

URBAN INFORMAL SECTOR & MIGRANTS

Pushendra Misra

Ph.D, Assistant Professor, Dept. of Commerce, University of Lucknow, Lucknow-India

Mohd.Saif Alam

Ph.D, Assistant Professor, Saraswati Institute of Technology & Management, Unnao (U.P) – India

Introduction

In most developing countries there is a large sector of the economy that is called the informal sector or the unorganised sector. Employment in the informal labour market plays an important role in most developing economies. Very broadly, the informal labour market consists of workers in the informal sector plus casual workers in the formal sector. The informal labour market is a very large part of the agricultural sector, but is also a significant part of the urban sector. There is a difference between employment in the formal sector and the informal sector in terms of conditions of work, whether workers are subject to government taxes, have access to social security or insurance, casual or contract workers, whether they receive minimum wages or not, etc.

The informal economy is a very important sector of the Indian economy: the National Council of Applied Economic Research estimates that the informal sector -“unorganised sector”- generates about 62 % of GDP, 50 % of national savings and 40 % of national exports, (ILO 2002, p. 30). In terms of employment, the informal economy provides for about 55 % of total employment (ILO 2002, p. 14). Urban areas (especially large cities) attract numerous migrants from both the rural areas and from smaller urban towns and cities in the hope of a better life. The Indian labour market can be conceived of as a segmented market: a formal sector with workers who have salaried work, with good working conditions, and of course organised business. The informal economy would consist of small self-employed traders and business people, and casual workers in the informal or formal sectors.

India with its 28 states and 7 union territories is the 7th largest country in the world. With the independence of the country in 1947, the country embarked on achieving higher economic growth with development and recently new concept of inclusive growth has been incorporated in the five years plan. With the progress of each plan there was some success and now India is regarded as one of the fast growing economy in the world. This development is positively reflected in terms of reduction of poverty, disparities in income, increasing literacy, representation of socially backward classes etc. But the major outcome of this development process is the increase in the regional disparities, at inter-state and intra state level. Some states and regions within states are more developed with respect to other states and region. As a result of regional disparities in terms of development, the net result was in the form of migration of people at inter-state and intra-state level in search achieving higher economic development. Apart from regional imbalances other factors that have played significant role in migration is the development of transport and communication. As with more developed transport and communication people came into contact with the other parts of the country regions.

A recent Report of the National Commission for Enterprises in the Unorganised Sector by the Government of India (Sengupta 2009) finds that 86% of the total employment in 2004-2005 was in the informal sector. Further, the agricultural sector consists almost entirely of informal workers. The non-agricultural workers in the informal sector were 36.5 % of the total, most of whom were self-employed. From 1999-2000 to 2004-2005 most of the increase in employment in the formal sector was of informal workers (Sengupta 2009, p.14). The NSSO (2012, p ii) document finds that in 2009-2010 in the non-agriculture sector, nearly 71 % of the workers in rural areas and 67 % in the urban areas worked in the informal sector. It finds that the informal sector activities are concentrated mainly in the manufacturing, construction, wholesale and retail trades, and transport, storage and communication industries.

The migrants primarily trace work in the informal sector in cities as they do not possess adequate skills that are required to get jobs in organized sector. This leads to the development of dual labour market in the urban areas. On one hand there are the scantily paid workers, not availing any form of social security in the informal sector, and in contrast there are the highly skilled and better paid formal sector workers. Although the migrants earn more in the urban areas than in the rural areas, since they are underpaid in the informal sector in the city it thrusts on them a low standard of living and quality of life in the metropolis. Given the set-up of the urban labour market in India, some of the important issues that are raised, since informal sectors had higher proportion of migrants labour, whether migrants are from disadvantaged social and ethnic groups or more so to religious minority, and finally, what their level of education and what impact does migration have on their socio-economic and human development conditions.

Statement of Problem

Presently NSSO conduct the quinquennial survey for estimating the number of migrants both rural and urban. The estimates are largely based on usual place and residence and current status. Estimates on employment are collected by Ministry of labour and employment, both for formal and informal employment. The problem with these two surveys is that NSSO estimate on migration does not reflect seasonal and circular migration and based on single question framework. Secondly there are migration of children is not taken into consideration although they are the major part of hotels and restaurants and domestic helper. These is almost no representation of the SC/ST in the process of migration. Fourthly estimates on migration are not able to brings the relationship between migration and poverty.

