Chapter 4

Migration of Labour to Alang Ship Breaking Yard

4.1 Introduction

The present chapter deals with the process of migration, type of migration and determinants of migration and presents various works carried out by scholars and organizations on migration and migrant labour. It also deals with the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents such as age, caste, occupational history etc.

A large proportion of the labour employed at Alang ship breaking yard are migrants from other states. They are largely from backward states of U.P, Bihar, Orissa and Jharkhand. Only a small fraction around 5-10 percent originates from Gujarat state. The large influx of migrants can be explained through the push-pull factors put forward by sociologists, economists and geographers. It is observed that the migrants originate from the most backward districts of these states. A detailed profile of districts and socio-economic profile of respondents is presented in the subsequent sections of this chapter.

There are several causes of migration and these causes are complex and never simple, except in the case of forced migration in which a direct political motive is clearly discernible. Kingsley Davis states that the causes of human migration have never been systematically understood. When people speak, they often have in mind either the motives that migrants carry in their heads or the conditions they face (Kingsley, 1964: 586-587).

A number of factors are taken into consideration by the individuals who decide to move from their place of origin to some other place of destination. If a person is well satisfied with his present situation, he may not think in terms to migrating even if the economic opportunities at the place of migration are better because this has a direct relationship with the aspirations as an individual. The important determinants being

social and economic aspirations. This can be judged only from the point of view of the individual himself. An individual may be economically better off but dissatisfied or he may hail from a low socio-economic stratum but may be more satisfied and therefore may not think in terms of leaving the place of his birth. Therefore, there are number of factors that determine the migrant's decision to move. The migrant is engrossed in several problems which either facilitate or retard his move. Therefore decision to migrate is nearly always difficult one. It is hard to balance objectively both the effects of leaving the present residence and the exerted advantages of a new home. Hence the decision to migrate is always considered to be subjective in nature.

The present chapter consists of twelve sections. Section two define and examine factors that are important in the process of migration. This section includes the concept and types of migration as defined by various scholars. Sections third and fourth examine the major studies and the studies on India done by various scholars. Section five includes the importance of push and pull factors in the process of migration. In the process of migration various factors are important which are examined in detail in section six. Section seven discusses the development of the different states as well as the districts within the state. The socio-economic profiles of the labour are examined in section eight. This section includes various variables such as age, caste, education, occupational background etc. The determinants of migration at household level is analysed in section nine. This section analyses landholding, family size, family occupation, earning members etc. The family income differences before and after migration is also analysed in this section. In the process of migration various factors are important such as push and pull factors. These factors are analysed in section ten which includes years of stay, source of information and finance etc.

4.2 Concept of Migration

Migration is as old as human history. The massive movement of population of the modern times has wider social, economic, political, demographic and ecological implications. Migration process has been analysed by a number of ways. Generally it

means the settlement or shifting of an individual or a group of individuals from one area i.e. origin to another area i.e. destination. The views of various researchers are presented in the following paragraphs.

Everett Lee defines migration as a permanent or semi-permanent change of residence. There is no restriction on the distance of the move or the voluntary and involuntary nature of act and distinction between external and internal migration (Lee, 1968: 184).

According to Weinberg, human migration is the movement of place permanently or temporarily for an appreciable duration for example in the case of seasonal migration (Weinberg, 1975: 3) Whereas Eisenstadt defines migration as the physical movement of an individual or a group of individuals from one society to another (Esientadt, 1975: 3).

Caplow defines migration as a change of residence and doesn't necessarily involve any change of occupation but closely associated with occupational shift of one kind or another (Caplow, 1954: 60-61). Peterson defines migration as movement of individual motivated by the willingness to take risk of the unknown, of a new home and breaking down of familiar social universe for the sake of adventure, achievement of ideals or to escape a social system from which he has become alienated (Peterson, 1958: 256).

According to Kenneth Kammeyer, migration is a permanent movement from one geographical to another preceded by decision on the part of the migrant on the basis of set of values or value ends and resulting in change the interactional system of migrants (Kammeyer, 1975: 175).

According to Helen. I. Safa, "Migration is normally viewed as an economic phenomenon. In addition to economic factors, non-economic factors have some bearing. According to this study migrants leave their place of origin because of lack of

employment opportunities and move to other place or destination in the hope of finding better employment opportunities elsewhere." (Safa and Brian, 1975: 1-2).

Beijer point out that migration is necessary for the normal population redistribution and an arrangement for making use of the available manpower (Beijer, 1965). According to Jansen, "Migration is a demographic problem which affects the population size at both- the place of origin as well as place of migration."(Jansen, 1969: 60).

These are various views on migration provided by different scholars. The reason for the migration process to vary with population under study and could also change with times. Demographers and Economists have analysed this process from different perspectives.

4.2.1 Type of Migration

Demographers, economists, geographers and sociologists have all analysed migration. Migration has been classified on the basis of the physical distance, duration of stay and individual and group migration. Kant has put forward two broad categories of migration (Kant, 1962: 351). According to him migration can be distinguished on the basis of duration and spatial cause or extent. Kant has classified migration as:

(a) Accidental or temporary;
(b) Permanent or periodic; and
(c) Definitive migration.

There are various types of internal migration mentioned by Lynn Smith (Lynn, 1948). The following are the major types:

(a) Migration from country to city (rural to urban);
(b) Migration from cities to country (urban to rural);
(c) Migration from one province to another province; and

(d) Migration from one country to another.

The classification of migration on the basis of environment of the place of origin and goal of the migrant was done by Torsten Hagerstrands. According to him, various types of migration are:

(a) Country place to/from country place;
(b) Country place to/from urban agglomerations;
(c) Urban agglomeration to/from urban agglomerations (Kant, 1962: 86).[1]

Migration can be voluntary as well as involuntary (Wrong, 1956: 86). For example, persons who are forced, by political or social agencies to leave their place of origin is the involuntary type of migration. Thus, in 1947 at the time of partition, a large number of people migrated from Pakistan to India and from India to Pakistan, is also the type of involuntary migration. On the other hand, Voluntary migration takes place due to the operation of the free will and personal choice of the people.

Kingsley Davis classifies the migration as conquest, displacement, forced labour, free individual migration and controlled migration (Kingsley, 1964: 588) whereas Fairchild classifies it into invasion, conquest, colonization and immigration. The latter classification is based on two important factors namely, the difference in the level of culture or whether the movement is predominantly peaceful or not (Peterson, 1958: 49-50).[2] Likewise Peterson classifies the migration as primitive, forced, impelled, free and mass migration (Peterson, 1958: 54). Zachariah has classified migrants on the basis of the distance of movement (Zachariah, 1964: 250-251).

[1] Quoted from Kant. E, op cit, p. 351.
[2] Quoted from Peterson (1958) "A General Typology of Migration" in Clifford. J. Jansen (ed) op. cit, pp. 49-50.

4.3 Major Studies on Migration

The first development in the theory of migration was by Ravenstein through published articles entitled "The Laws of Migration" in 1885 and 1889. According to him, people move from low productivity to high productivity areas. The choice of destination is moderated by distance. Migrants from rural area firstly move to nearby towns and then to large towns and cities. Further he observed that the urban people are less migratory than the rural. Lastly, he observed that migration is encouraged by the growth in the means of transport and communication and the expansion of trade and industry (Ravenstein, 1885: 167-227 and 1889: 241-301).

Lee developed a general theory in which a variety of spatial movements can be placed. He divides forces which influence migrant decision into "pluses" and "minuses". The former factor pull individuals towards urban area and the later tend to drive them away. These forces are associated with the place of origin and the place of destination which are in their own way governed by personal factors which affect individual's decision and facilitate migration (Lee, 1975: 101).

According to Lewis-Fei-Ranis model, migration is an equilibrating mechanism through which transfer of labour from the labour-surplus to the labour deficit sector, brings about equality between the two sectors. The model is based on a concept of dual economy comprising of subsistence agricultural sector characterized by unemployment and under-employment and modern industrial sector characterized by full employment where capitalists reinvest the amount of their profit. In the subsistence sector marginal productivity of labour is zero or very low and workers are paid wages which equal to their cost of subsistence. Thus in this sector wages exceed marginal productivity. In the modern sector, wages are maintained at levels much higher than the average agriculture sector. Movement to the industrial sector increases industrial production as well as profit and since this profit is fully reinvested in the industrial sector, it further increases the demand for labour from the rural agriculture sector. This process continues as long as the reserve army of disguised unemployed, whose supply to the urban industrial sector is assumed to be elastic at the given urban wage, exists in the rural subsistence sector. It

might continue if the growth rate of population in the rural sector is higher or equal to the rate of labour out-migration but would come to end eventually if the rate of expansion of demand for labour exceeds the growth rate of population in the rural areas (Lewis, 1970: 547-554).

Sjaastad presented a human investment theory of migration, according to which the decision to migrate is an investment decision involving costs and returns over time. The returns are divided into monetary and non-monetary components. Non-monetary returns include changes in "psychic benefits" as a result of locational preferences. Similarly, costs such as cost of transport, of disposal of movable and immovable property necessitated a shift in residence, of wages foregone while in transit of retaining for a new job. There are psychic costs too: of learning unfamiliar surroundings, in many cases of giving up one's language and culture and adapting to new habits and social customs.

Sjaastad discuss monetary as well as non-monetary costs and benefits, however in calculating net return to migration he includes only monetary costs and non-psychic benefits. He assumes that the decision to move by the migrants tends to maximize their net real life span income and they have a rough idea of what their life span income stream would be in the present place of residence as well as in the destination area and the costs involved in such migration (Sjaastad, 1962: 80-93).

According to Todaro the possibility that migration may increase unemployment in urban areas has both realism and important implications. The important features of Todaro model are: a) rural-urban migration is stimulated primarily by rational economic consideration; b) the decision to migrate depends upon expected rather than actual wage differential and probability of successfully obtaining an urban job; c) the Probability of obtaining an urban job is inversely related to the urban unemployment rate, and d) high rate of urban unemployment are the result of the serious imbalances of economic opportunities.

According to Todaro rural-urban migration is a two-stage process. In the first stage, the migrant who arrives in the urban area is either unemployed or under-employed in the traditional (Informal) sector. With the passage of time he is able to obtain a modern (Formal) sector job and the higher earnings i.e. in the second stage. From the life span income point of view the modern sector earnings in the second stage are high enough to offset the zero or low traditional sector earnings during the first stage. Thus, individuals deciding to migrate have a longer time horizon in mind and migrant experiences of current income loss as a result of migration. The migrant could be acting rationally as long as the present value of life span income exceeded the present value of rural income plus the cost of relocation (Todaro, 1969: 38-48).

The fundamental view the new economics of labour migration is presented by Stark and Stark and Bloom. Being entirely the domain of individuals, migration decisions are viewed as taking place within a large context – typically the household which potentially consists of individuals with diverse preferences and differential access to income and is influenced by its social milieu. The migration decisions are not taken by isolated individual but by larger units of related people, typically households or families is a trade mark of the New Economics of Labour Migration (NELM) (Stark and Bloom, 1985: 173-178 and Stark, 1991: 1163-1180).

In the next section a brief survey of studies conducted on migration in the Indian content is presented.

4.4 Studies on India

As early as in 1929-31, Royal Commission on labour highlighted the situation and existence of migrant labour in Indian states. Another early study by Davis made an attempt to examine the mobility of population in India by using census statistics. He finds that the immobile nature of Indian population is due to the factors like dominance of agriculture, caste system, early marriage, joint family system, language barriers and illiteracy (Kingsley, 1951: 108).

Sovani's study on population in which potential out-migrants in three districts of Orissa was considered as removable surplus population (Sovani, 1959: 702-709). Zachariah made deep investigation on internal migration in the Indian sub-continent during 1901-31 in order to measure the magnitude and assess its contribution to the process of population redistribution (Zachariah, 1964: 262).

