practice is common to various countries in the world including Nepal and India.

Historically people are found moving from one part of the world to another. After the formation of modern state the mobility of people from one place to another within a country or from one country to another is called migration. Migration is therefore continuous process of movement of people from the place of their origin to place of destination. This kind of mobility of people can be found in the history of all countries in the world and it is increasing nowadays. Mukherjee (2017) elaborately mentions about the current trend of migration from India. The migration pattern from Nepal also follows the similar pattern as in India. Mukherjee (2017) writes, "Millions of people are seeking work, a new home or simply a safe place to live within and outside their countries of birth. Essentially, international migration is taking place at a faster pace in the era of globalization especially from the Third World countries to the First World countries". However, migration takes place within and outside country. The mobility of people outside the country is known as emigration. People migrate from one country to another for various purposes. According

to Mukherjee (2017) this is happening at all levels. The levels Mukherjee (2017 : 91-92) mentions are as follows :

First, white-collar skilled professionals are migrating in search of better opportunities both in education and jobs. Second, informal labourers are migrating to serve as nannies, domestic help, taxi drivers, small restaurant owners, etc. For example, several women from Sri Lanka and Kerala migrate to the Gulf to work as nannies, nurses. Migration of the semi-skilled and unskilled has been mostly to the Arab world which comprises regions of the UAE, Saudi Arabia, Oman, Kuwait, Qatar and Bahrain.

As in India Nepali people are also migrating in Gulf and other countries of the world including USA, UK, Canada and Australia. In addition, most of the Nepali migrants are in India working as unskilled labour. Migrants working in different parts of the world send cash or kind to their home. Nepal Living Standard Survey (NLSS, 2010/11) defines remittance as a transfer in cash or kind sent or received by the household over the last 12 months preceding the interview. All incomes transferred from a single source (individual/household) are counted as one remittance. The proportions of households that receive remittance are 56 percent in Nepal (NLSS, 2010/11).

In the past, emigration was considered as a response of the people to the existing socio-economic and political conditions of a country. Many people who were unable to fulfill their needs with the environment around them and find it convenient to emigrate rather than fight for a change. It was observed that generally most unemployed young males have a tendency to emigrate and thus even as short-term emigration may relieve the unemployment problem to some extent (Gautam, 2005). However, these days migration has become global phenomena for all categories of peoples; rich and poor; male and female; educated and uneducated, and so on. It is therefore important for all countries of the world today.

In the last three decades, Nepal has experienced a dramatic growth in internal and international migration, especially from rural areas to urban centers and foreign countries such as America, Germany, Britain, Canada, Japan, Qatar, Arab, United Arab Emirates (UAE) and other countries including India (Gautam, 2008). The number of emigrants is increasing even in the countries like

Australia and United Kingdom. Some emigrants, who are able to earn sufficient cash money, are leaving their place of origin (home) and are moving to new places purchasing land and houses after the temporary emigration. Other emigrants are temporarily migrating to urban centers in the name of consuming modern facilities including their children's better education (Gautam, 2008). This is how migration has become national and international phenomenon. It is playing role from individual, household to national level on the one hand and at global level on the other. However, there is inequality even in poverty rate and migration pattern across ethnicity.

#### **4. Ethnicity, Poverty, Migration and Inequality**

Momin (2016) argues that the issue of inequality has acquired a good deal of prominence in academic research as well as in international forums and in the economic and political policies and agendas of governments, international organisations and NGOs. There is a growing realisation around the world that inequality poses a formidable challenge to both developed and developing nations, that it continues to persist in large parts of the world and is in fact rising in some countries, and that it is not only a drag on economic growth but involves multiple social, psychological and health cost. The notion of inequality is also found connected even in the context of migration and its causes and consequences.

