



Analysis of Socio Economic Conditions and Migration Patterns of Migrant Settlements in Bengaluru

**Dr. Raghu Kumar N, Assistant Professor,
Dept of Sociology,
BMS College for Women (Autonomous),
Bangalore 560004, Karnataka**

Abstract

Rural to urban and rural to rural migration has become both a boon and a bane. It is a boon to the extent that it gives livelihood and throws open new opportunities to the migrated labourers. According to the 2011 Census more than two-thirds (69 percent) of 1.21 billion people live in rural areas of India and majority of them are dependent on rural economy (agriculture), whereas, agriculture contributes less than 18% to the GDP of the country. There is a necessity to reduce the dependency on agriculture. The excess labour in agriculture has to be absorbed into industry and service sector. 25 of the 100 fastest-growing cities worldwide are in India. Rural-to-urban migration is a significant contributor in the growth of these cities. Population migration from rural to urban areas occurs mainly due to the lack of sufficient economic opportunities in rural areas. In this way rural to urban migration is a boon.

From the total social perspective migration has become a bane. This is more due to the apathy of the government. As there is no planned migration, both sending and receiving places are going to loose. The migrated labourers end up in slums. Education for migrated labourers children, social security measures like public distribution system, health facility are concerns. The displaced labourers many times depend on middlemen to avail jobs. Often these jobs are seasonal. Exercising voting and opportunity for hearing the voice has become difficult. As a result, in a democratic system, migrated labourers face political exclusion. The worst impact of the migration is on women and children.

Other social problems like prostitution and spreading of contagious diseases and cultural shocks are other important concerns of migrated. This paper attempts to study and throw light on the gravity of the situation through survey method data collection in Bangalore, the home for highest number of migrated labourers in India.

Keywords: Migration, Labour issues, Social and economic exploitation.

Introduction

Even though migration has political, geographical and climatic connotations it is more a socio-economic problem. Migrants are exposed to new social and living conditions in their new settlements. Distress factors in their native pushes them to the urban centres. Biggest challenge they face in their migrated place is the gap between their income and expenses. With a dream of saving and living comfortably they migrate to cities. The chances of these migrants being

financially exploited by the middlemen and other exploiters are very high. The push and pull factors do not remain stagnant. The impact of the push and pull factors have to be studied to understand the reasons of migration and to manage the migration properly. The vulnerable sections of migrants are women and children. Most of the migrants are children and the youth. They are the beneficiaries of the successful migration and sufferers of the unsuccessful migration efforts.

The general citizen of a country lives in an ecosystem which is influenced by both the legal and the social norms. This helps them to meet some of the basic fundamental needs to survive without compromising the self-esteem and health. However, the problem faced by the migrants is their exclusion under both these systems. Exploitation by external employment agencies, local political wings who seek support during election, industries and domestic households who seek cheap labour; all have either directly or indirectly become responsible for the problems faced by migrants like unemployment, social exploitation, illiteracy, malnutrition, health issues, prostitution, etc.

Migration is defined as a move from one migration defining area to another, usually crossing administrative boundaries made during a given migration interval and involving a change of residence (UN 1993). A Universal definition for “Migration” is challenging, due to the complexity of the various factors influencing the migration like the spatial dimension of distance of migration between native and destination (short distances / long distance), the time duration of stay at the destination – the time dimension: the migrant can move for short duration in particular season (seasonal), nomadic (semi-permanent, in search of jobs) and/or permanent (long duration stay, the issues relating the geographic borders (inter-state, intra-state, inter-country and inter-continental).

More challenges are faced when the definition needs to encompass the smallest social unit of “family”. What constitutes a migrant family? Should they be only the members who have migrated from birth place to a new destination or should it also include members of the family who were born after the migration to the destination. Challenge is the identification of the migrant cluster itself.

There are several families’ who migrated decades ago and had settled in the destination location, without any basic fundamental living facilities like the pucca structure, or basic water and sanitation facilities. “A pucca structure is one whose walls and roofs (at least) are made of pucca materials such as cement, concrete, over burnt bricks, stone, stone blocks, jack boards (cement plastered reeds), iron and other metal sheets, timber, tiles, slate, corrugated iron, zinc or other metal sheets, asbestos cement sheet, etc.” (NSSO 1998). Also there is the issue of children being born in these non-pucca structures and conditions where they are denied the basic hygiene facilities and not having a proper birth record. 68 million Indians live in slums, which is about 25% of the population of India’s 19 cities with more than 1 million residents (2011 Census).

The NSSO in its 55th Survey defined a Migrant as any member of the sample household who had stayed continuously for at least six months or more in a place other than place where he/she was enumerated. However, this definition may also include people who have been living with bipolar conditions.

Consider the following two cases, IT professionals who migrates from their birth place to a city in search of a job, are placed with an MNC with good monetary and non-monetary benefits. They are not ignorant and are learned. They have all their documents in place and are not socially or economically vulnerable. Poor, illiterate, ignorant labourers who migrates to city in search of job, who has no pucca structure to stay, no guarantee of employment, no legal documents in place, struggles to meet their ends with the meagre day wage they earn. Now in these two cases who should be included in the definition of the migrant for the purpose of the policy? The IT professional or the poor Wage earner? A more rational definition is needed for migration, since not all migrants fall under the same category of being socially and economically vulnerable. These two factors play a major role in identifying the clusters who require the policy support.