Saha made investigation to bring the historical factors which are responsible to out-migration of Indian labours to British sugar colonies- Guiana, Trinidad, Jamica and Mauritius especially after the abolition of slavery in 1834. The form of supply was due to the search by British capitalist for the supply of cheap and easily controlled labour. The supply of labour was mainly from India as it was under British control. Migration of Indian labour began on an organised scale in 1834 and continued till 1917. In 1900-1901, nearly half a million labour of Indian origin was living in various sugar colonies (Saha, 1970: 29-39).

Srivastav and Ali have analysed the behavior of migrant labourers in Bundelkhand region especially the Kols, who were facilitated by professional labour contractors. The contractors attract the Kols by advancing loan at the time of social urgency and employ them at various work sites. Adult males in the age group of 15-35, females and even children were employed in such work like tendu leaves Plucking, Construction works etc (Srivastav and Ali,1981).

Kamble investigated the problem of labour migration in the state of Kerala on the basis of primary data. The study covers both in and out migration, their volume, type, direction of movement, educational levels, occupations etc (Kamble, 1983).

Breman's study in the state of Gujarat especially in Bardoli taluka, found that the capitalist form of farming has caused inequality in rural areas resulting in increasing class discrimination between the landowners and the landless labours (Breman, 1985).

Nijam Khan focuses on the persistence of depressed and stagnant agricultural economy that had hardly exhibited any improvement. The study is mainly based on field data collected from twenty randomly selected villages of Uttar Pradesh and explores the pattern of migration on the basis of quantum of migration, characteristics of migrants, spatial-temporal pattern of the movement. The study concludes that the economic backwardness in rural areas caused by lack of gainful employment opportunities and tremendous pressure of population on land has been pushing rural bulk to urban centers in search of livelihood (Nijam Khan, 1986: 20).

Vidyut Joshi focuses the inhuman condition of migrant labours employed in Government projects in Uttar-Kashi, Uttar Pradesh (Tehri Garhwal project). Labours migrating from Orissa, Bihar including women and children were employed in such project works violating all labour laws. Most of the labour especially from Orissa was bonded labour who had received advance from the labour contractors (Vidyut Joshi, 1987:14-15).

Subrahmany in his article on 'policy and administrative aspects of labour migration' has mentioned that migrant labours were mainly seasonal character and associated with the features of contract labour or bonded labour (Subrahmany, 1987:25).

Raju made study in the state of Andhra Pradesh in the district of west Godavari, where migrant labours are employed in Tungabhadra project in Karnataka state. Due to migration of labours to Tungabhadra region, the economic condition of migrants improved considerably. The author concludes that the purpose of migration was for their better economic life. In the context of green revolution, today a new phenomenon of migration of surplus labour from the rural areas of neighbuoring states is observed. It is this type of rural to rural migration and remittance from one area to another which is a new development on migration scene (Raju, 1989: 5-7).

Gupta examined that the migratory process of farm labour in the context of their socio-economic characteristics, factors of migration, mode of recruitment and relative deprivation in the agriculturally advanced state of Punjab (Gupta,1990: 4).

Kasar investigates the seasonal migration of farm labour from dry and backward tracts of Maharashtra to co-operative units in irrigation sector for employment and income earning. He finds that the important factor behind the process of seasonal migration is the employment in harvesting and transporting of sugarcane during crushing season of sugar factories. This seasonal migration mainly depends on the middlemen who generally exploit poor, illiterate and landless agricultural labours. The problems are further aggravated by involvement of woman and their children who are deprived of the basic facilities of education and health during their stay (Kasar, 1992: 24).

Barik has made attempt to investigate on the condition of Oriya migrant labour in Surat, working in the textile mills. The study mainly based on questionnaire and interview method to present the structure of art silk industries, working environment and working condition of migrants in Surat. The study also attempts to find the role of kinship in the cycle of migration process (Barik, 1994: 21).

4.5 Push and Pull Factors in Migration

The movement of people from rural to urban areas is not a new phenomenon. Socio-economic and cultural conditions always are governed the phenomenon of population have movement. The push away from the village to the pull of the city's life and these combinations will produce the stream of migration. The migrants expect stable and rewarding employment in the city and hope to find more and adequate health, cultural amenities and better education for their children ([1] Ernst, 1965: 414-415).

The important reason for voluntary migration is economic. Almost all studies find that most of the migrants have moved in search of better economic opportunities. This is true of both international and internal migrations. Migration is viewed as an economic phenomenon. Though non-economic factors have some importance, most studies

conclude that migrants leave their area of origin primarily because of lack of economic opportunities with hopes of finding better opportunities elsewhere.

Economic factors are also behind the large streams of internal migration. Rural-urban migration of the workplace is because by the expanding and better economic opportunities in the urban areas. The most vital factors that motivate migration can be classified as (i) the push factors and (ii) the pull factors.

Push Factors

The push factors mainly refer to the poor economic conditions and resultant economic misery or lack of opportunities for advancement which pushes the people out of the region in search of a livelihood or better opportunities. The push factors are thus the important factors which compel people to leave their place of origin.

The push factor is used to explain the cause of rural-urban migration. The rural poverty is characterized by low productivity, unemployment and under-employment, low income levels and low levels of consumption may push people out to the cities and town where there are better economic opportunities available (Acharaya, 1964: 10-11).

According to an estimation of the Planning Commission, in India over one-third of the rural population is below poverty line (Planning Commission, 2002). In most developing countries due to the population explosion, the per capita availability of cultivable land has drastically declined and the number of unemployed people and under-employed have significantly increased over a period of time.

Most of the developing countries are suffering from population explosion resulting in lower land-man ratio and accumulation of surplus labour on land. Technological advancement, capital intensive methods of production in the agriculture sector and the substitution of factory made goods and other articles for those produced by the rural artisans and mechanization of certain processes have reduced labour requirements in rural areas. Even without significant mechanization, the agriculture

sector of the developing countries is said to be characterized by the existence of surplus labour in the form of disguised unemployment and open unemployment (Upreti, 1981: 30-31).

The importance of joint family system and inheritance laws which do not permit the division of property causes many young people to migrate to cities in search of economic opportunities and financial independence. However sub-division and fragmentation also lead to migration when the holdings become too small and uneconomical to support a family or to absorb the labour of the family.

Many Scholars have laid strong emphasis on the 'Push-Pull' theory of migration. According to Bogue, the pull-push attributes of communities in the place of origin and of destination are independent migration variables. According to him, "migration that has a very strong push tends to be much less selective with respect to the community of origin, than migration which has a very strong pull where there is a situation of very strong 'push' but no strong 'pull' (extreme cases are disasters such as famine, drought, floods, exhaustion of resource), the origin selectivity of out-migrants from one community to other vary directly with the strength of the attractive pulls and inversely with the pushes from the community itself (Bogue, 1961).

However, there are a number of factors pushing the people out of the rural areas. All the migration caused by push factors are not confined to the rural-urban stream. There are large migration flows from rural areas representing movement of people from poor areas characterized by lack of economic opportunities to areas with better opportunities. Push factors are the most important causes of internal migration in many cases. Though in many cases migrations is a combined effect of push and pull factors.

Pull Factors

Pull factors refer to the factors which encourage migration to areas that have employment and economic opportunities, facilities, amenities etc. opportunities for better

employment, higher wages, facilities and amenities of modern life etc. The facilities, amenities and glamour of city life which attract migrants are termed as 'Bright Lights'.

Some of the urban migration stream may be regarded as the response to the 'pull' factors exercised by the better economic opportunities available in the urban area. There is usually the movement of population to cities where rapid expansion of industry and commerce takes place. Migration of people from the rural areas to the cities bear a close functional relation to the process of industrialization, technological advancement and other cultural changes which characterized the evolution of modern society all over world. The main reason determining the rate of outward movement is the expansion of employment in other occupations. However, it is the factor which explains the high rate of movement in recent years in the advanced countries and in rapidly developing countries (Cherlohilam, 1987: 22-23).

There is a tendency for a large amount of investments to get concentrated in the urban areas, especially large cities. Further as economists and progressive thinkers like Michael Lipton, Colin Clark, Lester Brown and Paul Streeten pointed about the possibility of an urban bias in the public sector expenditure in many developing countries. Many policies and programmes have created strong incentives to expand economic activities in the urban than the rural areas and have encouraged people to move to urban areas in the expectation of higher paid jobs and better amenities.

As the employment opportunities and income increase at a higher rate in the urban areas as a result of the huge investments, it is obvious that the job-hunters and those who seek better economic opportunities will rush towards such areas. In addition, there are number of other attractions that the city holds out like, a variety of amenities and facilities as well as non-economic factors of so called modern life. In short, rural people are attracted by the "Bright Lights of City."

The migration of professional and highly skilled persons from developing countries to developed countries is largely caused by the pull factors. Pull factors also

play important role in the migration of unskilled labour from the developing countries to the oil rich Middle East countries. Labour migrates from Mexico to U.S.A under NAFTA for job opportunities. It is felt today that wage differential is the main important force for International migration. For example, in the late 1970's an unskilled migrant labour from Bangladesh earned ten times more in the Arab Gulf states than he did in his own country (World Bank, 1984). The gap still remains high.

Pull or Push

It is not easy to differentiate completely the push and the pull factors in migration. They are inseparable in many ways. Gerald Breese pointed out that "the push-pull" factors are a controversy and it is difficult to differentiate. According to him both push and pull factors are responsible for the movement of the rural people and village population to urban areas. The evidence indicates that it is the push of existing rural situation which suggests to the rural residents that things might be better in urban areas.

In most of the studies in India it has been found that areas which experience large rural out-migration also have a high rate of unemployment. Thus, the rural population migrates to cities not to avail the employment opportunities and other facilities in urban areas but also to avoid and overcome the problems in rural areas.

According to Aurora, in all types of migration these two factors- push and pull are present. According to him pull factors such as the attainment of a higher standard of living, the possibility of better treatment in the society, better educational facilities, enhancement prestige in the society motivate migration. In addition, reasons for the push factors are high population pressure on land, conflict in family and socio-political conditions which bring about economic and physical insecurity of people (Aurora, 1967: 11-15).

According to Lakdawala it is very difficult to find out the motivating factor. According to him a push from village for a person may be operative because there is a pull from the town or vice-versa (Lakadawala, 1963: 160-165).

Therefore, it can be concluded that the motivating factors in migration have a direct relationship with the nature and type of migration, which varies from place to place and region to region. So there is multiplicity of factors determining migration decision, expect in case of forced migration.

However, the urban centers in countries like India do not hold out sufficient and attractive opportunities to absorb the influx of villagers. Thus, recent rapid rate of urbanisation through visible in Asian countries does not correspond to the growth of industry but a shift of people from low productive agricultural employment to yet another low productivity industrial or urban informal employment. Thus the shift is from rural informal sector to urban informal sector. However, urban informal sector acts as a stepping stone for the economic enhancement of migrant labours and their families.

4.6 Factors responsible for migration

The factors responsible for migration can be understood in terms of positive and negative factors both at the place of origin and at the place of destination. The motives of the migrants are difficult to analyse because they are so mixed up that the individual himself is unaware of the factor responsible for his migration. A combination of attractive as well as repulsive forces is always working simultaneously and migrants may not be able to identify clearly the factors which have been responsible for their migration. Motives are usually complex and several factors are associated with them. Migration is a complex process. Migration may be innovating, it is a means of achieving a new mode of livelihood or it may be conservative for people who seek a new location in which to preserve what they have. This distinction is important because the latter challenge the modern notion that people universally migrate in order to change their way of life (Upreti, 1981: 26).

Migration is not a new phenomenon to the human history. Migration has been contributing to economic and social development of mankind to overcome the problem of day-to-day life. The main factor behind migration is the quest for better standard of living away from home. The direction of people's movement has always been guided by some

specific needs of the time. In the pre-transitional stage of development, migration movements assumes a particular and regular path and takes place from rural to rural areas. When country enters into early transitional stage of development, the movement of people diverted from rural to urban areas. This urban migration is in response to the creation of new and gainful employment opportunities in various secondary and service sectors located to a great extent in cities and towns. In the later stage of development, the rapid industrialization, easy transportation and communication and other advancements in urban areas encourage people to migrate in large number from smaller towns to big and metropolitan cities in search of better employment opportunities (Singh, 2003: 214).