Reason that finds it dominancy for migration is employment for male and marriage for female. Since there has been migration of rural to urban area. The basic question that comes to mind is with respect to the sector in which migrants find themselves employed. As per the general consensus they are employed in the informal sector. Till now not much work has been done that tries to find out relationship between migration and their employment in the informal sector. Even if some studies have been conducted they are not for the state of Uttar Pradesh. Secondly the studies have not take into consideration the socially backward classes and minorities. There for this proposed project will be the first of it kind for the state of Uttar Pradesh and will not only bring new areas that are less explored to the forefront but will also help the central as well as state government to formulates some plan and policies for the migrants that are working in informal sector and that too with special focus on the socially backward classes and minority,

Against this backdrop this paper will undertake to examine the socio- economic aspects of migrant labourers with respect to their livelihoods, wages, working conditions. The socio-economic condition of the migrant workers is far below the desirable level, due to migrants' transitional and informal nature of employment. In addition, lack of skill and educational attainment among migrants renders them to a vulnerable economic and social life in the city. Further, worker's volition seems to have very limited power in exploring opportunities in the labour market since their choices in this market are being subject to intermediary institutions such as labour brokers, often constraining these workers opportunities to avail a work with decent pay and social security.

Informal Labour Market: Definitions

The term informal sector came in a broader sense in the academic literature only after the visit of an International Labour Organization (ILO) employment mission to Kenya in 1972. The ILO then evolved a conceptual framework and guidelines for the collection of statistics on informal sector and presented the same in the Fifteenth International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS) held in February, 1993 in the form of a resolution. The resolution was then endorsed by the United Nations Statistical

Commission (UNSC) and made a part of the “System of National Account (SNA) 1993” by the United Nations Economic and Social Council.

Though the term „informal sector“ gained currency after ILO evolved a conceptual framework and guidelines for the collection of statistics on informal sector, there has not been any single definition of informal/unorganised sector in India. Informal sector is a matter of discussion among the academics, policy makers etc. from the beginning as a large chunk of workforce employed in this sector. Different criteria are used to identify the informal sector but non of them was universally applicable in different empirical situations (papola, 1981). A study by Mitra (2001) based on fourth economic census of India took the criteria of own account enterprises and employment establishments employing one to nine workers to identify the informal sector. The different organizations of India like National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO), Directorate General of Employment and Training (DGET) etc used varying definitions of informal/unorganised sector depending on the specific requirements of each organisation. Keeping in view the absence of a uniform definition of informal/unorganised sector in India the National Commission for Enterprises in the Unorganised Sector (NCEUS) set-up a Task Force to review the existing definitions and formulated harmonized definitions of informal/unorganised sector employment and informal/unorganised employment.

In the developing country context, the informal sector is sometimes defined in terms of the activities of the enterprises (ILO, 1972) and sometimes in terms of the kind of work done by individuals as employees or as self-employed people (Hart, 1973).

In 1972 the ILO characterised the informal sector as:

- (a) Ease of entry
- (b) Reliance on indigenous resources
- (c) Family ownership of enterprise
- (d) Small scale of operation, often defined in terms of hired workers less than (say) ten
- (e) Labour-intensive methods of production and adapted technology
- (f) Skills acquired outside the formal school system
- (g) Unregulated and competitive markets

Whereas the formal sector was characterised by:

- (a) Difficult entry
- (b) Frequent reliance on overseas resources
- (c) Corporate ownership
- (d) Large scale of operation
- (e) Capital-intensive and often imported technology
- (f) Formally acquired skills, often expatriate
- (g) Protected markets (through tariffs, quotas, and licences)

Hart (1973) discussed the informal sector in terms of the conditions of work of the individuals and whether they worked for wages with good conditions or informally as self-employed workers. Informal activities included:

- (a) Farming, market gardening, self employed artisans, shoe makers, tailors, etc.
- (b) Working in construction, housing, road building
- (c) Small scale distribution, e.g. petty traders, street hawkers, caterers in food and drink, etc.
- (d) Other services, e.g. barbers, shoe-shiners etc.
- (e) Beggars
- (f) Illegal activities like drug pushing

Formal sector income earning activities included:

- (a) Public sector wage earners

(b) Private sector wage earners (on permanent contracts, not casual workers)

Sengupta (2009, p. 3) defines the informal economy thus:

Informal Sector: The unorganised sector consists of all unincorporated private enterprises owned by individuals or households engaged in the sale and production of goods and services operated on a proprietary or partnership basis and with less than ten total workers.