In this paper, the focus is on rural–urban intrastate migrant community settlements in Bangalore, Karnataka, India. These samples include only those members who have formed clusters of settlements with no proper pucca structures and who are considered to be vulnerable to social and economic exploitation. These families may also include members who have actually migrated from a different place of birth or may have been born in families settled in these communities and are dependent on these migrated members (children born to migrant family members at the place of destination).

Need for the study

Economic, social and cultural rights (ESCR) are certain fundamental rights that need to be bestowed upon the migrant community irrespective of their migration status. This not only requires political will, but also the will of the society who also are affected by the social costs involved in sharing limited resources and opportunities. One of the important factors leading to over urbanization is rural-urban migration. This leads to misallocation of labour leading to unemployment, underemployment, poverty and increase in social cost in the Urban areas (Gugler, 1988).

Migrants are subject to continuous vulnerabilities at multiple levels - social, political, emotional and economic levels. Children are the main victims of migration. Children are living under conditions where they do not have basic facilities like sanitary facilities (defecation was done in open fields, railway tracks), and are suffering from water borne diseases and others like malaria, Dengue, Chikungunya.

The Government of India enacted the Inter-State Migrant Workmen (Regulation of Employment and Conditions of Service) Act of 1979 to provide better work conditions and alleviate exploitation at various levels of interstate migrants by employers, middlemen and contractors. However, this has failed to address the intra state migration issues and lack

enforcement provisions.

The current Narendra Modi Government policies focus on inclusive growth. This is being implemented by introducing various social-security and welfare schemes like the Atal Pension Yojana, a pension scheme which can be started with a contribution of as low as INR 100 per month and a pension of minimum of INR

1000 after 60 years' age, Pradhanmantri Bimayojana (insurance scheme), with Life Insurance worth INR 2 lacs at just INR 330 per annum and Accident Insurance worth INR 2 lacs (1 USD = 66 INR as on 5 Nov 2015; 1 Lac = 100,000) at just INR 12 per annum. Also to enable financial empowerment the Pradhanmantri Jan-Dhan Yojana (PMJDY) was started to ensure access to financial services, namely Banking Savings & Deposit Accounts, Remittance, Credit, Insurance and others. However, even though these schemes have been very successful across the non-migrant population as per statistics, the Migrants have not availed these benefits because of the lack of knowledge about these schemes, and also non availability of birth records and other necessary documents required for processing and enrolling in these schemes.

Even after several efforts, the government has failed in the grass root level of implementation and facilitating vulnerable migrant members in getting basic support. The complication of the eviction of these migrant community is, also, the focus of various help groups and NGO. The basic issue is what should be the role of the government and the immediate society towards the rehabilitation of these migrant communities who are evicted? How will they be provided the basic civic facilities like portable drinking water, fuel, electricity, pucca housing structure, education and employment?

There are two options to address the problem of migration. One is 'avoiding' migration and the other one is 'managing' the migration. In both the options, it is necessary to understand the push and pull factors of migration. In 'avoiding' migration the best option is to reduce the impact of push factors. In 'managing' the migration to the good of migrants is to energise the migrants to use the pull factors to their advantage. In a country like India where unreasonably large population is depending on agriculture, it is necessary to analyse the socio economic issues of migrated downtrodden.

The migrant settlements in Bangalore are mostly having homogeneous characteristics, especially with respect to the place of origin, the education status of majority of migrates, the push and pull factors influencing their decision to migrate. Each of these settlements have been identified as a Migrant community in this paper. Each migrant community is observed to have different dynamics especially with respect to their living conditions, the type of house they live in, the quality of life they lead in the destination place. However, the underlying problem is same; poverty, social and financial exploitation due to their vulnerability and the failure of the local government in implementing policies in providing legal or social protection to these vulnerable groups.

Literature Review

Two third of the urban growth around the world (Gugler 1988) and around 30% of urban growth in India (Mitra & Muryama 2008) is due to rural-urban migration. In the NSS Survey, 64th round, the rural-to- urban migration stream constituted nearly 20 per cent of the total internal migrants in India in 2007-08. 11.54% of the total urban population in Karnataka constituted the gross decadal intra state migration of male and female. The proportion of in-migrants to total population, Bangalore Urban Agglomeration was 13.4%, which was the third highest after 16.4% Delhi and 15.1% Greater Mumbai (2001 Census). Bihar and Uttar Pradesh are the largest migrant sending states in India, with Mumbai, Delhi and Kolkata being the largest destination cities for internal migrants. Significant seasonal migration also happens from drought prone regions of Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka's rural areas in search of wage employments. About 610,032 people migrated from rural to urban areas in Karnataka, this was 32.76% of total migration in Karnataka under all categories (2011 Census).