The factors influencing migration decision are not only numerous but are also very complex and vary from place to place and from time to time. However the basic factor responsible for migration is the regional disparities in economic activity and population problems. Various researchers have presented their views on the factors responsible for migration. Some researchers have laid emphasis on economic factors.

According to Toshio Kurode, in an unequal distribution of economic activity, the level among regions and regional reproductive differentials of population tend to reinforce each other to accelerate migratory movements (Kuroda, 1972: 252-253). According to Pal the factors that motivate the villagers to migrate is relatively better conditions of living and better prospects in the city (Pal, 1974: 1). In the opinion of Brinley Thomas, the economic factors are predominant in migration and ignore other factors (Brinley, 1954: 52).

According to Everett Lee, the factors determine the process of migration such as factors associated with the place of origin, factors associated with the place of destination, intervening obstacles between the place of origin and the place of destination, personal factors (Lee, 1975: 190-191). According to Hertzler, the advantages and disadvantages of the two places act as attractive or repulsive factors in migration. Urban areas offer employment opportunities and better prospects of life than rural areas. The attractions of urban centers coincide with rural distress and induce people to move. The

attractive face of city life motivates people of all ranks and categories skilled or unskilled, rich or poor, highly educated or illiterates to migrate (Hertzler, 1956: 213-214).

The views of various researcher of the phenomenon of migration indicate how complicated the factors in migration are. Therefore, they are very many and they all play a role in migration in a very subtle way.

According to Kingsley Davis, there are so many factors responsible for people to move from one place to other are: religious ceremonies, commercial fairs, famines, general wars and ruthless taxation in the past accelerated the movement of population. Certain other factors during British rule in India favoured migration. The prominent are the development of the means of transport and communication, educational facilities, the decline of caste and family solidarity, the growth of large-scale industries, the development of cities, the expansion of irrigation and increase in security (Kingsley, 1951: 106-108).

In the opinion of D. N. Majumdar the causes of migration are insufficiency of land for cultivation, disputes in the family, presence of friends and relatives in the destination area which might help the migrant to get a job, loss in the business, the attraction of city life, the absence of employment opportunities in their native place, official transfer, search for employment, political reasons and accompanying other elderly migrants (Majumdar, 1960: 73-75).

Dhekney study on Hubli finds the following causes of migration: securing employment, better prospects, better employment or better business, city-ward migration motivated by such factors such as famine, inadequacy of land, loss of land, low income etc (Dhekney, 1959: 44-52).

John Cornell et al. talk of social factors affecting the propensity to migrate. These factors are demographic influences such as age, sex, the family conflict, family structure,

marriage migration, and the social factors outside the village, such as urban educational facilities, opportunities of pleasure etc (Connell et al, 1976: 38-55).

There are number of case studies conducted in different parts of India which indicate that economic factors are the most important reasons for male migration. For instance a case study of the migrant household conducted in Poona in search of employment and an equal percentage came after receiving appointment orders for jobs. Some of them (28.5%) came here on account of job transfers. Thus 91% of all the migrants came to Poona on account of employment. Lack of employment opportunities was reported as the most important reason to leave their native places by as much as 70.5% of the migrants (Nair, 1975). Another study of 150 migrant families and 300 migrants of four villages in Gorakhpur district, Uttar Pradesh indicated that the main causes of migration in the order of importance felt by the respondents were decline of hereditary occupation (81%), hope of getting better job (41%), prospects of opening new business (31%), unemployment (20%), not enough land to cultivate (14%), increase in population pressure and floods (10%) etc (Saxena, 1977).

In short, the city-ward movement of population is mainly influenced by the opportunities available in the city for economic improvement. The larger is the size of city, the higher number of people move in search of economic opportunities.

4.7 Socio-Economic Conditions of Sample States and Districts

Before discussing socio-economic characteristics of migrant labours from different states viz. Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Orissa, Jharkhand and Gujarat, first it is important to examine the socio-economic conditions of these states and districts from which labours are migrating to Alang ship breaking yard. Gujarat is the recipient state of migrants originating from a number of backward states.

Gujarat is one of the developed states of India. It is the largest recipient of investment on annual basis and is one of the fastest growing states in India. The state is

industrially developed and hence creates demand for industrial labour. Gujarat is well known for production of Textiles, Chemicals, Diamond Cutting and Polishing, Petrochemicals etc. The steel recycling industry and ship breaking industries are also concentrated in the state. The demand for labour by these industries and their ancillaries leads to large scale in-migration. The most dynamic city of Gujarat, viz Surat is known as a city of in-migrants.

Labour from various states such as Bihar, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh, Jharkhand Rajasthan and Hindi speaking labour for southern states of Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Kerala can be found all over Gujarat. Hence Gujarat is a net importer of skilled, semi-skilled and even unskilled labour from all over India. The entrepreneurial class in Gujarat deserves all credit for the development of the state.

Alang ship breaking yard has migrant labour largely from U.P, Bihar, Jharkhand and Orissa. It also uses local labour but is minimal. The subsequent discussion analyses the socio-economic characteristics of these states and the districts from which the migrants originate. The trend in human progress as measured and computed by human development index along with its rank is given in table 4.1. The HDI values are given in the table for five states along with all India HDI value. These states have many similarities with respect to their social and economic contexts. Among these states, Uttar Pradesh and Bihar are the two largest states in terms of population and geographical area.

All selected states are backward and underdeveloped states of India expect Gujarat. The per capita is highest in Gujarat (Rs. 28,355) followed by and Orissa (Rs. 13601) and Jharkhand (13013). Bihar (Rs. 5772) is the poorest state among these sample states in terms of per capita income followed by Uttar Pradesh (Rs. 11477). There is wide variation in human development index among these states. Gujarat has a highest value of HDI for the year 2001 followed by Orissa, whereas Bihar has the lowest value. In terms of HDI values, it clear that Gujarat has highest HDI value of 0.479 and Bihar has lowest value of 0.367 as compared to all India HDI value of 0.472. After comparing the relative

state of human development index among the sample states, the overall development perspective on key area of human development is presented in table 4.1.

Apparently, the first important sector for most of the countries is agriculture. The basic indicators reflecting agricultural development is self-sufficiency in food production. India has achieved self sufficiency in food production. The total food production has increased from 51 million tons in 1951 to 209 million tones in 1999. Most of the population still depends on agriculture for their livelihood. The percentage of population in India depending on agriculture is 52.40 percent (Census, 2001). But there are wide variations in percentage of population depending on agriculture sector among different states under review. In Bihar the percentage of agriculture labours and cultivators to total workers is 77 percent which is high compared to other states followed by Jharkhand and Uttar Pradesh which is 66.8 and 66.0 percent respectively. The lower percentage of population depends on agriculture in Gujarat i.e. 52.04 as compared to other states and also all India level. According to the structuralists the share of primary sector declines with development. It is found that the sample states have a large population depending on agriculture.

The percentage of population of India living below the poverty line declined from 56 percent in 1973-74 to 26 percent in 1999-2000. There is variation among states of India in terms of population living below poverty line. Among the sample states, Orissa has the highest percentage of population living below poverty line with 47.4 percent followed by Bihar (42.6 percent) as compared to other sample states and with all India level. The percentage of population living below poverty line is low in Gujarat state i.e. 14 percent as it is a developed state with high industrialization and per capita income greater than national average.

On literacy front, the overall literacy rate for India has increased from 52.2 percent in 1991 to 64.8 percent in 2001. There exists great variation among the states. In the sample states, Gujarat has highest literacy rate i.e. 69.1 percent and other states are below the all India rate. Low literacy rate is found in Uttar Pradesh which is 47 percent

followed by Jharkhand (53.6 percent) and Bihar (56 percent) respectively. Orissa state has higher literacy rate as compared to Uttar Pradesh and Jharkhand however all are lower than all India figures.

From the above discussion it may be stated that though the country is developing over times but there still exist wide variation among the states in terms of poverty ratio, per capita income, HDI and literacy. The state of human development is not uniform across the states of India. States such as Bihar, Orissa and Uttar Pradesh have not succeeded in raising the standard of living substantially and hence all classified as the most backward states of India.

Table 4.1 Selected Development Indicators of State.

States	Per Capita Income (2004-05 in Rs.)	HDI Value (2001	HDI Rank (2001)	Literacy Rate (2001)	Percent of Population in Agriculture (Agriculture Labourers and Cultivators)	Percentage of Population Below Poverty Line (1999-2000)
Uttar Pradesh	11477	0.388	13	47.00	66.03	31.15
Bihar	15772	0.367	15	56.27	77.35	42.60
Orissa	13601	0.404	11	63.08	64.73	47.15
Jharkhand	13013	N/A	N/A	53.56	66.84	--
Gujarat	28355	0.479	6	69.14	52.04	14.07
All India	23222	0.472		64.84	52.40	26.10

Sources: Planning Commission & Census of India 2001

After discussing the socio-economic conditions of different states under review from where labour have migrated to Alang ship breaking yard, a brief presentation on the general features of the districts from which migrants originate is presented. Factors such as location and topography, climate, population, economic situation etc, of specific districts are presented.

Alang ship breaking yard employ more than 30,000 labours. The labour employed is largely migrants from U.P, Bihar, Jharkhand and Orissa. There are farm labours from southern states but their proportion is low. Some local labour is also employed which hail from Bhavnagar and surrounding districts.

For the purpose of detailed analysis a sample survey of 300 labourers are selected. The sample is so constructed that it encompasses the states of origin and also represent various tasks/occupations in which the labour is employed. The selection of the respondents is based on stratified sampling, however within each state random sampling is followed. The respondents hail from various districts which have diverse socio-economic background. At first the study analyses the districts from which the respondents originate, which is followed by the analysis of individuals and their reasons for migration.

It is important to examine the state of development of each states from which labour have migrated to Alang ship breaking yard. Table 4.2 demonstrate that majority of labour from Uttar Pradesh have migrated from Azamgrah district. Similarly labour from Munger district (Bihar), Ganjam district (Orrisa), Palamau district (Jharkhand) have migrated in large numbers. The majority of respondents migrated from these district due to various reasons such as poverty, lack of employment opportunities, low productivity of agriculture, drought etc. Therefore, it is important to examine the reasons for migration of labours from these districts.

Table 4.2 District of origin and the State of the Respondents

States	Districts				State Total
Uttar Pradesh	Gorakhpur (22)	Azamgarh (36)	Pithorgrah (36)	Almora (19)	113
Bihar	Gopalgunj (7)	Banka (8)	Samastipur (7)	Munger (9)	31
Orissa	Ganjam (35)	Sambalpur (10)	Kalahandi (20)	Bolangir (9)	74
Jharkhand	Dumka (5)	Palamau (26)	Gumla (21)	Pakur (20)	72
Gujarat	Amreli (6)	Bhavnagar (4)	--	--	10

Source: Field Survey 2004.

Planning Commission has classified the districts of different states of India into four categories, viz. backward, most backward, industrially backward and developed. According to Planning Commission, districts are considered as backward districts of the state in terms of literacy, employment etc. From the table 4.3 it can be seen that four districts i.e. Banka (Bihar), Sambalpur (Orissa), Pakur (Jharkhand), Bhavnagar and Amreli (Gujarat) are the developed districts in the present study. From the sample, two districts of Orissa i.e. Ganjam and Kalahandi and one district of Jharkhand i.e. Palamau are the most backward districts of the respective states. All other sample districts are either backward or industrially backward districts of the respective state. It is important to examine the conditions of various districts from which labours are migrating to Alang ship breaking yard.

Table 4.3: Respondents by their district of origin

Nature of District	Number of Districts	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Most Backward	3	81	27.0
Backward	7	128	42.7
Industrially Backward	3	62	20.7
Developed	4	29	9.6
Total	17	300	100.0

Source: Field Survey 2004.