Informal worker/employment: Unorganised workers consist of those working in the unorganised sector or households, excluding regular workers with social security benefits provided by employers and the workers in the formal sector without any employment and social security benefits provided by employers.

Informal economy: The informal sector and its workers plus the informal workers in the formal sector constitute the informal economy.

Informal Worker

To estimate the contribution of Informal sector to gross domestic product the definition of informal sector was included in the System of National Accounts (SNA), 1993. The definition is, therefore, in terms of characteristics of the enterprise rather than in terms of the characteristics of the worker. Thus a large number of workers with informal job status were excluded. Some of the reasons for the exclusion are.

(i) The persons engaged in very small-scale or casual self-employment activities may not report in statistical surveys that they are self-employed, or employed at all, although their activity falls within the enterprise-based definition.

(ii) Certain groups of persons such as out-workers, sub-contractors, free-lancers or other workers whose activity is at the borderline between self-employment and wage employment are likely to be missed or wrongly classified.

(iii) An enterprise based definition of the informal sector will not be able to capture all aspects of the increasing “in formalisation” of employment, leading to various forms of informal employment even in the formal sector.

(iv) Persons employed in private households as domestic servants, gardeners, etc. are likely to be left out in an enterprise based definition.

The Employment relationship even in the so called organized sector is not formal in a good percentage of cases and many workers working in the formal sector without any protection and social security. At the same time, there are atleast a few employees in the unorganised/ informal sector that enjoys formal employment relationship. The National Commission for Enterprises in the Unorganized Sector (NCEUS) took note of these aspects and decided to complement the definitions of unorganized/ informal sector with a definition of informal employment.

“Informal workers consists of those working in the informal sector or households, excluding regular workers with social security benefits provided by the employers and the workers in the formal sector without any employment and social security benefits provided by the employers”

Migration: Introduction

Migration, especially internal migration, contributes significantly to the growth of Indian cities. The Constitution of India guarantees freedom of movement and freedom to settle within the territory of India as a fundamental right of all citizens (Article 19). Yet, migrants face several barriers in access to civic amenities, housing and employment, as well as restrictions on their political and cultural rights because of linguistic and cultural differences. These discriminations are articulated in various parts of India in the ideology of the ‘sons of the soil’ movement, which evokes anti-migrant sentiments (Weiner 1978; Hansen 2001). Migrants are all the more vulnerable to discrimination and exploitation, because many of

them are poor, illiterate and live in slums and hazardous locations that are prone to disaster and natural calamities. As such, the condition of migrants in cities needs to be addressed squarely in urban policies and programmes.

Migration is a central issue with regard to the 'right to the city' (that is, the right for everyone, including migrants, to access the benefits that the city has to offer), and how best to promote awareness and representation of migrants within the city is another important concern (Balbo 2008, p. 132). The right to the city perspective seeks to improve the condition of migrants by providing an alternative thinking to counter the negative effects of neo-liberal policies (Purcell 2002). It advocates proactive strategies to include migrants in the decision-making process, recognizing their contribution as valued urban citizens. This paper presents an array of cases of denial of migrants' right to the city: it reviews the nature and process of migration to urban areas in the light of recently available evidence; identifies the exclusionary processes operating in Indian cities that influence migration and migrants, and suggests strategies for the integration of migrants to build inclusive cities in India.

Migration, Urbanization and Cities

Migration has been the main component of urbanization. According to the Census 2011, about one third of the population in India lives in urban areas (31 per cent). The urban population comprising 377 million people out of a total population of 1,210 million people, as enumerated in the 2011 Census, is spread over about 8,000 cities and towns. These cities and towns are hierarchically linked to each other, but predominantly embedded in the spatial organization of the national economy. The spatial structure of the Indian economy is shaped by three port cities, namely, Kolkata, Mumbai and Chennai, built during colonial rule (Raza and Habeeb 1975). Delhi also played an important role after it became the capital city in 1911. Together, these cities dominated the urbanization process and the inter-regional flow of migration. The 2011 Census shows that the urbanization process is vibrant in north, west and south India with the three largest cities, namely, Delhi, Mumbai and Chennai forming a nucleus in their respective regions.