The Indian Government Census data captures four major categories of migration streams with in India, they are rural-rural, rural-urban, urban-rural and urban-urban migration. Further the stream can be intra district, intra state, and interstate. These migrations can be seasonal/cyclical, permanent or semi-permanent. Rural urban migration is necessary for urbanization and economic growth and further industrialization, the question that challenges the government is the rapid growth in the demand for civic requirements and the impact on socio-economic costs due to migration.

The three major factors which influence change in population are mortality, fertility and migration. In general, several studies have been conducted to identify the push and pull factors which determine the migration patterns. Conflict, drought, famine, or extreme religious activity are push factors while better economic opportunities, more jobs, and the promise of a better life pull factors (Krishnakumar & Indumathi, 2014), Lack of public services like transportation, safety in native, seeking better environment and employment opportunities at destination (Kyaing Kyaing Thet, 2014), Relative prices of rural and urban goods impacts migration patterns, urban unemployment and wage rate is positively correlated to rural-urban migration, while the rural wage rate have an inverse relationship (Park & Fullerton, 1980). Rural agricultural employment acts as an insurance to the expected revenue of farmers who migrate to the urban modern sector employments. This will also influence whether there is full migration or partial migration. The migration Costs are also a deterring factor to rural-urban migration (Liu Zhijun & Bing Peng, 2013).

The unemployment and re-employment durations at the destination has an impact on the migration patterns of immigrants (Bijwaard, et.al, 2014). Other studies also include the assessment of impact on agricultural production due to the migration of farmers from rural to urban areas (Wang, Rada et.al, 2014), impact on left behind children's welfare,

their education, health among short term migrants (Coffey, 2013), educational performance of Boy and Girl Child left behind by migrant parents (Feng Hu, 2013), Non- subjective neighbourhood amenities, Socioeconomic and demographic variables influences the propensity to migrate. (Alperovich, 1983)

Various factors influence the migration patterns in India. These include social networks influence, caste & minority status, literacy rate, social-cultural diversity hindrance to mobility, marriage as a factor especially among women migrants (Mitra & Muryama, 2008), Number of rural literates and rural population explains rural-urban migration across the rural areas of India (Sangita Kumari, 2014), diverse economic opportunities (Jacob, 2008), switching low profile jobs under growing opportunity conditions (Deshingkar, 2008).

Research Concept: The research paper is a socioeconomic baseline study of the 34 migrant communities spread across Bangalore. Community connotes a temporary settlement of 20 to 400 households having no legal status.

Objectives of the study:

1. To study the living conditions of migrants before and after migration.
2. To analyze the expenditure patterns.
3. To explore the vulnerability towards financial exploitation.
4. To analyse push and pull migration pattern and to design migration estimation model.
5. To explore the perception of parents towards the overall development of migrant children.

Limitations

1. The study uncovers the social and economic status of rural to urban migrants only.
2. The study covers only the migrants who are settled in Bangalore city.
3. The study is limited only to those migrants who are settled in migrant communities of Bangalore city.

Research Methodology

The research method used in this research paper is descriptive research. Descriptive research is a study designed to understand the respondents, who are part of the study in an accurate way. Survey method, which is one of the three types of descriptive research, is used in this paper. During the survey, a brief interview was taken from the respondents by the data collection team. The members of data collection team were the authors, migrant union members, members of Bhima Sangha and members of CWC (The Concerned for Working Children). The research is based on mixed methodology i.e. qualitative perspective with acceptance of quantitative data. It includes both inductive as well as deductive line of enquiry. In line with the deductive reasoning, proposed research assumes that migrant community is deprived, vulnerable and excluded and through inductive process it would explore the nature, scope and severity of deprivation, exclusion and vulnerability.

The sampling method used in this research is probability sampling. In the First level, Cluster sampling technique is used to select five clusters (communities). Samples from each cluster was selected by two stage probability sampling. Samples selected from each cluster is proportional to the cluster size.

The study required both Primary and Secondary data. The primary data is collected with the help of a survey conducted in Bangalore. Since the main objective of the study is to explore the socio and economic conditions of migrant labourers, the respondents were migrants who are settled in any of the 34 migrant communities of Bangalore. The primary source of information is collected from the members of each household including women and children. Secondary sources of information include members of the neighbouring households, school/anganwadi teachers, and key persons in the community. The population size of migrant communities settled in Bangalore is around 3400 families. A sample size of 340 was planned. But, depending on the availability of respondents, data collected was only from 302 families.

The clusters, its population and the proportionate sample identified for the data collection is given below.

Table 1 : Sample Proportion		
Migrant community	Population (Families)	Sample size
Nagarapalya	350	75
Garudacharapalya	130	10
CV Raman nagar	370	83
Hoodi	305	56
KR puram	200	24
Marathalli	300	54
Total	1655	302

Questionnaire is administered on the selected sample. The research also includes observation and in-depth discussion with representative sample as the tool for data collection. The secondary data for literature review is collected from EBSCO database, Google search engine and research reports on this topic.

Formulation of Questionnaire

The survey used a questionnaire, which had both categorical and continuous variables. The responses were collected on multiple option questions and a five point Likert Scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Agree) to 5 (Strongly Disagree). Five point Likert scale being the simplest and easy to understand is suitable for this category of respondents.