Out of 18 districts from which the respondents originate 4 are developed, 3 are industrially backward, 8 are backward and 3 are most backward as classified by the Planning Commission. It is found that more than 65 percent of labour originates from backward or most backward districts. Only 9.6 percent are from developed districts. Out of the total respondents only 3 percent are from Gujarat state which indicative of the nature of ship breaking at Alang.

Table 4.4 Backward and Developed District of the Sample State

State	District	Backward/Developed
Uttar Pradesh	Gorakhpur	Backward
	Azamgarh	Backward
	Pithorgarh	Industrially Backward
	Almora	Industrially Backward
Bihar	Gopalgunj	Backward
	Banka	Backward
	Samastipur	Industrially Backward
	Munger	Developed
Orissa	Ganjam	Most Backward
	Sambalpur	Developed
	Kalahandi	Most Backward
	Bolangir	Backward
Jharkhand	Dumka	Backward
	Palamau	Most Backward
	Gumla	Backward
	Pakur	Backward
Gujarat	Bhavnagar	Developed
	Amreli	Developed

Source: Planning Commission, MLP Division, Annual Plan 2003-04.

There are wide variations among these districts in terms of literacy, and agriculture dependent population. Therefore it is important to examine the socio-

economic conditions of the districts from which most of the labours were migrating to Alang ship breaking yard. Table 4.4 demonstrates glaring level of inter district variations in literacy levels. As per 2001 census, Pithogarh and Pakur districts represent the upper and lower stratum of the education ladder respectively. Pithogarh district has the highest literacy level measured in terms of person, males and females literacy. It has 75.6 percent of literacy followed by Almora (73.6 percent) and Bhavnagar district (66.2 percent). The corresponding figure for Pakur district is 40.6 percent. Out of 18 districts from respondents are originates, 13 districts are below 60 percent literacy rate. It is found that only 5 districts have literacy rate above 60 percent. Out of 18 districts, literacy level of as many as three districts i.e. Ganjam, Pakur and Palamau districts is below the state level literacy rate.

The proportion of population engaged in productive work, the quality of employment and the remuneration received by the working population are important determinants of human development. A lack of adequate opportunity for gainful employment results in lowering income level which in turn pushes people into poverty and compels for migration in order to increase income.

Analysis of the trends in the shares sectoral employment in these districts shows that though there has been a decline in the income share of agriculture sector, this has not been accompanied by a significant shift in the share of employment. Consequently, sizable sections of the labour force in these districts (nearly 65 percent) continue to depend on the agricultural sector. The average income of persons depending on agricultural sector is considerably less than that of those working in the secondary and tertiary sectors. The prevalence of poverty in these sample districts is widespread mainly due the low productivity of workers in the agriculture sector and the seasonal nature of employment. Therefore, workers migrate from these districts to other districts and also to other states in search of employment. The population of the majority of the districts is depending on agriculture for their livelihoods, expect districts of Gujarat. Out of 18 districts under analysis only Bhavnagar has less than 50 percent of labour force in agriculture. 10 out of 18 districts have more than 70 percent dependent upon agriculture

and almost all of them are either backward or most backward by Planning Commission classification. Out of the total sample districts Bhavnagar district of Gujarat and Sambalpur district of Orissa have less population depending on the agriculture and both are developed districts. From the table 4.5 it is revealed that Gopalgunj, Banka, Dumka and Gulma districts have more than 80 percent of population as cultivator and agricultural labour. Further it is also found that more than 50 percent of population in the districts under study is engaged in agriculture. Therefore, it can be concluded from analysis that there are wide variation between these districts in terms of literacy and population depending on agriculture. Due to backwardness of these districts people generally migrate to other states for employment and income.

In the following paragraph a brief presentation of the selected districts is taken up. One district from each state that has labour working at Alang ship breaking yard is selected as a representative. The geographical location, population composition, density, literacy, sex ratio and other features are discussed. The aim is to present the basic facts about the state that the labours hail from.

Table 4.5 Literacy rate and Population engaged in Agriculture from origin of Districts of Respondents

State	District	Literacy Rate (in Percentage)	Percentage of Agriculture Population
Uttar Pradesh		47.0	66.0
	Gorakhpur	58.7	65.6
	Azamgarh*	57.0	73.3
	Pithorgarh*	75.6	68.9
	Almora	73.6	76.2
Bihar		56.3	77.4
	Gopalgunj	47.5	81.5
	Banka	42.7	81.1
	Samastipur	45.1	75.6
	Munger	59.5	57.8
Orissa		63.1	64.7
	Ganjam	62.9	63.1
	Sambalpur	67.3	53.7
	Kalahandi	45.9	79.9
	Bolangir	55.7	71.3
Jharkhand		53.5	66.8
	Dumka	47.9	81.8
	Palamau	44.9	79.8
	Gumla	51.7	86.9
	Pakur	40.6	66.9
Gujarat		69.1	52.0
	Bhavnagar	66.2	44.9
	Amreli	66.1	63.7
All India		64.9	52.4

Source: Census of India 2001.

*These districts are at present part of Uttaranchal.

Ganjam (Orissa)

Ganjam district is situated in the coastal region in Orissa state surrounded by Khurda, Phulbani, Gajapati and Nayagarh districts. The district is located on the coastal line, Bay of Bengal and Chilika Lake. The geographical area of the district is 8.706 lakh hectares which is 5.16 percent of the state area.

The total population of the district as per 2001 census is 3,136,937 which is 8.55 percent of the states population. According to 2001 census Ganjam district was the most populous district of Orissa. The population density is 382 per sq Km against the state average of 203 and the sex ratio is 1000 female per 1000 males as against the state average of 971 females per 1000 males.

The literacy rate in the rural area is comparatively much less than that of the urban areas. In rural areas the literacy rate is 42.31percent in rural areas whereas in urban areas it is 69.64 percent. The overall literacy rate of the district is 62.94 percent.

Total number of workers in the district is 10, 83,903 out of which 9, 47,048 are main workers. The percentage of main workers and marginal workers to total workers are 87.37 percent and 12.6 percent respectively. Most of the population (63.1percent) are engaged in Agriculture and related activities, which is the main occupation of the district. Agricultural sector in Ganjam district is not productive, agricultural income is low and frequent flood in the district cause the out-migration of population from the district. This district has been classified as the most backward district.

Azamgarh District (Uttar Pradesh)

The district of Azamgarh comprises somewhat irregularly shaped tract of country lying south of the Ghaghra river. Now this district is part of Uttaranchal. It is bounded on the east by Ballia, on the South-East by Ghazipur on the South-West by Jaunpur, on the West for short distance by Sultanpur, on the North-West by Faizabad, on the north by Gorakhpur and on the North-East by Deoria district.

The total population of the district is 31, 53, 885 as per 2001 census, which is 2.3 percent of state Uttar Pradesh population. The population density is 938 per sq km as against the state average of 689 per sq Km. and sex ratio is 1007 females per thousand males as against the state average of 898. The population pressure lead to increase dependence on agriculture. The decennial growth rate of population has been very high during the last three decades.

The literacy rate of the district increased from 19.1 percent in 1971 to 57 percent in 2001 which is higher than the state average of 47 percent. The pressure on land in Azamgarh continues to increase because of sizable work force was found to be engaged in agricultural activities. As per 2001 census, workers engaged as agricultural labour is 73.3 percent. The high proportion of agriculture workers shows that employment in secondary and tertiary sector was growing very slowly. This is evident from the fact that number of workers engaged in household industry was 5.55 percent while those engaged in other than household industry was 3.23 percent only. The number of workers engaged in trade and commerce and other services was 4.83 percent and 7.49 percent respectively.

Another feature of the district is related to low urbanization. The true picture of the districts could only be inferred from increase in urban population from 5.21 percent in 1971 to 7.64 percent in 2001. Due to high pressure on agriculture and few opportunities in urban areas people migrate to other states to eke out their livelihood. This district is categorized as backward district by Planning Commission.

Palamau District (Jharkhand)

The district of Palamau of Jharkhand is categorized as most backward district. It contains geographical area of 5043.8 Sq Kms. The district is bounded in the north by the river Son which separates it from the district of Rohtas and by the district Aurangabad (Bihar), on the east by district of Chatra and Hazaribagh, on the south by the district Latehar, on the west by the district Garhwa of Chhatisgarh.

The total population of the district is 2,092,004 as per 2001census. 59.3 percent of population live below poverty line.The population density is 240 per Sq Km against the state average of 338 Sq Km and the sex ratio is 937 females per 1000 males as against the state average of 941. The literacy rate among females is comparatively less than males i.e. 30.5 percent and 59.76 percent respectively. The overall literacy rate of the district is 44.9 percent.

The total number of workers in the district is 794952 out of which 285360 are cultivators and 348680 are agriculture labours. The main occupation in this district is agriculture i.e. 79.8 percent of the population is dependent on the agriculture and related activities. But agriculture sector is not productive and frequent drought in the district cause food scarcity which is an important cause of migration of the rural people to other regions.

Munger district (Bihar)

Munger district is located in the southern part of Bihar and its headquarters are located on the bank of Ganges river. On the north it is surrounded by Khagaria district, on the south and south-west by Jamui and Lakhisarai district, on the eastern side it is surrounded by Bhagalpur district and western side by Begusarai and Patna district.

The total population of the district is 11, 35,499 as per 2001 census, which is 1.37 percent of the state population. According to 2001 census. The sex ratio of the district is 878 females per 1000 male as against the state average of 921. The literacy rate for female is comparatively less than the males. Total literacy rate is 59.5 percent whereas for female it is 47.97 percent and for male it is 70.68 percent.

Total number of workers (marginal and main) in the district is 944306. In Munger district nearly 57 percent of population are engaged in agriculture and related activities. According to Census of Bihar 2001, around 50 percent of population of Munger district is below poverty line. Due to abject poverty and unemployment in the district many people are migrating to other districts and states. This district is categorized developed by the Planning Commission.

Amreli District (Gujarat)

Amreli is located near the Gulf of Khambhat in Arabian Sea. Amreli district is bounded by Bhavnagar district in the east, Junagrah district in the west, Rajkot district in

the north and Arabian Sea in the south. There are 11 talukas and 7 muncipalities in the district.

The district comprises a total geographical area of 7381 Sq Km. the total population of the district is 13, 93,295 as per 2001 census. The sex ratio is 1006 per 1000 males as against the state average of 921. The literacy rate of the district is 69.1 percent whereas for female it is 57.8 percent and for male it is 66.1 percent. There is wide variation in literacy rate among male and female.

Total number of workers (Marginal and Main) in the district are 6, 00,792. In Amreli district nearly 63.7 percent of population is engaged in agriculture and related activities and the rest are engaged in manufacturing and service sector. The district is classified as developed by Planning Commission.

4.8 Socio-Economic Profile of Migrants

In the discussion of the socio-economic characteristics of the migrants, it generally assumed that the migrants have certain distinguishing socio-economic characteristics which are markedly different from those of the rest of the population in their place of origin. These socio-economic characteristics such as age, education, family size, caste, income and their family occupation play a significant part in their movement from one place to another place for livelihood.

The social background and lack of sufficient income generating opportunities act as the push factor for the migration. The attraction of the availability of better opportunities for jobs leading to higher incomes coupled with better standards of living for themselves and their family member's acts as the pull factors. In the ultimate decision making process by the potential migrants, the push-pull factors together are combined to arrive at an appropriate decision. There is also an element of subjectivity on the part of the potential migrants, their families, near and dear, however it is difficult to capture the subjective elements. Hence most the works on migration are based on observable factors

and quantifiable variables. The present study analysed the socio-economic factors that explain the migratory process of labour.

A sample of 300 adult male respondents in the present study represents a cross section study of the migrants from the different states viz. Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Orissa and Jharkhand to Alang ship-breaking yard. There are variations in the age, caste, income, education and occupational characteristics of these respondents. It is, therefore necessary to present the socio-economic background of the migrants from different states of India.