Hyderabad, Bangalore and Ahmedabad are another group of big cities that shaped the regional pattern of urbanization. On the other hand, eastern and north-eastern India lagged behind, because of the declining importance of Kolkata and the lack of any other megacity in the region. The next ranking city in east and north-east India is Patna, which is about seven times smaller than Kolkata. The exclusion of eastern and north-eastern India on the map of urbanization is also evident in the fact that the region as a whole is characterized by high inter-state out-migration, which is largely due to the lack of vibrant cities in the region. The same is also true for the central region, consisting of the states of Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh and Rajasthan.

India has launched a policy of economic liberalization since 1991. During the post-liberalization phase, the importance of cities and urban centres has been growing in India's economic development; for example, the contribution of urban areas to India's GDP has increased from 29 per cent in 1950–1951 to 47 per cent in 1980–1981, to 62 to 63 per cent by 2007, and it is expected to increase to 75 per cent by 2021 (Planning Commission 2008, p. 394). It is also being emphasized that 9 to 10 per cent of growth in GDP depends fundamentally on making Indian cities more livable and inclusive (Planning Commission, Govt of India 2008, p. 394). However, with increasing economic growth, wealth is getting concentrated in cities and urban centres, and the rural-urban gaps in income levels and wages and employment opportunities are widening. Further, increasing economic growth is also associated with growing regional disparity and lopsided urbanization. Many have argued that the process of urbanization during the post-liberalization phase has been exclusionary (Kundu 2007; Bhagat 2010). It not only is

exclusionary in the regional sense, but is also a social and spatial process within the city, and it would be perilous to ignore the conditions of migrants in urban areas.

Internal Migration: Trends and Patterns

Indian cities are growing through internal migration, unlike some cities of the developed countries where the component of international migration has been relatively larger. Because of the visibility of international migrants in western cities, international migrants received more attention from researchers, international organizations and funding agencies. It is now realized that internal migrants – those who move within the national territory – are several times larger than those who move across countries. According to the *Human Development Report*, 2009, those who moved across the major zonal demarcations within their countries were nearly four times larger (740 million) than those who moved internationally (214 million) (UNDP 2009, p. 21).

However, if we take smaller units such as villages and towns as geographical demarcations, the internal migrants were as many as 309 million in India alone, based on place of last residence in 2001, out of which 101 million were enumerated in urban areas

Migration to urban Areas

India's urban population was 79 million in 1961 and increased to 377 million in 2011 in a half century. By 2030 it is likely to reach about 600 million (Ahluwalia 2011). The share of in-migrants (all durations of residence) in the population of urban areas has increased from 31.6 per cent in 1983 to 33 per cent in 1999–2000 to 35 per cent in 2007–2008, for which the latest data are available from National Sample Survey Office (NSSO 2010a). The increase in the migration rate to urban areas has primarily occurred owing to increase in the migration rate for females.. Although females migrate on account of marriage, many of them take up work sooner or later, joining the pool of migrant workers in urban areas. On the other hand, the male migration rate in urban areas has remained constant (between 26 and 27 per cent), but employment-related reasons of migration for males increased from 42 per cent in 1993 to 52 per cent in 1999–2000 to 56 per cent in 2007–2008 (NSSO 2010a). This shows the increasing importance of employment related migration to urban areas. When we disaggregate the reasons of migration by various streams of migration such as rural to rural, rural to urban, urban to rural and urban to urban, employment-related reasons go as high as 62 per cent in male rural to urban migration (NSSO 2010a;). Further, within the rural to urban migration stream, there is an increasing importance of inter-state rural to urban migration for employment-related reasons (Bhagat 2010).

Migration to Cities

As mentioned in the earlier section, internal migration in India is influenced by regional disparity in the levels of development, which had its roots during colonial rule. Migration towards cities became more important when cities with million plus population acquired new prominence in the urbanization map of India. At the beginning of the twentieth century, Kolkata acquired the status of a million-plus city, followed by Mumbai in 1911. By 1951, Delhi, Chennai and Hyderabad joined the ranks of the million-plus cities. By 2001, there were 35 million-plus cities in India, in which about 38 per cent of the total urban population was residing. The number of million-plus cities has gone up to 53 and population residing in them increased to 43 per cent by 2011.⁴ The rising importance of million-plus cities, in both numbers and huge concentration of urban population in them, shows the significance of migrants in the city space. The share of in-migrants (all durations of residence) in the entire population varies from less than 15 per cent in million-plus cities like Allahabad and Agra to 55 per cent and more in cities like Surat, Ludhiana, and Faridabad. Mumbai and Delhi had about 45 per cent of migrants in 2001.