Results of Analysis

The data collected is coded into numeric form and statistically tested using the SPSS software. The variables are coded in a particular format to analyze frequencies and measure the significance of independent variable on the dependent variable and the results are tabulated.

Objective 1: To study the living conditions of migrants before and after migration

The data relating to the living condition of the migrants specifically with respect to basic housing, sanitation, facilities were collected. A comparative frequency distribution study between the before and after migration conditions of these variables are analyzed below.

Table 2 : Comparative Frequency analysis of Before and after migration conditions Variables			
Particulars of various Facilities		% Before Migration	% After Migration
Housing	No	3.3	1
	Shed	54	55
	Hut	7.6	39.7
	Mould	34.1	4.3
	Others	1	0
House Ownership	Own	90.4	33.4
	Rented	8.6	66.6
	Others	1	0
Toilet facility	Open space/field	62.3	67.2
	Public without water	3.3	30.1
	Public with water	2.3	2.6
	Own Toilets	32.1	0
Electricity Connection	yes	84.8	27.2
	No	15.2	72.8
Fuel Type for cooking	Firewood	92.1	90.4
	Gobar gas	1.3	1.3
	LPG Cylinders	1	2
	Electric	5.6	1
	Other sources	0	5.3
Water facility	Public tap	52	15.9
	Public well	12.6	8.6
	Public pipeline/bore well	27.5	12.6
	Private well	4	6
	Private pipeline/bore well	1	56
	Other (lake, river, pond)	3	1
Good Health Facilities	Yes	65.2	57
	No	34.8	43
Good Health Facilities, if No, reasons?	Non-availability of Doctor	32.4	10
	Non-availability of Facilities	44.8	59.2
	Demanding Additional Fees	22.9	30.8

1. Housing – most of the migrants lived in non-pucca structures, and averaging a dimension of 100- 300 square feet. It was also observed that each family had atleast 5 members on an average. From the table it is clear that there is not much difference between families living in shed before and after migration. However, 34.1% of the samples lived in pucca structure (mould : a structure which uses bricks / stones/ cement) before migration, while only 4.3% lived in pucca structures after the migration. It is also

observed that a very large percent (90.4%) of migrants had their own house in their place of origin, and they stayed in rented houses at the place of migration (66.6%), This shows that just around 33.4% of the migrated families lived in their own houses in the place of migration. However, none of these families (except 1) had any legal property document.

2. Toilet Facility- A Large percentage of migrants did not have any toilet facility. 62.3% and 67.2% of the migrants before and after migration respectively went to open fields for defecation. 32.1% of the migrants had their own toilets at place of origin and 30.1% of the migrants used public toilets without continuous water supply at the place of migration.
3. Electricity supply - A big contrast can be seen in the availability of electricity. 84.8% of the migrants have electricity connection in the place of origin, whereas just 27.2% of families have electricity connection after migration in their current place of living. Most of the houses used candles, kerosene lamps, and battery run lights during the night for lighting. As they did not have electricity in the current location, they did not have any of the electrical / electronic devices which require electric power. Even, among the 27.2% who have electricity, they are connected only to a single bulb, or there is frequent disconnection.
4. Cooking Fuel – It is observed that about 90% of the migrants use firewood as a source of fuel both before and after migration. Before migration the wood was sourced from nature and forest, and post migration they are purchased from local vendors. During the data collection it was observed that they did not have proper ventilation/exhaust facilities for the smoke and the huts were filled with smoke and deposits of soot. This could result in potential health hazards.
5. Water Facility – Before migration the source of water was public water supply (52%) and after migration, 56% of the migrants purchase water from private water suppliers. There were no public water supply pipelines or public water hand pumps in the place of migrant settlements.
6. Health Facilities – 34.8% respondents were not happy with the medical facilities at the place of origin. They reasoned unavailability of Doctor (32.4%) and facilities (44.8%) to be the main factors for dissatisfaction. 43% of the respondents were not happy with the medical facilities at the current place of migration. They reasoned unavailability of facilities (59.2) and demand of additional fees (30.8%) to be the main factors for dissatisfaction. Further it was also found that in the current migrated location, the migrants preferred to visit private health centers rather than government hospitals.

The above analysis shows that there are major problems relating to the housing, electricity and water facilities at the current location of the migrants.

Objective 2: To analyze the expenditure patterns

The expenses of the migrants before and after migration have been collated and analysed using paired t test. In the paired t-test the mean of the expenses of the sample before the migration is compared with the mean of the expenses of the samples after the migration. The difference between the samples means are then tested for their significance at 95% confidence level. Among the various components of the expenses, select few like Health expenses, food expenses, and education expenses incurred before and after migration are then compared and the difference is tested for their significance at 95% confidence level.

The following hypotheses are framed.

H_0 : There is no significant difference between the expenses of the migrant community before migration and after migration.

H_{01} : There is no significant difference between the Health expenses of the migrant community before migration and after migration

H_{02} : There is no significant difference between the Food expenses of the migrant community before migration and after migration

H_{03} : There is no significant difference between the Clothing expenses of the migrant community before migration and after migration

H_{04} : There is no significant difference between the education expenses of the migrant community before migration and after migration

The above hypotheses are tested using SPSS and the results are represented in the tables below

1. H_0 : There is no significant difference between the expenses of the migrant community before migration and after migration.