4.8.1 Age Structure and Education Level of the Respondents

Age is one of the primary demographic variables which have great social and cultural importance. It is the basic determinant of nation's manpower supply and describes other characteristics of population. The role and activities of an individual in a family and the community are deeply associated with the age, hence it affects the over all aspects of individual and community life i.e. social attitudes, economic activities, political propensities, mobility etc.

Age structure of a society or community can be studied by dividing the entire population into three broad age groups:

- Youthful (14 years or below)
- Adult (Working group) (between 15-59 years)
- Aged (60 years and above)

The population in the age group 15-59 consists of the potential labour force of the economy. The other two group (0-14 and 60 and above) constitute the dependents in the society. However the actual labour force can be different as there can voluntary unemployment in age's 15-59 and labour participation in other groups.

Table 4.6 shows age wise distribution of the respondents originating from different states. It indicates that 75.3 percent of the population falls under the age group of 21-35 years. In Alang ship breaking yard, respondents are from different backward and underdeveloped states and they all belong to the working age group and majority of them are young. A study conducted by Yadav found migration differential by age has been almost generalized and the percent is higher for the people aged between 15 and 40 (Yadava, 1988). Average age of the migrants from five states i.e. from Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Orissa, Jharkhand and Gujarat are 28.52, 31.03, 29.77, 27.13 and 30.70 years respectively. Average age of the respondents from Orissa is lower of 27.13 years as compare to the other states. The group or total average age of the respondents from all states is 28.81 years.

Table 4.6 Age structure of Respondents and their Nativity

Age Groups	U.P	Bihar	Jharkhand	Orissa	Gujarat	Total
15-20	15.93(18)	3.23 (1)	2.78 (2)	9.46 (7)	--	9.34 (28)
21-25	24.78(28)	22.58 (7)	27.78 (20)	32.43 (24)	30.00 (3)	27.33 (82)
26-30	23.89(27)	25.81 (8)	33.33 (24)	24.32 (18)	--	25.67(77)
31-35	22.13(25)	29.02 (9)	20.84 (15)	21.62 (16)	20.00 (2)	22.33 (67)
36-40	7.96(9)	9.68 (3)	8.33 (6)	6.75(5)	20.00 (2)	8.33 (25)
41-45	2.65(3)	6.45 (2)	6.94 (5)	2.70 (2)	20.00 (2)	4.67 (14)
46+	2.65(3)	3.23 (1)	--	4.05 (3)	--	2.33 (7)
Total	100.00(113)	100.00(31)	100.00(72)	100.00(74)	100.00(10)	100.00(300)
Average Age	28.52	31.03	29.77	27.13	30.70	28.81

Source: Field Survey, May 2004.
Note: Figures in bracket are number of the respondents.

A wide diffusion of literacy and education is indispensable to the processes of development both in economic and social terms. Though education by itself does not generate socio-economic progress, the lack of it can certainly be an impediment in the development process. A certain minimum development of literacy is therefore a basic

requirement for the people to get out of ignorance and backwardness. This also enhances the employment opportunity of a person. The present study on migrants from different states shows that 33.7 percent are illiterate which less than the literates, while number of literates is higher (Table 4.7).

The table also shows that respondents having primary level education are less than the (23.3 percent). Only one respondent has technical education and 3 respondents are Graduates. Table 4.7 also shows that respondents from the five states are mostly literates i.e. 66.3 percent. The percentage of illiterate is higher from Orissa state which is 47.3 percent. Several studies showed that migrants are more educated than non-migrants with respect to the place of origin (Singh and Yadava, 1981a: 33-46 and Singh 1985). Studies on developing countries also pointed out that most of the migrants are educated and the process of migration has education selectivity (Singh and Yadava, 1981b: 392-411). Present study also supports the above studies that migrants are more educated. However, migration process is not education selectivity because the percentage of illiterate is also high i.e. more than 30 percent. It is also found that educated people are less interested in taking agriculture as their occupation.

The table shows that most of the respondents have low levels of education or none at all. Only around 10 percent of the respondents have tertiary or higher education. This in a way speaks about the nature of the industry that is drawing these labours from various regions of the country. Looking at the educational background it can be inferred that the labour is largely unskilled and at most semi-skilled.

Table 4.7 Distributions of respondents by their Level of Education

Education Level	U.P	Bihar	Jharkhand	Orissa	Gujarat	Total
Illiterate	22.12 (25)	32.23 (10)	38.89 (28)	47.30 (35)	30.00 (3)	33.67 (101)
Primary	16.81 (19)	25.81 (8)	19.44 (14)	32.43 (24)	50.00 (5)	23.33 (70)
Secondary	46.01 (52)	35.48 (11)	30.56 (22)	18.92 (14)	20.00 (2)	33.67 (101)
High-Secondary	14.16 (16)	6.45 (2)	6.94 (5)	1.35 (1)	--	8.00 (24)
Graduation	--	--	4.17 (3)	--	--	1.00 (3)
Technical	0.88 (1)	--	--	--	--	0.33 (1)
Total	100.00(113)	100.00(31)	100.00(72)	100.00(74)	100.00(10)	100.00(300)

Source: Field Survey, 2004.
Note: Figures in bracket are number of respondents.

4.8.2 Caste of the Respondents

Migrants from different parts of the country have different caste backgrounds. In the present study various castes are grouped into four broad categories, namely, Scheduled Caste, Scheduled Tribes, Other Backward Caste and General.

The data summarized the Table 4.8 indicates that 55.7 percent of respondents are from General Category, followed by 31 percent of migrants are from Other Backward castes and 9.7 percent of the migrants are from Scheduled castes. Migrants from the Scheduled Tribes are negligible at Alang ship-breaking yard i.e. only 3.6 percent. In Alang ship-breaking yard one thing is noticeable that most of the migrants are from the upper caste (General) which shows their social background at their place of origin is not a factor that pushes them to migrate. Several studies indicate that lower caste people migrate more than the upper caste (Upreti, 1981: 65-72). The current study does not support the proposition as most of the migrants are not from lower castes.

Table 4.8 Distribution of respondents by their Caste

State	U.P.	Bihar	Jharkhand	Orissa	Gujarat	Total
ST	3.54 (4)	--	1.39 (1)	6.76 (5)	10.00 (1)	3.67 (11)
SC	5.31 (6)	6.45 (2)	11.11 (8)	16.22 (12)	10.00(1)	9.67 (29)
OBC	38.15 (43)	38.71 (12)	20.83 (15)	27.03 (20)	30.00(3)	31.00 (93)
General	53.10 (60)	54.84 (17)	66.67 (48)	50.00 (37)	50.00(5)	55.67 (167)
Total	100.00(113)	100.00(31)	100.00(72)	100.00(74)	100.00(10)	100.00(300)

Source: Field Survey, 2004.
Note: Figures are in bracket are number of the respondents.

3.7.2 Occupation Background of the Respondents

In the study of migration, the pre-migration occupation and income also helps to understand the causes behind migration. In this section migrant's profiles are discussed considering their previous occupation and previous income at any place or their native place. The distribution of respondents according to their previous occupation and previous income at the place of origin is shown in the given table 4.9a and 4.9b.

The table 4.9a shows the respondent's previous occupations can be diverse. It is found that 35 percent of migrants were involved manual work in agriculture and 21.3 percent of migrants were unemployed before migrating. Further only 14 percent respondents were engaged in agriculture as marginal farmer and 29.7 percent respondents were non-agricultural labour. Therefore, it is clear that most of the respondents were engaged in unskilled occupations which constitute 60 percent of respondents. In Alang ship-breaking yard previous occupation of majority of the respondents from the different states is related to non-agriculture sector, which created opportunity to employment in industrial sector due to their experience in industrial work and considered as one of the push factors in the process of migration. It is found that majority of respondents were engaged in non-agricultural occupation and therefore the propensity to migrate was higher.

Table 4.9a Distribution of respondents by their Previous Occupation

Previous Occupation	U.P.	Bihar	Jharkhand	Orissa	Gujarat	Total
Farmer	11.50 (13)	22.58 (7)	19.44 (14)	10.81 (8)	--	14.00 (42)
Manual Labour	35.40 (40)	29.03 (9)	50.00 (36)	27.03 (20)	--	35.00 (105)
Manual Labour in Non-Agriculture	31.00 (35)	32.26 (10)	15.38 (11)	37.84 (28)	50.00(5)	29.67 (89)
Unemployed	22.20 (25)	16.13 (5)	15.38 (11)	24.32 (18)	50.00(5)	21.33 (64)
Total	100.00(113)	100.00(31)	100.00(72)	100.00(74)	100.00(10)	100.00(300)

Source: Field Survey, 2004.
Note: Figures in bracket are number of the respondents

Table 4.9b indicates that average previous income of 236 respondents from all states is Rs. 1065.38 which is very low. Out of 300 respondents, 64 have reported that current occupation at Alang to be their first job, hence for them previous income does not exist. The average income of respondents from Bihar state is higher (Rs 1269.04) whereas average income of the respondents from Orissa is lower (Rs 944.05). The vast majority of the respondents are in the income group of Rs 500-1000 which constitute 71.6 percent. Therefore, it is found from the analysis that respondent's previous income is lower, which is one of the important push factors in the process of migration. It is found that for most of the families, the respondents in this study are the sole bread winners, hence per-capita availability of resources in much lower.

Table 4.9b Average Previous Income of the Respondents

Previous Income	U.P.	Bihar	Jharkhand	Orissa	Gujarat	Total
500-1000	946.84(57)	923.33(13)	930.00(46)	904.17(48)	962.50(5)	933.37(169)
1001-1500	1273.10(21)	1275.00(7)	1281.25(14)	1183.33(8)	1150.00(2)	1232.54(52)
1501-2500	1904.16(8)	2011.11(6)	1800.00(1)	--	--	1905.09(15)
Total	1115.56(86)	1269.04(26)	1024.88(61)	944.05(56)	1016.07(7)	1065.38(236)

Source: Field Survey 2004.

4.9 Determinants of migration at household level

The determinants of migration at household level provide a better understanding as to why some families participate in the process of migration while others do not. It is found that the number of migrants from educated households is higher than the uneducated household. In other words, the propensity of out-migration was remarkably higher for the household whose member(s) have some education.

Landholding of household plays an important role in determining rural out-migration in an agrarian economy where the people are mostly dependent on land for their livelihood. Several studies found that out-migration from rural areas is closely associated with unequal distribution of resources, particularly land (Sovani, 1961 and Samsuddin, 1981). However, some studies conducted in developing countries on the relationship between landholding and propensity to move, have shown dissimilar result. For example, (Hill, 1972) mentioned that poorer and landless people have a higher propensity to migrate than richer and big landowners. On the other hand, Sekhar found that out-migration is higher for the small and medium land owning families and lower for either landless or big landowners (Sekhar, 1993: 191-202). The present study supports the proposition that out-migration is significantly higher for the landless households. The data revealed that 41 percent of the respondents are from the landless households (Table 4.10).

Most of the respondents are landless or marginal farmers with less than 2 acres of land. A higher rate of out-migration from the landless households may be due to the fact that person from such household mainly migrate to get employment as local opportunities are few. In the present study 41 percent of respondents are landless and 32 percent of respondents are having 0.5-2 acres of land. These two groups constitute 73 percent of the respondents. The number of respondent holding 2-5 and 5-10 acres of land is relatively low which is 13.4 and 11.3 percent respectively. Migration rate is very high for the landless migrants than the medium and large landholding migrants. The majority of respondents are landless. Further, persons from the landless household are found to be migrating mainly for their survival because a work/job may not be available in the rural areas and thus are capable to fulfill their livelihood needs during all seasons.

Landless labourers do not have much productive assets in rural areas and when employment opportunities are lacking in a region, there arises the need to look for better opportunities hence need for migration. In rural areas agriculture land is the main productive asset which has the capacity to generate a flow of income. Individuals having low amount of agriculture land keep falling in and out of poverty depending upon vagarities of nature. Hence these two group viz, landless labourers and marginal farmers are the most vulnerable groups in rural areas. The situation is much worse in drought prone regions of the country.