Migrants in cities and urban centres are predominantly engaged in the informal sector. They work as construction workers, hawkers and vendors, domestic servants, rickshaw pullers/drivers, electricians, plumbers, masons, security personnel, etc. The majority are either self-employed or casual workers. About 30 per cent of migrant workers, working as casual workers, are quite vulnerable to the vagaries of the labour market and lack social protection. Only 35 per cent of migrant workers are employed as regular/salaried workers (NSSO 2010a).

Seasonal and Temporary Migration

Migration involves change of residence either on a permanent or semi-permanent basis, but in a year, there are large numbers of people who move for a short duration in the lean season from their current place of residence. Such migrants, known as seasonal and temporary or circular migrants, are not fully captured by the conventional definitions based on the criteria employed by the Census or NSSO, that is, of place of birth or place of last residence criteria. An additional definition of migration has been used by NSSO to capture the seasonal and temporary migration.

A seasonal/temporary migrant is defined as ‘the household member who has stayed away from the village/town for a period of one month or more but less than six months during the last 365 days, for employment or in search of employment’ (NSSO 2010a). This criterion estimated a 14 million seasonal/temporary migration additionally as per National Sample Survey 64th Round in 2007–2008. The seasonal/ temporary migration is predominantly (63 per cent) directed towards cities and urban centres (Keshri and Bhagat 2012). Several studies have pointed out that seasonal/temporary migration is more prevalent among the socioeconomically deprived groups, such as Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, and among the poorest of the poor and landless households. It is mostly driven by distress and is a form of livelihood strategy of the rural poor (Deshingkar and Akter 2009; Keshri and Bhagat 2010).

Migration in India is not new and historical accounts show that people have moved in search of work, in response to environmental shocks and stresses, to escape religious persecution and political conflict. However improved communications, transport networks, conflicts over natural resources and new economic opportunities have created unprecedented levels of mobility. But as we discuss in following sections, the increase in mobility is not fully captured in larger surveys often leading to erroneous conclusions about mobility levels in India.

Although significant in recent years, growth has been unequal in India (Balisacan and Ducanes 2005), characterised by industry in developed states such as Gujarat, Maharashtra and Punjab drawing labour from agriculturally backward and poor regions such as eastern Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, southern Madhya Pradesh, western Orissa and southern Rajasthan. High productivity agricultural areas (“green revolution areas”) continue to be important destinations, but rural-urban migration is the fastest growing type of migration as more migrants choose to work in better paying non-farm occupations in urban areas and industrial zones. Delhi and the states of Gujarat and Maharashtra are top destinations for inter-state migrant labour. Labour mobility has grown and will probably continue to grow once the economy recovers from the current crisis.

Literature Review (Internal Migration)

Kundu (2003) had earlier estimated the contribution of net rural-urban migration along with natural increase, (net) population of new towns, and increase due to expansion of existing towns and merger of towns into them. He found that the percentage contribution of natural increase and new towns declined from 61.3 per cent and 9.4 per cent, respectively, in the 1980s to 59.4 per cent and 6.2 per cent, respectively, in the 1990s. The contribution of area/coverage increase of existing towns/cities was obtained on the assumption that the number of towns being merged in the existing towns in the 1990s

was more than double compared with the 1980s, and the contribution of net rural-urban migration for the 1990s was then obtained as a residual and was estimated at 21 per cent – that is, slightly lower than its contribution in the 1980s (21.7 per cent). Kundu has argued that the role of migration can be expected to decline further owing to the anti-migrant bias in some states and to the exclusionary urbanization policies being pursued.