Momin (2016) further writes, "Unprecedented economic growth in industrialized as well as developing societies around the world has been accompanied by massive inequalities of income, power, resources and status. The scale and magnitude of inequality around the world is truly staggering". On the other hand, the 2014 United Nations Human Development Report points out that while many countries have succeeded in lifting tens of millions of people out of poverty and destitution in the past few years, the lives of a large number of people in Africa and Asia remain vulnerable and precarious (Momin, 2016). Though global poverty has been halved between 1990-2010, 1.2 billion people still live on less than the internationally accepted extreme poverty line of \$1.25 a day. In sub-Saharan Africa, the number of people living in extreme poverty has increased during the past three decades (Momin (2016 : 121).

As mentioned in Momin (2016 : 121) inequalities are rising not only across the world but also within nations, including



industrialized countries. A 2011 report by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development said that the gap between the rich and poor has grown even wider in wealthy countries over the past three decades. The Gini coefficient, a widely used measure of inequality, increased by almost 10% from 0.29 in 1985 to 0.32 in 2008 for working-age people in OECD countries. This kind of inequality can be observed in many phenomenon including migration and its causes and consequences at individual, household, community and country level.

As cited and discussed in Keshri and Bhagat (2010, p. 26), in the economy of rural households of developing countries, temporary migration plays an important role, not only by securing household survival but also by providing income to household members. Households diversify their economic activities outside the traditional agricultural sector to secure alternative sources of income by sending out members to work in urban areas for a short duration (Deshingkar and Farrington, 2009a; Pham and Hill, 2008). Yang and Guo (1999) have found that in rural areas, men's decision to migrate is mainly shaped by community level factors whereas for rural women, temporary labour migration is predominantly determined by individual characteristics. In urban areas, however, individual as well as household factors seem to determine temporary migration (Yang, 1992). It is therefore important to examine the ownership (land size), poverty rate and migration pattern of households across ethnicity in Nepal.

## **5. Objectives, Data Set and Methods**

Among many literatures on migration and remittance, Acharya and Leon-Gonzalez (2012) found that the impact of remittance on poverty and income distribution in developing countries has been extensively investigated since 1980s (see Adams, 1991; Stark, et al. 1986, 1988) with mixed findings. In general, it is agreed that migration and remittance reduce poverty. However, the magnitude of poverty reduction varies among origin communities, remittance sources, and whether remittance is treated as 'potential substitute' or 'exogenous transfer'. Using household data from 11 Latin American countries, Acosta, Fajnzylber, and Lopez (2007) found that the impact was modest and varied across countries. However, very few literatures deal with how migration differs by poverty status of households.

The primary objective of this paper is to explore inequality across ethnicity in terms of ownership (landholding size), poverty status and migration. In specific, it also analyzes how do the distribution of landsize, poverty rate, migration and receiving remittance vary across ethnicity in the context of Nepal. Finally, it explains to what extent these all factors shape migration.

In order to explore the landholding, poverty rate, migration and remittance receiving status of households across ethnicity third round of Nepal Living Standard Survey (2010/11) data set is used. Based on the raw data set the overall and ethnicity level poverty rate and migration is explored comparing means and finally inequality is explained using one-way ANOVA.

In order to describe the relationship between ownership, poverty rate and migration binary logistic regression is applied and the relationship is explained based on odds ratio.

## **6. Ethnicity, Poverty, Migration and Inequality in Nepal**

Lu and Treiman (2011 : 1120) noted, “The most influential migration theory that links migration and people left behind is the New Economics of Labor Migration (Stark and Bloom 1985). This theory focuses on migration as a household strategy aimed at diversifying income sources, and sees remittances as one of the most visible outcomes of labor migration. This has motivated research into the consequences of migration for people left behind”. While some suggest that remittances are largely allocated for daily consumption, a crucial question is whether the impact of remittances extends to longer-term individual socio-economic benefits, such as human capital enhancement (Lu and Treiman, 2011 : 1120). Obviously, remittance contributes at various aspects of individual’s life at various levels including household’s basic features. Household which receives remittance performs different characteristics compared to household which does not receive remittance. Therefore, migration and household receiving remittance is taking a wider shape in all the countries of the world including Nepal. The number of households receiving remittance is therefore increasing every year. About a decade ago the proportion of households receiving remittance in Nepal was about 56 percent. This percentage must have been further increased at present.