Table 4.10 Distribution of respondents by Land Ownership at their Native Place

State	U.P	Bihar	Jharkhand	Orissa	Gujarat	Total
Landless	32.74 (37)	41.94 (13)	34.72 (25)	56.76 (42)	60.00(6)	41.00 (123)
0.5-2	38.94 (44)	35.48 (11)	34.72 (25)	18.92 (14)	20.00(2)	32.00 (96)
2-4	16.82 (19)	19.35 (6)	12.50 (9)	6.76 (5)	10.00(1)	13.34 (40)
5-10	10.62 (12)	--	13.88 (10)	14.86 (11)	10.00(1)	11.33 (34)
11+	0.88 (1)	3.23 (1)	4.17 (3)	2.70 (2)	--	2.33 (7)
Total	100.00(113)	100.00(31)	100.00(72)	100.00(74)	100.00(10)	100.00(300)

Source: Field Survey, 2004.
Note: Figures in bracket are number of the respondents.

It is found from the table 4.11 that the average land holding of the all respondents at their native place is 3.52 acres of land. The respondents from Orissa have more are of land at their native place as compared to other respondents i.e. 4.53 acres. These respondents own large are of land as compared to other respondents from different states but are migrating to Alang ship breaking yard. The reason is that the districts from which the migrants come are frequently proved to drought and floods. Kalahandi, Ganjam and Bolangir districts of Orissa are known for drought and natural calamities. Therefore, in these districts agriculture is not highly productive, hence this cause migration of labours. The average land holding pattern of other states viz, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Jharkhand and Gujarat are 2.79, 2.47, 3.70 and 4.13 respectively. The respondents from Uttar Pradesh have lower land holding at their native place as compared to other states. The table 4.10 also shows that majority of the respondents own less than 5 acres of land and hence considered as marginal farmers.

Table 4.11 Land holding of the respondents at their native place

State	Average land holding (in Acres)	Minimum (in Acres)	Maximum (in Acres)
Uttar Pradesh	2.79	0.5	15.0
Bihar	2.47	0.5	15.0
Orissa	4.53	1.0	13.0
Jharkhand	3.70	0.5	20.0
Gujarat	4.13	0.5	10.0

Source: Field Survey 2004.
*Respondents who have reported some land holdings.

Another important factor in the process of migration is the family size of migrant. Several studies argued that migration is positively related with family size (Connell et al, 1976 and Upton, 1967). In other words, people migrate mostly from large households because it is easy to spare some members to go outside for work. The present study showed a similar result. The average family size of the respondents from the five states was found to be 7.60 members. Table 4.12 shows that average family size of the respondents from U.P was found to be highest at 8.64 members and for other states ranges from 4.8 to 8.27. The average family size of the respondents from Gujarat is 4.8 persons.

Table 4.12 Average Family Size of the respondents

Family Size	U.P	Bihar	Jharkhand	Orissa	Gujarat	Total
0-2	1.67(3)	--	--	2.00(1)	2.00(1)	1.80(5)
2-4	3.67(3)	4.00(4)	3.71(16)	3.69(11)	4.00(2)	3.75(36)
5-10	7.12(80)	7.20(19)	6.73(45)	6.96(57)	5.44(7)	6.94(208)
11+	14.48(27)	12.95(8)	12.81(11)	14.00(4)	--	11.59(51)
Total	8.64(113)	8.27(31)	6.98(72)	6.69(74)	4.8(10)	7.60(300)

Source: Field Survey, May 2004.
Note: *Figures in bracket are number of migrants.

Nevertheless, the number of adult male in the household better describes the outcome of an event (out-migration) than the family size. The study on migrants from different states shows that the average number of adult male was found to be more than 2. The inference is clear that the higher number of the male migrants in the family higher is the rate of migration. It is found from the table 4.13 that household having more than 2 adult male members are more migratory than household having less than 2 adult male members. This is due to the fact that migrants have some property in their native place and to take care of property some members have to stay in the native place. Thus it also supports the proposition that more male members in a family more will be the propensity for some to migrate.

Table 4.13 Average male members in the respondent's family

Male Member	U.P	Bihar	Jharkhand	Orissa	Gujarat	Total
0-2	1.04(55)	1.48(19)	1.44(46)	1.48(36)	1.11(10)	1.23(166)
2-4	3.57(43)	3.13(6)	3.32(24)	3.27(32)	--	3.40(105)
5-10	6.10(15)	6.00(6)	5.50(2)	5.00(5)	--	5.84(28)
11+	--	--	--	12.00(1)	--	12.00(1)
Total	2.67(113)	2.67(31)	2.18(72)	2.63(74)	1.11(10)	2.46(300)

Source: Field Survey, May 2004.

Note: Figures in bracket are number of migrants.

4.9.1 Family or Father's Occupation and Income of the Respondents

Family occupation or father's occupation also influences the migrant's decision to migrate. If family occupation is related to non-agricultural sector then the propensity to migrate is higher. If families are engaged in agriculture sector then the propensity to migrate will be lower. Several studies found that the families engaged in non-agricultural work are more migratory than those engaged in agriculture work (R.R.Paul, 1989: 79-85). Table 4.14a shows the family occupation of the migrants at their place of origin.

Most of the respondent's families or father's are belonged to partially unemployed group i.e. 62.3 percent. Therefore, it is indicated from the table that the parents of the respondents are employed but there is not sufficient work available to employ round the years at their native place. The distribution reveals that most of the respondents were the sole earner in the family and their parents were particularly unemployed at their place of origin. Thus, the decision to migrate is influenced by their family occupation at their native place.

Table 4.14a Percentage distribution of respondents by their father's occupation at the place of origin.

Family Occupation	U.P.	Bihar	Jharkhand	Orissa	Gujarat	Total
Farmer	37.17 (42)	35.48 (11)	23.62 (17)	28.38 (21)	--	30.33 (91)
Labour Work	5.31 (6)	--	1.77 (2)	4.05 (3)	--	3.67 (11)
Service	4.42 (5)	9.68 (3)	--	4.05 (3)	--	3.67 (11)
Partially Unemployed	53.20 (60)	54.84 (17)	73.61 (53)	63.52 (47)	100.00(10)	62.33 (187)
Total	100.00(113)	100.00(31)	100.00(72)	100.00(74)	100.00(10)	100.00(300)

Source: Field Survey, 2004.

Note: Figures in bracket are number of the respondents.

Another push factor which influences the people to migrate is the family income. If the family income is low and the number of dependent members is high, the propensity to migrate is high (Hossain, 2001: 11-13). The dependency ratio is based on the fact that every member of the society is a consumer while some are producers. A country with large proposition of producer is economically better off than a country with smaller proposition of producers. It is found that the ratio of persons of relatively non-productive ages is high in India. A high rate of dependency means that large proposition of population is less than 15 years or above 60 years.

It is found that dependent members in respondent's family are more than 5 members. Table 4.14b shows that average dependent members in the respondents families is 5.11, which shows that respondents are from the large family size with higher number of dependent members. Table also reveals that number of dependents is higher in Bihar state which is 6.27 persons. The table reveals that for every migrant there are many dependents. When the dependents are more per working member, the worker looks for higher and steady income. In agriculture the income are seasonal and unsteady.

Table 4.14b Average Dependent Member in respondents Family

Dependent Member	U.P.	Bihar	Jharkhand	Orissa	Gujarat	Total
0-2	1.17(12)	--	2.00(11)	1.47(15)	1.00(1)	1.52(39)
2-4	3.50(28)	3.49(9)	3.56(21)	3.53(27)	3.83(7)	3.55(92)
5-10	6.49(69)	6.70(20)	6.38(38)	6.54(32)	6.00(2)	6.49(161)
11+	12.25(4)	14.50(2)	11.50(2)	--	--	12.63(8)
Total	5.39(113)	6.27(31)	5.03(72)	4.41(74)	3.98(10)	5.11(300)

Source: Field Survey, May 2004.

Note: Figures in bracket are number of the respondents

One of the major factors in the process of migration is the earning members in respondent's family, which will affect the migration process. More members in a family are earning then less number of dependent members in the family. It is found from the table 4.15 that 151 respondents are the sole earners in the family and 84 respondents have two earning members in the family and remaining respondents have 3 or more than 3 earning members in a family. It is found from the analysis that 50 percent of the respondents are the only earning member in the family. Therefore, it can be said with the increase in earning members in a family reduce the dependent members.

Table 4.15 Family Size and Earning Member in respondents Family

Family Size	Earning Members in a Family						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
1-2	3.31 (5)	-	-	-	-	-	1.67 (5)
2-4	21.10 (32)	3.57 (3)	-	-	-	-	11.67 (35)
5-10	72.19 (109)	76.19(64)	69.57 (32)	38.46 (5)	-	-	70.00 (210)
11+	3.31 (5)	20.24(17)	30.43 (14)	61.54 (8)	100.00(3)	100.00(3)	16.66 (50)
Total	100.00(151)	100.0(84)	100.00(46)	100.00(13)	100.0 (3)	100.00(3)	100.00(300)

Source: Field Survey, May 2004.
Note: Figures in bracket are number of the respondents.

Table 4.16a and 4.16b shows that the average family income of the respondents before and after migration. The average family income of the respondents before migration is Rs. 1871.22 and after migration is Rs 5387.23 which is three to four times higher than the pre-migration family income. The average family income of respondents from different states before migration is Rs 2637.17, Rs 1940.32, Rs 2255.56, Rs 2095.74 and Rs 900 whereas after migration family income of the respondents is Rs 5058.30, Rs 3990.65, Rs 4086.77, Rs 4626.20 and Rs 2810.99. It is found from the analysis that after migration family income of respondents increase three or four times and most of the family income before migration ranges between 500-2000. However, it is found that lower family income with higher number of dependents increase the propensity to migrate which is also found to be valid among workers at Alang ship-breaking yard.

Table 4.16a Average Family Income of the Respondents

Family Income	U.P.	Bihar	Jharkhand	Orissa	Gujarat	Total
500-1000	743.59(39)	980.77(13)	646.88(32)	663.79(29)	900.00(10)	671.55(123)
1001-2000	1657.14(21)	1560.00(10)	1738.46(13)	1692.31(13)		1666.67(57)
2001-4000	2883.87(31)	2760.00(5)	2881.25(16)	2773.91(23)		2841.33(75)
4001-6000	5000.00(12)	5500.00(2)	4800.00(5)	5000.00(6)		5000.00(25)
6001-8000	7350.00(8)	7000.00(1)	7250.00(4)	6666.67(3)		7175.00(16)
8001-10000	--	--	9000.00(1)	--		9000.00(1)
10001+	--	--	11000.00(1)	--		12333.33(3)
Total	2637.17(113)	1940.32(31)	2255.56(72)	2095.74(74)	900.00(10)	1871.22(300)

Source: Field Survey, May 2004.

Note: Figures in bracket are number of respondents.

Table 4.16b Average Family Income of the Respondents (After Migration)

Family Income	U.P.	Bihar	Jharkhand	Orissa	Gujarat	Total
1000-2000	1950.00(3)	1950.00(4)	2000.00(2)	2000.00(1)	2000.00(1)	1980.00(11)
2001-4000	2975.70(44)	2976.72(15)	2756.81(33)	2964.64(33)	2901.11(9)	2379.00(134)
4001-6000	5174.55(41)	4754.18(7)	5148.24(24)	5208.11(27)	--	5017.27(99)
6001-8000	6962.50(12)	6566.67(3)	7458.33(7)	7024.44(9)	--	7003.00(31)
8001-10000	9283.33(8)	9140.00(2)	9250.00(2)	9666.67(4)	--	9335.00(16)
10000+	12966.67(5)	--	12516.67(4)	--	--	12741.67(9)
Total	5058.30(113)	3990.65(31)	4086.77(72)	4626.20(74)	2810.99(10)	5387.23(300)

Source: Field Survey, May 2004.