More recently, Bhagat and Mohanty (2009) have also estimated the contribution of migration to urban growth in India during the recent decades. In their study, Bhagat and Mohanty have used the actual data on migration from the Census, which is also available for the period 1991–2001, and unlike previous studies, they have made adjustments for natural increase of the inter-censal migrant population. As in the previous study by Kundu, the components of urban growth that have been assessed are natural increase, net increase in towns, jurisdictional changes, and net rural-urban inter-censal migration. In their estimate, they find the contribution of natural increase to have declined from 62.3 per cent in 1981–1991 to 57.6 per cent in 1991–2001. The contribution of new towns also declined from 17.2 per cent to 12.3 per cent, while that of internal migration increased from 18.7 per cent to 20.8 per cent. The residual component (jurisdictional change) contributed 1.8 per cent and 9.2 per cent to the urban growth in these two decades. If unclassified migrant decennial population in urban areas is classified as rural-urban migrants, then the contribution of migration to urban growth during the 1990s would increase to 22.4 per cent. Thus, Bhagat and Mohanty find the contribution of migration to have increased during the 1990s.

Migrant labour makes enormous contributions to the Indian economy through major sectors such as construction, textiles, small industries, brick-making, stone quarries, mines, fish and prawn processing and hospitality services. But migrants remain on the periphery of society, with few citizen rights and no political voice in shaping decisions that impact their lives (Kabeer 2005). Unlike countries in Southeast Asia and East Asia, the bulk of the migrant workforce in India has little or no education (Srivastava 2003). In fact migrants are poorly endowed all-round: they come from poor families where access to physical, financial and human capital is limited and where prospects for improving living standards are constrained by their inferior social and political status. Historically disadvantaged communities such as the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes¹ and Other Backward Castes are heavily represented in migration. Poor migrants are absorbed in informal sector jobs, much maligned for being insecure, poorly paid and unproductive but offering the only option for labourers to improve their capabilities.

In the period 2001–2011, urban population has increased from 286 million to 377 million. For the first time since independence, urban population growth (91 million) has exceeded rural population growth (90.5 million). However, the number of new towns has increased very significantly in this period – by 2,744 towns. Kundu (2011a, b) has argued that this spurt in the identification of new towns is proactively induced by policymakers. Be that as it may, the contribution of this element to urbanization is likely to go up significantly in this decade. Bhagat (2011) has estimated that the contribution of natural increase to urban growth during 2001–2011 has further declined to 44 per cent. Since data on new towns and migration are currently not available, it is not possible, at present, to assess the separate contribution of the three other factors.

Literature Review- Informal Workers and Urban Migrants

The literature on the role of the informal sector in developing countries has oscillated between treating the informal sector as a backward sector that is holding back economic development to a dynamic sector that is helping to develop the economy rapidly without straining foreign currency balances and with relatively low demands for (real) capital goods, see Mazumdar (1976), Weeks (1975), Bromley (1978), Gerxhani (2004). The informal sector is considered as a pre-capitalist form of production compared to the formal sector that is a profit maximising capitalist sector. There is a large literature on rural-urban

migration (see, Harris and Todaro, 1970) that considers migrants arriving in the city and initially finding work in the informal sector and then moving on to better paid work in the formal sector. Fields (1975) developed an early model of the informal sector as a “way station” for line up for a formal job in urban areas (De Mel et al. 2010) which has been followed by others. This view of the informal sector as a temporary abode for migrants has been disputed (amongst others) by Mazumdar (1976). The debate has also ranged over whether informal sector workers are living in poor conditions with low incomes, or whether some of the informal sector workers are there out of choice and have a comfortable life, see Meng (2001). Some individuals may have employment in the formal sector and work in the informal sector as well.

The contribution of the migrant workforce to urban development is immense. In addition, the processes of liberalization, privatization, and globalization, especially since 1991, have enhanced the pace of internal migration of skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled workers from rural to urban areas (Pattanaik, 2006). Nevertheless, the experience of developing countries including India reveals that the modern urban sector, especially better organized ones, due to its emphasis on capital intensive techniques in production may absorb partially the enormous growth of the urban workforce (Harris 2003) into an employment ensuring decent working conditions. On the other hand, a substantial part of the increased labour force, due to migration, in the modern sector is likely to be absorbed in the informal work in the unorganized sector where people create their own employment opportunities to the extent that their capital and skills permit. In a circumstance like this, people who join workforce often end up earning lower than the minimum wage (Kundu and Sarangi 2007). To a greater extent, the exodus of causal labour from rural to urban, pertinently in developing countries such as India, may have its roots in ostensible dualities which exist in the economy. In the dual economy of developing regions, there are two sectors evolving together. There is the modern sector existing in urban regions where the patterns of living and working resemble the developed countries. On the other hand, there is the non-modern sector present either in rural regions or urban peripheries, which absorbs majority of workforce in the country, struggling to eke out means of survival and living in entrenched inequalities (Schumacher, 1973). Moreover, the majority of the population living in the non-modern sector has very limited opportunities which offer decent work. Their work opportunities are so restricted that they cannot work their way out of misery. Their participation in labour market hinges around possibilities like underemployment and unemployment. When they locate occasional work, they may get low paid works with lesser chances of attaining their work potential. Obviously, those who are keen to get out of this loop may opt to migrate, often drifting to urban regions where they get work at higher wages.