Keshri and Bhagat (2010) reported that temporary and seasonal mobility is higher among scheduled tribes than other caste groups in rural areas. This is plausible, since scheduled tribes that are composed of various tribal and ethnic groups located in the plateau, hilly and forested areas of Central India have been historically, socially and economically disadvantaged social groups. Previous studies have also documented that seasonal migrants in the countryside consist of tribal groups, casual labourers and peasants who are in debt (Breman, 1994; Mukherji, 2006; Rogaly, 1998). In urban areas, caste is not found to be a significant predictor of seasonal migration. This may be due to the decreasing importance of the caste system/identity in urban India (Keshri and Bhagat, 2010 : 40). As in the case of India the mobility from households is found almost similar among all ethnic groups. However, access to land and the poverty status across ethnicity widely varies. This kind of unequal access to landholdings and the poverty must have some association with migration as the option looked for income generation. Table 1 shows the distribution of households in terms of landholding, poverty and migration across ethnicity in Nepal.

**Table-1 : Landholding Size, Poverty Rate, Migration, and Inequality across Ethnicity**

Ethnicity		Total land in hectare	Poor household (%)	Households with absentee (%)	Remit receiving hhs (%)
Brahman	Mean	.718	10.21	54.25	61.18
	Std. Error	.001	0.02	0.05	0.05
Chhettri	Mean	.644	23.40	55.24	55.17
	Std. Error	.001	0.02	0.05	0.05
H/M Janajati	Mean	.646	28.62	55.70	53.16
	Std. Error	.001	0.02	0.04	0.04
Tarai Janajati	Mean	.701	25.58	54.76	60.42
	Std. Error	.002	0.03	0.08	0.08
Madhesi	Mean	.964	28.07	45.33	55.99
	Std. Error	.003	0.02	0.06	0.06
Dalit	Mean	.384	39.90	52.96	60.67
	Std. Error	.001	0.02	0.06	0.05

Newar	Mean	.526	10.25	43.31	38.38
	Std. Error	.003	0.02	0.08	0.08
Other	Mean	.682	20.45	53.52	58.22
	Std. Error	.002	0.03	0.10	0.10
Total	Mean	.656	25.16	52.82	55.76
	Std. Error	.000	0.01	0.02	0.02
F-value (df=7, =0.01)		14647.51	178453.96	5410.99	10577.23
P-value		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

**Source :** Computed from the raw data set of NLSS-III (2010/11)

The figures in table-1 show a number of facts in terms of distribution of land size, poverty status, and migration. Let us discuss each variable in terms of household status and inequality.

### 6.1 Ethnicity, Landholding Size and Inequality

The average landholding size of household in Nepal is 0.656 (or about .70) hectare. However, there is variation in the distribution of average land size across ethnicity. The landholding size ranges from .384 hectare, the lowest, among dalits to .964 hectare, the highest, among Madheshi. There are other households which has medium level of land ownership compared to the highest and the lowest one. The average landholding size among Brahman (.718 hectare) and Chhettri (.644 hectare) and H/M Janajati (.646 hectare) follow the largest landholding size among Madheshi. Interestingly, the landholding size among Tarai Janajati (.701 hectare) is higher than Brahman, Chhettri, and H/M Janajati. The F-value (14647.51) is highly significant ( $p=0.000 < =0.01$ ) at 0.01 level of significance. It is enough evidence to come to conclusion that there is significant difference in the average landholding size across ethnicity.