Note: Figures in bracket are number of respondents

4.10 Other Factors Responsible for migration

In developing countries, particularly in Asia, low agricultural income and agricultural unemployment and under-employment are the major factors pushing

migrants towards areas with greater job opportunities. The pressure of population, resulting in a high man-land ratio has been widely hypothesized as one of the important causes of poverty and rural out-migration. With the given mode of production only a small part of the labour force can be absorbed by agriculture. Unless the non-crop husbandry sectors, cottage and small-scale industries in the rural areas can take in the surplus labourers and these people move to the urban centers to be gainfully employed (Oberai and Singh, 1983: 25-30).

The causes of migration are usually explained by using two broad categories viz, push and pull factors. For example, people of a certain area maybe pushed off by poverty and unemployment to move towards a town and/or industrial base for employment. While a better employment and higher facilities may pull people to move to urban areas to get these opportunities. People's decision to migrate from one place to another may be influenced by many non-economic factors such as personal maladjustment in the family or community, natural disaster and political instability. When these non-economic factors arise, economic disadvantages may appear as a strong influential or push factor in migration decision of an individual.

The causes of migration as reported by the respondents have been collected by the researcher and the results are presented below. The findings show that it is the economic opportunity that played a dominant role in migration decision. Over 58 percent of the respondent reported that they migrated due to unemployment and low wages at their place of origin. While another 35.7 percent did so to find better income (Table 4.17). Further, about 5.3 percent migrants were pushed off due to the influence of the family members because of low property at their native place. From the analysis of data the main reason for migration it is found to be the backwardness and unemployment situation in the respondent's native place. It pushed them to migrate to Alang ship breaking yard and to earn their livelihood as well as to fulfill their family responsibilities.

Table 4.17 Percentage distribution of respondents by reason for migration

Reason for Migration	U.P.	Bihar	Jharkhand	Orissa	Gujarat	Total
Low Property	0.88 (1)	9.68 (3)	1.39 (1)	13.52 (10)	10.00(1)	5.33 (16)
Low Wages	39.83 (45)	32.26 (10)	44.44 (32)	21.62 (16)	40.00(4)	35.67 (107)
Social Problem	--	--	2.78 (2)	1.35 (1)	--	1.00 (3)
Unemployment & Low Wage	59.29 (67)	58.06 (18)	51.39 (37)	63.51 (47)	50.00(5)	58.00 (74)
Total	100.00(113)	100.00(31)	100.00(72)	100.00(74)	100.00(10)	100.00(300)

Source: Field Survey, 2004.

Note: Figures in bracket are number of the respondents.

It is documented that migration decision of an individual is influenced not only by the push factors but also by the pull factors (Yadava, 1990). But in case of migrants from different states to Alang ship breaking yard it is found that the most of the migrants are migrated due to push factors but some pull factors are also responsible in the process of migration.

Another most important factor is the situation in the place of origin which also influenced decision to migrate. In Alang ship breaking yard most of the migrants arrived between the years 1996-2000. Some states were frequently suffering from drought which is one of the important factors in the process of migration (Table 4.18).

Table 4.18 Percentage distribution of respondents by year of migration to Alang Ship Breaking Yard

Migration Year	U.P.	Bihar	Jharkhand	Orissa	Gujarat	Total
1980-85	7.08 (8)	9.67 (3)	6.94 (5)	4.05 (3)	12.50 (1)	6.67 (20)
1986-90	15.04 (17)	12.90 (4)	11.11 (8)	14.06 (11)	--	13.33 (40)
1991-95	24.78 (28)	48.39 (15)	30.56 (22)	22.97 (17)	50.00 (4)	28.67 (86)
1996-2000	35.40 (40)	22.59 (7)	38.89 (28)	39.19 (29)	25.00 (2)	35.33 (106)
2001-2004	17.70 (20)	6.45 (2)	12.50 (9)	18.93 (14)	12.50 (1)	15.40 (46)
Total	100.00(113)	100.00(31)	100.00(72)	100.00(74)	100.00(8)	100.00(300)

Source: Field Survey, 2004.

Note: Figures in bracket are number of the respondents.

From the data it is revealed that most of the respondents migrated to Alang ship breaking yard between years 1996-2000 and they account for 35.6 percent. This is due to the fact that in these years most of the districts of Orissa, Bihar and Jharkhand faced the drought situation. Therefore, most of the respondents migrate to Alang ship breaking yard in search of employment and to fulfill their survival needs.

One of the important pull factors in the process of migration is the presence of friends and relatives at Alang ship breaking yard. This pull factor is important in the process of migration because presence of villagers and relatives at the place of destination helps in getting employment and accommodation at the place of destination during the initial period.

Another pull factor which is very important in the process of migration is the availability of employment opportunity at the place of destination. During the years 1996-2000, Alang ship-breaking yard was at its boom with high growth of ship-breaking industry in the world. In these years most of migration took place. From the discussion it

is found that the push factors are stronger than the pull factors in the process of migration to Alang.

Table 4.19 summaries the stay at Alang. It is found that 60 percent of the respondents have been working at Alang for 6-15 years which is long. In Alang ship breaking yard most of the migrants are long term migrants because they are staying there for more than 8 month (see table 4.19). It is found from the table 4.19 that 38 percent of respondents are staying for the period of 6-10 years at Alang ship breaking yard. Further 22 percent of respondents stayed for 11-15 years. The new entrant at ship breaking activities in last one year is only 6 percent. Therefore, it can be said that majority of respondents at Alang ship breaking yard are long-term migrants.

Table 4.19 Respondents stay at Alang Ship Breaking Yard

Years of Stay at Alang	Number of respondents	Percent of respondents
0-1	18	6.0
2-5	67	22.3
6-10	115	38.3
11-15	66	22.0
16-20	29	9.7
21+	5	1.7
Total	300	100

Source: Field Survey 2004.

4.11 Arrangement for Migration

The arrangement for migration means the preparation i.e. how the migrants go to the place of migration. It is related with their decision of migration, the selection of destination of migration and the process of their movement to the destination of migration. There are two basic factors which have direct bearing on the arrangement of migration. First, the source of information, and second the financing of migration. For the sources of information, the migrants receive information through various channels viz, labour contractors, friends, relatives, their own past experience etc. Similarly, the cost of

migration is financed by various sources such as borrowing, advance by employers, contractors, own saving etc. Taking all these factors into consideration the arrangement for migration differs highly in case of short-term and long-term migration.

. Sources of Information

The sources of information for migration vary on the basis of duration of migration and the social class of the migrants. The respondents from different states migrate to Alang ship breaking yard on the basis of information passed on to them by the friends and relatives or are taken away by the labour contractor locally known as Muqadam at Alang. Some people migrate with the group of the fellow villagers. Middlemen/labour contractor are the main source managing short-term migration.

There are various sources of information for respondents about the potential employment opportunity at Alang ship breaking yard. Table 4.20 shows that majority of the migrants get information about the availability of job at Alang ship-breaking yard through friends and relatives (93.4 percent). This is due to the fact that the support of friends and relative reduce the cost of migration and also provides initial stay at the Alang ship breaking yard. Other source of information is seemed to be less important in the process of migration. All respondents from Gujarat migrate through friends and relatives. Thus in Alang ship-breaking yard the importance of contractor in terms of providing information to migrants is negligible. However, the employment is through labour contractors, even though friends and relatives provide information. The labour contractors themselves hail from different states and they tend to recruit their natives.

Table 4.20 Percentage distribution of respondents by their source of information

Source	U.P.	Bihar	Jharkhand	Orissa	Gujarat	Total
Friends & Relatives	90.27 (102)	96.77 (30)	94.44 (68)	94.59 (70)	100.00(10)	93.34 (280)
Contractor	9.73 (11)	--	4.17 (3)	2.71 (2)	--	5.33 (16)
Agents	--	--	1.39 (1)	1.35 (1)	--	0.67 (2)
Firms	--	--	--	1.35 (1)	--	0.33 (1)
Others	--	3.23 (1)	--	--	--	0.33 (1)
Total	100.00(113)	100.00(31)	100.00(72)	100.00(74)	100.00(10)	100.00(300)

Source: Field Survey, 2004.

Note: Figures in bracket are number of the respondents.

Some of the owners of ship breaking plots place their order for labour through their agent's i.e. labour contractors. These labour contractors are the agents of the owners who recruit labours at minimal wage rates. A large number of the labour contractors hail from the very regions where from potential labour is picked up. The labours with long experience and some level of education became local labour contractors. They are engaged by owner for this purpose, and are paid commission. The owners prefer the local labour contractors as they enjoy the confidence of the migrants and also help control labour. The labour contractors recruit the labours for migration, make arrangement for their travel and in some cases provide loan/advances to the prospective migrants.

Though it is always not true for all caste and class, generally those who are relatively better off have better access to information about prospective employers and therefore, usually migrate on the basis of their own knowledge or information provided. In Alang ship-breaking yard it is found that atleast one Muqadam (labour contractor) hail from the each states this has been discussed in section 5.3.1 of Chapter 5. In the process of recruitment of potential labour is important in Alang.

In recent years although the role of middlemen has not entirely been replaced by other sources, it has been minimized largely because of increasing awareness among

migrating workers. The role of middlemen/contractor has been more prominent in case of short-term migration, while the role of friends and relatives has been more prominent in case of long-term migration.

. Financing for Migration

The prospective migrants require money for migration. They require money to meet the initial expenses at the place of destination, expenses of those family members who stay behind in the village and their transport cost and other travel expenses. In some cases migrants have to pay bribe in cash or kind to labour contractors for getting job. Some of them manage it on their own while other take advance before migration. The labour contractors, employers, village moneylenders, fellow migrants and other village fellows provide them advance. It is found that some respondents have taken loans before or after migration whereas most of them have used their own saving for the initial expenses in the place of destination.

Table 4.21 shows that about 46.4 percent of respondents have used their own savings or family saving for migration whereas 30.3 percent took loans from their fellow villagers, only 10.3 percent got finance from labour contractors and the rest 13 percent from village moneylenders. It is found from the analysis that labour contractors are the agents of the owners who finance the labours in the form of loan and deduct from the wages of the migrant. In the table 4.20 it is found that the contractor provides information to only 5.3 percent of the respondents whereas labour contractor finance to 10.3 percent of respondents (see table 4.21). In the process of migration of rural labour clearly shows that the role of owner is indirect but the role of labour contractor is direct who finance the labours. However, it is found that most of respondents arrange their source of finance for their migration through their own and family savings.

Table 4.21 Percentage distribution of respondents by their source of finance for Migration

Source of Finance	U.P.	Bihar	Jharkhand	Orissa	Gujarat	Total
Saving	43.36 (49)	29.03 (9)	38.89 (28)	67.57 (50)	30.00(3)	46.34 (139)
Villagers	36.28 (41)	32.36 (10)	34.72 (25)	16.21 (12)	30.00(3)	30.33 (91)
Labour Contractor	7.96 (9)	12.90 (4)	15.28 (11)	8.11 (6)	10.00(1)	10.33 (31)
Money Lender	12.39 (14)	25.81 (8)	11.11 (8)	8.11 (6)	30.00(3)	13.00 (39)
Total	100.00(113)	100.00(31)	100.00(72)	100.00(74)	100.00(10)	100.00(300)

Source: Field Survey, 2004.

Note: Figures are in bracket are number of the respondents.

4.12 Conclusion

The process of migration is as old as human history. It is observed that differences are prevailing in the socio-economic development of the different states and district within. A large proportion of labours employed at Alang ship breaking yard are migrants from different states. They are largely from backward states of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Orissa and Jharkhand. Only a small proportion of workers are from Gujarat state i.e. 5-10 percent. Large proposition of the workers are originate from the backward or most backward districts of these states. Out of 18 districts from which respondents originate 4 are developed, 3 are industrially backward, 8 are backward and 3 are most backward as classified by planning commission.

In Alang ship breaking yard majority of respondents have low level of education or none at all. Further it is found that only around 10 percent of the respondents have higher education. Due to this educational background labours are largely unskilled or semi-skilled. As far as the caste of the respondent's is considered the majority of them are from General caste or upper caste. The survey also found that the Scheduled caste and Scheduled tribe workers are negligible at Alang.