The urban unorganized sector provides relatively easy access to various employment opportunities for deprived segments of the urban society as well as rural migrants. Concomitantly, the urban economic system copiously bank on such unorganized workers for the expansion and development. However, it is ironical that this segment of the labour market which provides vital services to the city also forms the lowest rung of the urban society (Shrivastava and Kumar, 2003).

The National Commission for Enterprises in the unorganized Sector (NCEUS) has observed that the trend of increasing short and long duration migration has an apparent link with regional inequalities. Mobility of labour takes place when workers in source areas lack appropriate options of employment and livelihood and there is expectation of improvement in standard of living through a continuous source of employment in the area where they intend to migrate, in terms of increased income and more participation in employment (Lall, Selod and Shalizi, 2006). The development process of the city provides people with new economic opportunities and also other social benefits which lead to migration of workforce to urban areas. However, the participation of these migrant workers in the organized sector employment, which provides decent working condition in the urban areas, has been abysmally low,

partly explained by lack of educational attainment of rural youth, which is required to get job in the organized sector (Bino et al, 2008). Therefore, they tend to be absorbed in the informal sector which has grown over time, functioning as providers of essential services to the city although at very low returns (Shrivastava & Kumar, 2003).

It appears the development of informal sector in the city enhances the intensity of migration of unskilled workers to the urban areas. In an attempt to mitigate deprivation and make an adequate living for themselves, the people from poor households in rural areas keep moving and shifting their place of living to urban areas. They make a serious effort to diversify their livelihoods through a variety of informal sector job opportunities available in the urban areas (Bhattacharya, 1998). In fact, the rural migrant labourer enters a situation of unlimited supply of labour from the rural areas to the expanding demand of labour in the urban informal market (Indrani Gupta and Arup Mitra, 2002).

The decision to migrate involves contextual factors such as push factors which force migrants out of rural areas and pull factors which attract migrants to urban areas (Indrani Gupta and Arup Mitra, 2002). Further, the close operation of the pull and push factors of migration become very pronounced due to the imbalance in the growth process of the different regions of the country. The surplus low skilled individuals, who do not find desirable employment profile with decent wage in the rural areas, get absorbed in the informal sector in the urban areas, donning the role of casual worker. In many instances, they work and stay in the urban area for a longer term. In other instances, they come to work during the season when there is no rain and agricultural activity is nil in their village and then return to their native place when there are rains. These people move to the urban region for a temporary period of time. The motive behind migrating to the city is to facilitate more earning than migrants would be able to within traditional primary economic activities (Deshingkar, 2004). In fact, temporary migration has become a routine part of the livelihood strategies of the rural poor. It is an important route to come out of poverty for the poor. Although income these migrants generate may help them to survive, there may be little scope for saving the investible surplus (Bhattacharya, 1998).

Further, the pull of informal sector work in urban areas is, to a greater extent, explained by the prevalence of low wages in rural areas. In most cases agricultural labour contracts are verbal, often not protecting workers from irregularity of employment and earning. It is important to note that low wage in primary activities such as agriculture, impacting the rural labour force, may be explained by both the micro phenomena like productivity, be it farm or individual, and macro ones such as institutions which enable the functioning of the product and labour market. For instance, a pervasive low wage rate, far lower than minimum wage set by the state, may occur if low productivity, due to obsolete state of art, coexists with exploitative labour market scenarios, wherein labour market institutions such as law and collectives may suppress even increase in real wage, thus pushing workers into perpetual misery.