Table 3: Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 Total Exp Before M - Total Exp After M	-4.91E+03	4511.421	446.697	-5792.84	-4020.58	-10.984	301	0

The test result shows a t-statistic of -10.984, with 301 degree of freedom. The two-tailed p value is 0.0000 which is less

than 5% level of significance. Therefore, we can reject the null hypothesis at 5%. This signifies that there is a difference between the expenses of the migrants before and after migration.

1. H_{01} : There is no significant difference between the Health expenses of the migrant community before migration and after migration
2. H_{02} : There is no significant difference between the Food expenses of the migrant community before migration and after migration
3. H_{03} : There is no significant difference between the Clothing expenses of the migrant community before migration and after migration
4. H_{04} : There is no significant difference between the education expenses of the migrant community before migration and after migration

Table 4 : Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	BEFORE FOOD - after food exp	-3.02E+03	2390.544	236.6991	-3491.05	-2551.96	-12.765	301	0
Pair 2	BEFORE HEALTH - after health	-5.54E+02	754.8383	74.74013	-702.082	-405.553	-7.41	301	0
Pair 3	BEFORE CLOTHING - after clothing	-4.41E+02	572.1762	56.65388	-552.893	-328.121	-7.775	301	0
Pair 4	BEFORE EDUCATION - after education	-7.80563	172.4542	17.07551	-41.6789	26.0675	-0.457	301	0.649

The test result shows t-statistic value of H_{01} , H_{02} , H_{03} , H_{04} as -12.765, -7.41, -7.775, -0.457 respectively, with 301 degree of freedom. The two-tailed p values are 0.0000 which are less than 5% level of significance for H_{01} , H_{02} , H_{03} , whereas greater than 5% level for H_{04} with a value of 0.649. Therefore, we can reject the null hypothesis at 5% for H_{01} , H_{02} , H_{03} and accept the null hypothesis H_{04} . This signifies that there is a difference between the Food, health and clothing expenses of the migrants before and after migration, where as there is no significant difference in the education expenses before and after migration.

Based on the data collated and observed during the survey it was found that most of the children who were sent to school attended public schools both at the place of origin as well as at the place of settlement. Therefore, their expenditure on education is very minimal. Only few families sent their children to private educational institutions. This supports the acceptance of H_{04} : There is no significant difference between the education expenses of the migrant community before migration and after migration

Objective 3: To explore the vulnerability towards financial exploitation

During the data survey, we also had administered certain open ended questions were also administered to enquire about the conditions of living, explore the vulnerability of financial and emotional exploitation by the neighbours and others at the current location. Various instances and cases were identified, which highlight the extent to which these migrants have been exploited. These are detailed below.

1. A major issue identified during the survey was the amount of money spent on water and cooking fuel. Water is purchased at INR 2 per bucket of 10 liters from private bore wells, pipes and tanks. An average family of 5 members need at least 20 buckets of water per day that translates to INR 40 per day/family and INR 1200 per 30-day month. While the general public who are provided the public water supply by the government spends at most INR 500 per month for same family Size. Firewood is the major source of fuel for cooking by most of these community members, they spend INR 80 per 10 kilo of firewood per week, which translates to INR 320 per month of 4 weeks. While the general public can buy a much more efficient and clean subsidized LPG cylinders at approximately INR 480 per cylinder.
2. The migrant families live in non-pucca structures on government or private land on which they have encroached illegally. Despite the status of the ownership of the land, they are paying monthly rent in the range of INR 300 to INR 1000 for the shanty of an average size of 100-200 sqft to some local person with political clout. There are no proper rental documents nor do they have any residential proofs. These communities are constantly under the threat of eviction by local authorities.
3. Some community members have paid INR 6000 to agents to get a Driving License, where the same could have been acquired without any additional fee other than the Regional Traffic Office processing fees and test fee, which does not exceed INR 100. Other instances where all family members had PAN card, which were procured at INR 300 per card. Considering the income class of these groups PAN was absolutely not necessary.