### 6.2 Ethnicity, Poverty Rate and Inequality

The overall poverty rate of Nepal is 25.2 percent. It is the headcount poverty rate of Nepal estimated in 2010/11. It tells us that 25.2 percent people of Nepal are below poverty line. The distribution of this poverty rate across ethnicity widely varies. The poverty rate ranges lowest (10.21%) among Brahman to highest (39.9%) among dalits. The poverty rate among rest of the ethnic groups lies in between. The poverty rate among H/M Janajati (28.62%) and Madheshi (28.07%) is also similar. The poverty rate among Tarai

Janajati (25.58%) and Chhettri (23.40%) is lower compared to H/M Janajati and Madheshi. Since F-value (178453.96) is significant ( $=0.000 < =0.01$ ) at 0.01 level of significance it is enough evidence to conclude that there is significant difference in poverty rate across ethnicity in Nepal.

### 6.3 Ethnicity, Migration, and Inequality

In the past, migration was regarded as obligatory phenomenon to poor people of different parts of the world. But today has been an important alternative source for better income. Therefore, the people from rich and poor, rural and urban, Brahman and Dalits, and so on are migrating in various parts of the world for employment opportunity. It is also increasing in the context of Nepal. Interestingly, the proportion of households with absentee is highest and similar among H/M Janajati (55.7%), Chhettri (55.24%), Tarai Janajati (54.76%) and Brahman (54.25%) and lowest among Newar (43.31%). However, the proportion of remittance receiving households is highest among Dalit (60.67%) and Tarai Janajati (60.42%) and the lowest among Newar (38.38%). This indicates that the practice of migration and receiving remittance at household is common to all ethnicity whether they are rich or poor. However, the rate of receiving remittance is higher among the households with higher poverty rate and absentee. This shows that there is inequality across ethnicity in terms of migration and remittance receiving practice. The effect of ethnicity, landholding size and poverty on migration/receiving remittance is presented in table-2 on next page.

As discussed earlier the migration pattern in Nepal is not only confined to a particular ethnic community and poor households. But also is common to individuals from all ethnic groups and both poor and non-poor households. The overall pattern of migration ( $=.400$ ) shows that people from Nepal are more likely to migrate in search of better opportunities for income. There is variation in landownership among the households of different ethnic groups. The result does not show that landownership has significant role in the migration of individuals. Another variables poverty was chosen as key determining variable of migration. However, the result regarding poverty shows that individuals from poor households are less likely ( $=-.516$ ) to migrate compared to individuals from non-poor households. Individuals from both poor and non-poor households are migrating and sending remittance to their households. Moreover, the

Table-2 : Estimates of migration/receiving remittance based on Ethnicity, Landholding size and Poverty

Variables	Household Receiving Remittance (1)/Migration							95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower	Upper	
Brahman (Ref.=0)			59.212	7	.000				
Chhetri (1)	-.153	.104	2.173	1	.140	.858	.700	1.052	
H/M Janajati (2)	-.206*	.101	4.139	1	.042	.814	.668	.992	
Tarai Janajati (3)	.143	.153	.874	1	.350	1.153	.855	1.555	
Madhesi (4)	-.009	.129	.005	1	.943	.991	.769	1.277	
Dalit (5)	.257*	.121	4.483	1	.034	1.293	1.019	1.641	
Newar (6)	-.820***	.150	29.984	1	.000	.441	.329	.591	
Other (7)	.162	.196	.686	1	.408	1.176	.802	1.725	
Landsize_(hectare)	.055	.033	2.732	1	.098	1.056	.990	1.127	
Poor (1)	-.516***	.079	42.279	1	.000	.597	.511	.697	
Constant	.400***	.083	23.258	1	.000	1.491			

Note : \*\*\*significant at 0.001; \*\*significant at 0.01 and \*significant at 0.05 level of significance

individuals from all ethnic groups of Nepal are migrating looking for better income source to sustain their livelihood. However, compared to Brahman Dalits are more likely ( coefficient 5=.240) to migrate and Newar are less likely ( coefficient 6=-.820) to migrate in search of opportunity for income generation to support their livelihoods. Thus, migration/ receiving remittance is common to individuals of all ethnic groups and economic classes.