It is observed that the migrants from rural areas to Alang largely dominated by individual rather than family migration. This has important implications for the flow of remittance back to the place of origin. Moreover, the impact of migration on the place of migration in terms of increased demand for housing, education and other services is likely to be much less serve when migration does not involve movement of all members of the family, than it would be otherwise.

The data in the present study divulge strong male domination. The average age of the migrants is found to be 33.82 years. About 75.33 percent of migrants were between 21-35 years of age, which is the working age group. So it can be said that migrants at Alang are quite young. Another significant feature was that nearly 71 percent of migrants were married while 29 percent of migrants were unmarried.

The overall average family size is found to be of 7.30 members, constituting of higher family size. In case of migrants from U.P the average family size is high (8.64 persons) as compared to migrants from other states (7 persons). However, the dependent members in migrant's family are observed relatively higher. The overall average dependent member in migrants family is 5 persons and high dependent members in migrant family is found to be from Bihar. About 41 percent of migrant households do not own any agricultural land. Further, about 71 percent of the cultivating migrant households owned less than 2 acres.

A study of the causes of migration is highly important in the process of migration. Among the causes of migration reported in the present study, it is observed that both 'push' and 'pull' factors have their influence on migration. Little more than 35 percent mentioned 'pull' factors are the main causes of their migration and 65 percent cited 'push' factors as the most important. So it is found that 'push' factors have been more important than 'pull' factors. As far as 'push' factors are concerned, it is observed that the leading cause of migration is unemployment in the rural areas which is the principal causes of migration. The study brings out that 58 percent migrants moved out of the rural areas because of non-availability of work at the place of origin. Another important push factor is low fixed property (5.3 percent) of the migrant at their native place. Social and family disputes are yet another push factor. The most important cause of migration for 35 percent of respondents is 'pull' factors. From the data it is observed that the important 'pull' factors, which cause migration of rural labourers, is relatively good wages at Alang as compared to their native place.

Important factor reported which influences the process of migration are contacts at the place of migration and availability finance for migration. Relatives and friends living in the place of destination not only amply supply information about employment opportunities in the areas but also actually assist in getting jobs. In the present study, 93.4 percent migrants get information about potential employment opportunities at Alang through friends and relatives which reduce the role of labour contractors which is only

5.3 percent. In many cases, friends and relatives help to reduce the cost of migration by arranging migrant's initial stay at the destination.

Another important phenomenon in the process of migration is finance for migration. In the present study, 46.4 percent migrants arrange finance for migration with their own saving or family saving which call for the role of family in the process of migration. The remaining 63.4 percent of migrants arranged through fellow villagers, contractors and village money lenders which has important implications for remittance. It is also found that role of principal employer at Alang is indirect but the role of labour contractor is direct in labours migration.

It is concluded from the analysis that majority of the respondents have migrated from rural areas due to low income, unemployment, social problems. These labours are not economically sound at their native place and migrated to earn their livelihood at Alang ship breaking yard.

References

Aurora. G.S (1967), "The New Frontier Man: A Sociological Study of Indian Immigrants in United Kingdom", Popular Prakashan, Bombay, pp.11-15.

Acharaya. G.N. (1964), "Some Thoughts on Urbanisation", Yojana, 13 September.

Barik. B.C (1994), "Rural Migrants in an Urban Setting: A Case Study", Classical Publishing House, Delhi.

Beijer. G. (1965) "Demographic, Social and Economic Aspects of Internal Migration in Some European Countries", United Nations World Population Congress, Belgrade.

Breman. J (1985), "Of Peasants, Migrants and Pampers: Rural Labour Circulation in West India", Oxford University Press, Delhi.

Brinley. Thomas (1954), "Migration and Economic Growth", Cambridge University Press.

Bogue. D. J. (1961) "Techniques and Hypotheses for the Study of Differential Migration" in International Population Conference, Paper. 114.

Cherlohilam. F (1987), "Migration: Causes, Correlations, Consequences, Trends & Policies" Himalaya Publishing House, Delhi.

Connell. J, B. Das Gupta, R. Laishely and M. Lipton (1976) "Migration from Rural Areas: The Evidence from Village Studies", Oxford University Press, Delhi.

Clifford. J. Jansen (1969), Some Sociological Aspects of Migration", in J. A. Jackson (ed.), Migration, Cambridge University Press, New Delhi.

Dhekney. B. R (1959) "Hubli City: A Study in Urban Economic Life", Karnatak University, Dharwar.

Esientadt. S. N (1975) "Analysis of Patterns of Immigration and Absorption of Immigrants", in Leszek. A. Kosinski and R. Mansell Prothero (eds.), People on the Move: Studies on Internal Migration, Methuen & Co. Ltd, London.

Ernst Weissman (1965), "The Urban Crisis in the World", Urban Affairs Quaterly, Vol. I, No.1.

Gupta. A.K (1990), "Sociological Implication of Rural to Rural Migration: A Case Study Of Rural Immigrants in Punjab", Vohra Publishers and Distributors, Allahabad.

Helen. I. Safa, Brian. M. dutoil (1975) "Migration and Development", 'Introduction' Mouton Publishers, The Hague.

Hertzler. J. O. (1956) "The Crisis of World Population", University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.

Hill. P. (1992) "Rural Hausa, A Village and Setting", Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Hossian. M. Z (2001) "Rural-Urban Migration in Bangladesh: A Micro-Level Study", IUSSP conference, Brazil.

Joshi. V(Ed) (1987), "Migrant Labour and Related Issues", Oxford University Press, Delhi.

Kant. E (1962) "Classification and Problems of Migration", in Philip. L. Wagner and Marevin. W Mikeshell (eds.), Readings in Cultural Geography, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Kamble. N.D (1983), "Labour Migration in Indian States", Ashish Publishing House, New Delhi.

Kammeyer. K. C. W. (1975) "Population Studies: Selected Eassy and Research", Rand Mchally College Publishing Company, Chicago.

Kasar. D.V (1992), "Economics of Seasonal Migration", Classical Publishing Company, New Delhi.

Khan. N (1986), "Pattern of Rural Out-Migration-A Micro Level Study", B.R.Publishing Corporation, Delhi.

Kingsley. D (1951), "The population of India and Pakistan", Princeton University Press, New York.

Kingsley. Davis (1964), "Human Society", The Macmillan Company, New York

Koteshwar. P (2004), "Seasonal Migration from Mahaboobnagar", ed. K. Gopal. Iyer, "Distressed Migrant Labour in Indian Key Human Right Issues", Kanishka Publisher, Distributors, New Delhi.

Kuroda. Toshio (1972), "Continuity and Transformation of Migratory Behaviour in Japan", in Isahrat. Z. Hussain (ed) Population Analysis and Studies, Somaiya Publications, Bombay.

Lakadawala. D.T. (1963), "Work, Wages and Well Being in an Indian Metropolis", Economic Survey of Bombay.

Lee. E. S. (1968) "A Theory of Migration" in D.H. Heer (ed.), Readings on Population, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Lee. E.S. (1975) "A Theory of Migration" in Kenneth. C. W. Kammeyer (ed.), Population Studies: Selected Eassys and Research, Rand Menally, College Publishing Company, Chicago.

Lewis. W. A (1970), "Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour" The Manchaster School of Economic and Social Studies.

Lynn. S. T (1948) "Population Analysis", Mcgraw hill Co. Inc.

Majid. H and Hashia. M.H (1989) "Seasonal Migration of Kishmiri Labour", Rima Publishing House, New Delhi.

Majumdar. D. N (1960), "Social Contours of an Industrial City", Asia Publishing House, Bombay.

Nair. K. S. (1978) "Ethnicity and Urbanisation", Ajantha Publication, New Delhi.

Oberai.A.S and H.K.Manmohan.Singh (1983), "Causes and Consequence of Internal Migration: A Study of Indian Punjab", Oxford University Press, New Delhi.

Pal. B. N. (1974) "Family and Women in Urban India" in Anthon De' Souza and Alfred De, Souza (eds), Population Growth and Human Development Development, Indian Social Institute, New Delhi.

Paul. R. R. (1989) "Rural-Urban Migration in Punjab", Himalaya Publishing House, Delhi.

Peterson. W. (1958), "A General Typology of Migration" ASR, Vol. 23.

Raju. B.R.K (1989), "Development Migration: A Professional Analysis of Inter-state

Rural-Rural Migration", Concept Publishing Co. New Delhi.

Ravenstein. E. G (1885) "The Laws of Migration and Development" Journal of the Royal Statistical Society.

Ravenstein. E. G (1889) "The Laws of Migration and Development" Journal of the Royal Statistical Society.

Saha. Panchanan (1970), "Emigration of Indian Labour", People's Publishing House, New Delhi.

Samsuddin. S. Dara (1981) "Aspects of Migration from Rural Areas to Industrial Urban Centres of Bangladesh", in R.B. Mandal (ed.), Frontiers in Migration Analysis, Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi.

Saxena. D. P (1977) "Rural-Urban Migration in India", Popular Prakashan, Bombay.

Sekhar. T. V. (1993) "Migration Selectivity from Rural Areas: Evidence from Kerala", Demography India.

Singh. S. N. and Yadava. K. N. S. (1981a) "On Some Characteristics of Rural Out-migration in Eastern Uttar Pradesh", Society and Culture, Vol. 12 (1).

Singh. S. N. and Yadava. K. N. S (1981b) "Dimensions of Rural-Urban Migration in India and Their Impact on Socio-Economic and Demographic Factors" in Urbanisation and Regional Development (ed.) R.B. Mandal and G. L. Peters, Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi.

Singh. S. R. J. (1985) "A Study of Rural Out-migration and its Effects on Fertility", Unpublished PhD thesis in Statistics, Banaras Hindu University, India.

Singh. S (2003), "Migration in India: Some Evidences from States", ed. K. Gopal. Iyer, "Migrant Labour and Human Rights in India", Kanishka Publisher, Distributors, New Delhi.

Sjaastad. L. A (1962), "The Costs and Returns of Human Migration", Journal of Political Economy, October

Sovani. N. V. (1959), "Potential Out-Migrants and Removal of Surplus Population in three Districts of Orissa (India)", International Conference, Vianna.

Sovani. N. V. (1961) "Urban Social Situation in India", Arthvinjana, Vol. III (2).

Srivastav and Ali (1981), "Frontiers in Migration Analysis", Concept Publishing House, New Delhi.

Stark. O and D. Bloom (1985), "The New Economics of Labour Migration", American Economic Review, Vol.75.

Stark. O (1991), "Migration Incentives, Migration Types: The Role of Relative Deprivation", The Economic Journal, Vol.101.

Subrahmanya. R.K.A (1987), "Policy and Administration Aspects of Labour Migration" ed. "Migrant Labour and Related Issues", Oxford University Press, Delhi.

Theodare caplow (1954), "The Sociology of Work", The University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Todaro. M. P (1969), "A Model of Labour Migration and Urban Unemployment in Less Developed Countries", The American Economic Review, March.

Upreti. H. C (1981) "Social Organisation of a Migrant Group: A Sociological Study of

Hill Migrants from Kumaon Region in the City of Jaipur" Himalaya Publishing House, Bombay.

Upton. M (1967) "Agriculture in South Western Nigeria", Department of Agricultural Economics, Development Studies No. 3, Migration, University of Reading.

Weinberg. A. A (1975) "Migration and Belonging: A Study of Mental Health and Personal Adjustment in Israel", in Leszek. A. Kosinski and R. Mansell Prothero (eds.), People on the Move: Studies on Internal Migration, Methuen & Co. Ltd, London.

World Bank (1984), "World development Report", World Bank, Washington D. C.

Wrong. D. H. (1956) "Population", Random House, New York.

Zachariah. K. C. (1964) "A Historical Study of Internal Migration in the Indian Sub-Continent, 1901-31", Asia Publishing House, Bombay.