4. It was observed that most of the migrant members did not visit Government public hospitals for their health issues even though they provided free treatment. They preferred to visit private clinics and hospitals despite the exorbitant fee which they will have to pay despite their earning ability. In cases where there were some chronic illness or emergencies, they even took hand loans at rate of 30%-34% for treatments. When asked why they preferred private hospitals over public government hospitals, they told that in the Government hospitals doctors make them wait for long hours without even undertaking initial diagnosis, and often expected payments before they could start any treatments. They were discriminated due to their income status and doctors preferred to treat patients belonging to higher income class groups. Also, they were of the opinion that the treatment received in public hospitals were not good and comparatively, they recuperated faster when being treated at private hospitals
5. Most of the migrants earned for subsistence. Very few, however also made small savings. These were deposited with the local ration store owners. The Store owners have been accepting deposits from migrants without giving them any documental evidence or interest. The principal deposit amount was also at the risk of being embezzled.
6. It was observed that most of these migrants were day wage construction contract labors. There was no job security and they were associated with a regular construction contract job agent. These labors are employed for an average of 3-4 days a week. Most of them remained at their home on other days. Wage earning of INR 400- INR 600 among male and INR 250- INR 350 among female is not sufficient to meet monthly expenses. Due to the uncertainty of work and in order to make up for the deficit income they also accepted work through other adhoc unknown agents. The regular agent makes payments on time and with no delays, however these adhoc agents have not been regular in making payments, sometimes delaying for 2-3 weeks or even at times not paying at all.
7. Finally, the Electricity related expenses show the extent of exploitation by neighbors. As the community is built on encroached property, no electricity lines are available. Most of these houses do not have electricity. During night, they either depend on kerosene lamps, candles or rechargeable battery lamps. For families using the rechargeable lamps, one full charge provides light for 6-7 hours. However, to charge these lamps, they approach the local shops who collect INR 200- INR 300 per charge. Even for mobile battery charge, they collect Rs 100 per hour. Considering this, a simple comparison shows a middle class family pays approximately INR 800-INR 1000 per month to the Local electricity board per month. They enjoy the benefits of 24 hours lighting, Water heater, Fan, Mobile charging, Television, Washing Machine, Refrigeration etc. In contract, these community members have to spend Rs 1200 alone on rechargeable battery lamps, if they need 28 hours of light per month.

All above cases show that these communities are easily susceptible for exploitation both emotionally and financially.

One reason can be the low level of illiteracy and awareness of social, civil and economic rights. The second being, the failure of the system as a whole in protecting the rights of migrant communities especially who are downtrodden. Both local, state and central government policies must be strengthened to not only protect the rights of these communities but also establish a strong system to deliver and implement these policies and a mechanism through which these members can be educated of their social, civil and economic rights.

Objective 4: To analyse push and pull migration pattern and to design migration estimation model.

Literature review shows that there are several factors (push and pull) which influence the migration patterns.

In our survey, we could identify many factors like low wages in non-agricultural sector, agricultural unemployment, better employment opportunities, better education and infrastructure facilities are the important factors which influence the migrants to leave and settle in a particular place. The table below shows various push and pull factors identified by the respondents.

Table 5 : Push Pull Factors		
Sl.No	Various Push Factors are as below	Percentage
1	Search of better economic opportunities	58
2	Low agricultural income	57
3	Agricultural unemployment	48
4	Lack of job opportunities	42
5	Low wages	37
6	Poverty	36
7	Drought	35
8	Lack of job opportunities for advancement	33
	Various Pull Factors are as below	
1	More jobs	64
2	Prospects of higher wages	50
3	Opportunities for better employment	37
4	Promise for better life	25

Monsoon-Migration Model

In this paper, we are proposing a model to establish the migration magnitude due the deficit in monsoon rainfall. Three Factors were identified close to agrarian crisis depending on the importance and selection by the respondents and also from the literature review. Out of total state's population 61.33 percent lives in rural areas. The economic activity in rural areas revolves around agriculture. 64.6% of the total geographical area which is 1,23,100 km² of land is cultivated in Karnataka. Karnataka having the second most arid land in India, depends heavily on the southwest monsoon, as a source of water for agriculture. 73.5% of the total agricultural land depends on rainfall, and is not irrigated. The three important factors identified are Drought, Low Agricultural Unemployment and Low Agricultural Income. To check the association between these three factors, reliability test was used. The table below shows strong association between

three factors with

Cronbach's Alpha value as 0.509.

Table 6: Reliability Statistics for the three factors	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0.509	3

Among the 74.5% of the total samples identified to have agricultural land in their place of origin i.e, (225/302 samples), 67.1% reasoned low agricultural income (151/225 samples) and 56.5% agricultural unemployment (127/225 samples) as the main reason influencing their decision to migrate.

25.5 % of the total samples identified to did not own agricultural land in their place of origin i.e, (77/302 samples), Even among these samples, it was identified that 46.15% (36/77 samples) reasoned both low agricultural income and agricultural unemployment as the main reason influencing their decision to migrate. (These families were employed in agricultural sector for daily wages).

This makes a total of 62% of total sample (187/302) reason low agricultural income 54% of total sample (163/302) reason agricultural unemployment as the main reason influencing their decision to migrate.

If we consider the analysis among only agricultural land owners, 90.7% of agricultural land owners are dependent on rainfall as a source of water for agriculture (204/225 samples). Among land owners who depended on rainfall, 37.68% reasoned draught (77/204 samples), 65.2% reasoned low agricultural income (133/204 samples) and 55% agricultural unemployment (112/204 samples) as the main reason influencing their decision to migrate. These factors were part of the multiple choice.

This model makes certain assumptions as below

1. There is high negative correlation between droughts with low agricultural income.
2. High positive correlation between drought and high agricultural unemployment
3. As per this model the drought becomes a factor of migration only after establishing the said correlations. Both the correlations stated above have been established.
4. All other factors influencing the migration patterns is represented by the error in the regression model.
5. There is a linear relationship among variables.