## 7. Conclusion

As in other parts of the world migration is common practice to Nepali people as well. There is record of at least one absentee from 53 percent of households of Nepal. Moreover, about 56 percent households of Nepal are receiving remittance. Both the migration and receiving remittance is common to individuals of all ethnic groups and poor and non-poor households. It is even common across households owning different size of landholdings. However, there is significant inequality/variation in landholding size, poverty rate and migration pattern across ethnic groups of Nepal. Landholding size is highest among Madheshi (.964 hectare), lowest among dalits (.384 hectare). Whereas poverty rate is highest among dalits (39.9%) and lowest among Brahman (10.2%). The number of absentee is highest among H/M Janajati (55.7%) and lowest among Newar (43.3%). Likewise, the number of households receiving remittance is highest among Brahman (61.2%) and Dalits (60.7%) and lowest among Newar (38.4%) and H/M Janajati (53.2%). Thus, there is wider inequality in landholding size, poverty rate and migration across ethnicity of Nepal. However, ethnicity and poverty status of households do not have significant effect on migration of Nepalese people in the present context of Nepal.

## References

- Acharya, Chakra P. and Leon-Gonzalez, Roberto, *The Impact of Remittance on Poverty and Inequality: Micro Simulation Study for Nepal*, Tokyo, Japan : National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies (GRIPS), 2012.
- Cobb, Ryon J., Perry, Samuel L. and Dougherty, Kevin D., "United by Faith? Race/Ethnicity, Congregational Diversity, and Explanations of Racial Inequality", *Sociology of Religion*, 76(2), Summer 2015, 177-198. Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24580121> Accessed: 12-06-2021 05:25 UTC.

- Gautam, Tika Ram, "Causes and Impact of Migration : A Sociological Study of Emigration from Kandebash, Baglung, Nepal", *Dhaulagiri Journal of Sociology/Anthropology*, 1, 2005, 146-163. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3126/dsaj.v1i0.285>.
- Gautam, Tika Ram, "Migration and the Problem of Old Age People in Nepal", *Dhaulagiri Journal of Sociology/Anthropology*, 2, 2008, 145-160. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3126/dsaj.v1i0.285>
- Gautam, Tika Ram, *Ethnicity and Inequality : Distribution of Capability, Employment and Ownership; A Contribution to Ethnic Debate in Nepal*, A Doctoral Dissertation Submitted to Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of Tribhuvan University, Nepal, 2013.
- Harnois, Catherine E., "Race, Ethnicity, Sexuality, and Women's Political Consciousness of Gender", *Social Psychology Quarterly*, December 2015, 78(4), December 2015, 365-386. Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26159779>
- Keshri, Kunal and Bhagat, Ram B., "Temporary and seasonal migration in India", *Genus*, 66(3), October-December, 2010, 25-45. Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/genus.66.3.25>
- Lu, Yao and Treiman, Donald J., "Migration, Remittances and Educational Stratification among Blacks in Apartheid and Post-Apartheid South Africa", *Social Forces*, 89(4), June 2011, 1119-1143. Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41290123>
- Momin, A. R., "Unravelling the Interface between Inequality and Ethnicity", *Sociological Bulletin*, 65(1), January-April 2016, 121-134. Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26368068>
- Mukherjee, Anushyama, "Gulf Migration and the Flows of Social Remittances: A Study of Barkas in Hyderabad", *Sociological Bulletin*, 66(1), April 2017, 91-103. Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26625666>
- Nepal Living Standard Survey (NLSS), *Nepal Living Standard Survey 2010/11. Highlights and Statistical Reports*, Volume one and two, Kathmandu : Central Bureau of Statistics, 2011.
- Sabates-Wheeler, Rachel, Sabates, Ricardo and Castaldo, Adriana, "Tackling Poverty-Migration Linkages: Evidence from Ghana and Egypt", *Social Indicators Research*, 87(2), Jun., 2008, 307-328. Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27734664>
- Strully, Kate, "Racially and Ethnically Diverse Schools and Adolescent Romantic Relationships", *American Journal of Sociology*, 120(3), November 2014, 750-797. Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/679190>. ★