For analysing the drought, monsoon rainfall deficit is estimated for each year by comparing normal Vs actual rainfall each year and estimate the rainfall deficit for t^{th} year (R_{dt}).

Every sample administered we have also collected the year of migration data. This provides us valuable information on the magnitude of population migration each year.

M_{pt} = Number of families migrated in the year “t” * Number of family members migrated Where M_{pt} = Total

Migration population in t^{th} year.

$M_{pt} = f(R_{dt}, O)$; where O is other factors.

The proposed **Migration-Monsoon Model** is $M_{pt} = \alpha_t + \beta(R_{dt}) + u_o$

Where β is the magnitude of influence deficit rainfall has on migration and u_o is the error in the estimates of the regression equation (other factors).

This model is based on the data of the sample of this study. This model shall be empirically tested and validated during extended with 3400 samples.

Objective 5 : To analyse the perception of parents towards children overall development

One of the objectives of the study is to analyze the factors for overall development of a child from parents' perspective. The survey used a questionnaire, which had twenty-three statements. The responses were collected through questionnaire on a five point Likert Scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Agree) to 5 (Strongly Disagree). Five point Likert scale being simple and easy to understand is suitable for this category of respondents. The exploratory factor analysis is used as statistical tool for analysis. The output of factor analysis is obtained by principal component analysis and specifying the rotation. The principal component analysis method is used to identify the number of factors that are to be extracted from the data. Three factors emerged from factor analysis. The factors with factor loadings ≥ 0.50 were considered as significant under each dimension. The Eigen values of selected factors were greater than 1.

Table 7: Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	11.929	51.865	51.865	11.929	51.865	51.865	6.17	26.826	26.826
2	1.68	7.304	59.169	1.68	7.304	59.169	4.486	19.505	46.331
3	1.304	5.668	64.837	1.304	5.668	64.837	4.257	18.507	64.837
4	1.105	4.804	69.642						
5	0.888	3.862	73.503						
6	0.761	3.307	76.81						
7	0.68	2.958	79.769						
8	0.648	2.817	82.586						
9	0.569	2.473	85.058						
10	0.51	2.219	87.278						
11	0.444	1.929	89.207						
12	0.395	1.718	90.925						
13	0.328	1.427	92.352						
14	0.286	1.243	93.596						
15	0.27	1.175	94.771						
16	0.235	1.02	95.791						
17	0.213	0.925	96.715						
18	0.2	0.871	97.586						
19	0.177	0.769	98.355						
20	0.146	0.634	98.99						
21	0.113	0.489	99.479						
22	0.077	0.336	99.815						
23	0.043	0.185	100						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

From table 7 & 8 ‘Total Variance’ and ‘Rotated Component Matrix’ table the analysis revealed the following factors:

Factor 1: Welfare

The factor 1 has the highest loadings on 'children are aware of hygiene habits like washing hands, use of toilets, bath, use of washed cloths, brush teeth', 'children have better opportunities in destination migrated', 'children actively participate in cultural and religious activities', 'local administration provides adequate facilities for the children to play', 'if better opportunities are available in terms of work/living/education, you likely to send your child alone to that place', 'children get better facilities at migrated place', 'child

Table 8: Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component		
	1	2	3
CHILD IS CONSULTED IN DECISIONS RELATED TO MIGRATION	0.806		
CHILDREN ARE AWARE OF HYGIENE HABITS LIKE WASHING HANDS, USE OF TOILETS, BATH, USE OF WASHED CLOTHS, BRUSH TEETH	0.771		
CHILDREN ARE INVOLVED IN CHILD DELINQUENCY	0.739		
CHILDREN HAVE BETTER OPPORTUNITIES IN DESTINATION MIGRATED	0.716		
CHILDREN ACTIVELY PARTICIPATE IN CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES	0.662		
LOCAL ADMINISTRATION PROVIDES ADEQUATE FACILITIES FOR THE CHILDREN TO PLAY	0.616		
IF BETTER OPPORTUNITIES ARE AVAILABLE IN TERMS OF WORK/LIVING/EDUCATION, YOU LIKELY TO SEND YOUR CHILD ALONE TO THAT PLACE	0.601		
CHILDREN GET BETTER FACILITIES AT MIGRATED PLACE	0.595		
CHILD WELFARE EXPENSES ARE GIVEN PRIORITY	0.584	0.52	
CHILDREN ARE PROVIDED ADEQUATE MEDICAL FACILITIES	0.543		
GIRL CHILD HAS TO ACTIVELY INVOLVE IN HOUSEHOLD CHORES	0.542		
CHILDREN HAVE A VERY GOOD RELATIONSHIP WITH SIBLINGS		0.879	
CHILDREN HAVE VERY GOOD RELATIONSHIP WITH PARENTS		0.865	
CHILDREN ARE SOCIAL WITH MIGRANT COMMUNITY		0.722	
CHILDREN ARE PROVIDED WITH HIGHLY NUTRITIONAL FOOD		0.649	
CHILD EDUCATION IS VERY IMPORTANT		0.647	
MALE CHILD IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN THE FEMALE CHILD			0.76
CHILDREN OFTEN FALL SICK			0.72
MALE CHILD IS PROVIDED MORE FACILITIES THAN FEMALE CHILD			0.705
INFANTS ARE OFTEN LOOKED AFTER BY YOUNG CHILDREN			0.67
SENDING CHILD TO WORK IS PREFERRED TO SENDING THEM TO SCHOOL			0.614
CHILDREN OFTEN COMPLAINT ABOUT THE DISCRIMINATION BY MEMBERS OUTSIDE THE MIGRANT COMMUNITY			0.543
CHILDREN ARE OFTEN VICTIMS OF CHILD ABUSE			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. Rotation converged in 7 iterations.

welfare expenses are given priority', 'children are provided adequate medical facilities', contributes to 26.826% of the total variance in the data. Factor 1 can be termed as “Welfare”. This reveals that every parent has to emphasize on the health, education, physical growth, better living conditions.

Factor 2: Affinity

The three significant items in this factor are 'children have a very good relationship with siblings', 'children have very good relationship with parents', 'children are social with migrant community'. This factor contributes to 19.505% of the total variance in the data. Factor 2 can be called as “Affinity”. Relationship with family and society need to be

given equal importance for the overall emotional wellbeing of the child.

Factor 3: Discrimination

For the third dimension which can be named as 'Discrimination', the four significant items are 'male child is more important than the female child', 'male child is provided more facilities than female child', 'sending child to work is preferred to sending them to school', 'children often compliant about the discrimination by members outside the migrant community'. This factor contributes to 18.507% of the total variance in the data. This shows that the parents need to be aware of the various ways in which the child can be discriminated and be denied of equal opportunities.

Conclusion

Socio-Economic issues of migrated downtrodden are multi-dimensional. Society as a whole, particularly the governments at state and central level and NGOs have bigger role to play in addressing migrants issues. Efforts have to be made to give better social and living conditions to the migrated labourers. The middlemen who are exploiting the migrants have to be regulated to give financial strength to the migrants. The family members' role in migrants' success is crucial to manage migration or avoid migration. From the sociological and anthropological angle, the push and pull factors have to be studied to resolve social and economic issues. This way migrant's contribution in nation building can be multiplied and their life can be made comfortable.

References

- Alperovich Gershon, 1983, 'Economic Analysis of Intraurban Migration in tel-Aviv', *Journal of Urban Economics* 14, pp. 208-292
- Bijwaard Govert E, Christian Schluter, and JacklineWahba, 2014, 'The impact of labour market dynamics on the return migration of immigrants', *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, July 2014, 96(3): pp. 483– 494
- Coffey Diane, 2013, 'Children's Welfare and Short-term Migration from Rural India', *The Journal of Development Studies*, Vol. 49, No. 8, pp. 1101–1117
- Deshingkar, P, 2008, 'Circular Internal Migration and Development in India', in J. DeWind and J. Holdaway (eds.), *Migration and Development Within and Across Borders: Research and Policy Perspectives on Internal and International Migration*, Geneva and New York: International Organization of Migration; Social Science Research Council: pp. 163-189
- Feng Hu, 2013, 'Does migration benefit the schooling of children left behind? Evidence from rural northwest China', *Demographic Research*, Vol 29, Article 2, pp. 33-70
- Gugler, J., 1988. 'Over Urbanization Reconsidered' in J. In Guglered. *The Urbanisation of the Third World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jacob, N., 2008, 'The Impact of NREGA on Rural-Urban Migration: Field survey of Villupuram District, Tamil Nadu', Working Paper 202, New Delhi: Centre for Civil Society
- Kirshnakumar & Indumathi, 2014, 'Push and Pull Factors of migration', *Sona Global Management Review*, Volume 8, Issue 4, pp. 8-12
- Kyaing Kyaing Thet, 2014, 'Pull and Push Factors of Migration: A Case Study in the Urban Area of Monywa Township, Myanmar', *News from the world of statistics*, Vol 1, Issue 4
- Liu Zhijun and Bing Peng, 2013, 'An Economic Analysis of the Rural-Urban Migration in China'. *Journal of American Sciences* 2013; 9(9s): pp. 56-63

Mitra Arup and Murayama Mayumi, 2008, 'Rural to Urban Migration: A District Level Analysis for India', IDE Discussion Paper, pp. 137

NSS 49th round, 1998, 'Migration in India (january-june 1993)', Report No. 430, National Sample Survey Organisation, Department of Statistics, Government of India.

Park Hong Youl and Fullerton Herbert H, 1980, 'Rural Urban Labor Migration: The case of Korea', Annals of Regional Science, Vol. 14 Issue 1, pp. 72

Sangita Kumari, 2014, 'Rural-Urban Migration In India: Determinants and Factors', International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (IJHSS) ISSN(P): 2319-393X; ISSN(E): 2319-3948 Vol. 3, Issue 2, Mar 2014, pp. 161-180

Wang Chenggang, Rada Nicholas, Qin Lijian & Pan Suwen, 2014, 'Impacts of Migration on Household Production Choices: Evidence from China', The Journal of Development Studies, 2014 Vol. 50, No. 3, pp. 413–425