Further, the nature of agriculture productivity is such that it depends on the vagaries of the monsoon and with it the employment scenario in the agriculture sector gets unstable (Harris 2003). In contrast to this, urban areas provide a lot of scope to diversify incomes through the various informal sector job opportunities.

There are certain traditional push factors which affect the rate of migration to a very significant extent. These are: drought in the rural area, low wages in the agricultural sector, lack of sustained sources of income and lack of diversified livelihood opportunities. Besides these there are also some new pull factors that have been operational in the last two decades and have given a momentum to population mobility. These are urbanization and the new economic opportunities arising from urbanization, improved communications and roads and substantial increase in remittances from migration. Overall, the process of urbanization has led to increase in remittances from rural–urban migration and it is gradually substituting the irregular and low wages of the agricultural sector (Priya Deshingkar, 2004).

The migrants primarily trace work in the informal sector in cities as they do not possess adequate skills that are required to get jobs in organized sector. This leads to the development of dual labour market in the urban areas. On one hand there are the scantily paid workers, not availing any form of social security in the informal sector, and in contrast there are the highly skilled and better paid formal sector workers. Although the migrants earn more in the urban areas than in the rural areas, since they are underpaid in the informal sector in the city it thrusts on them a low standard of living and quality of life in the metropolis.

Nevertheless, the impact of migration on the socio-economic condition of migrants can be varied. First, the migrants could get locked in the debt cycle where all their earnings are used up in repaying the loan they had incurred at home in the rural regions. Most of their remittance is also used in the funding their expensive working capital which is required in agriculture and performing other social and economic responsibilities in their village. Second, migration may not be capable of improving their social and economic condition to an immense extent but may help them to improve their survival strategies (Shrivastava and Kumar, 2003).

Social networking is a very important feature of labour migration in the informal sector as it impacts the movement of the rural labour force to the urban areas. The aspect of social networking is significant to comprehend the implications of labour mobility on the labour market trends. The migrants and the labour brokers form the set of connections which channelizes the movement of labour (Rees, 1966).

The informal sector in the urban areas is characterized by low wages, excessively long hours of work and social security almost not existing. Since migrants earn less than what is required to sustain a decent living in urban areas, they lead a life of low quality, presumably reflected in their low human development. The migrants live in deplorable conditions and have extremely poor health status. The women migrants are the worst hit in such a scenario as they are paid lesser than their male counterparts and they do not enjoy basic health benefits like maternity leave and others. In addition, for migrants the tenure of work for industries like construction is very unpredictable which leave them with a sense of insecurity of income and work (Solanki, 2002). Nevertheless, the employers in the informal sector may prefer migrant workers since it is easier to exploit migrants as they may have lesser information about the labour market of the destination area and are in extreme need of money.

The pay, time and duration of work can be flexibly molded by the employers as the migrant workers do not have much say in the scenario. The contractors take advantage of the migrant's economic necessity for their own benefit. The employers do not provide them anything more than minimum subsistence wages and along with that unacceptable working condition (Lall, Selod and Shalizi, 2006). It is reported that the brokers make the migrant labourers work for 18-20 hours and then pay them minimally. Further, since there is no formal contract of work for the migrant labourers they may be dismissed from their job without a proper notice and also charged of negligence of work. Again, in many cases, it has been reported that these informal sector workers are often released from their job without being paid for their work. The broker allure the asset-less persons of the villages with lump sum amount of money as advance for their wages and afterwards takes this as an opportunity to bind them to the work for infinitely long period of time. This makes their payment for work negligible compared to the labour that is extracted from them (Bhattacharya, 1998).

The rural urban labour markets are increasingly getting connected due to the need of urban informal sector for the development of the urban regions. The shift of rural labourers from farm activities to non-farm activities is a cumulative process, connecting the urban and rural labour markets. Nevertheless, the labour markets, instead of attaining desirable level of integration, tend to get stratified, in terms of the difference in skill possessed by the formal and informal sector workers owing to the lack of skill

development and education opportunities among the informal sector workers (Shrivastava and Kumar, 2003).

Factors Affecting Rural-Urban Migration

While a large number of empirical studies on migration have been conducted on the basis of field surveys in urban destinations, the focus of researches is primarily on migrants and in some studies non-migrants are added for the sake of comparison. Therefore, urban specificities which migrants have been pulled by or pushed to are not analysed per se although some of the important factors related to the livelihoods of migrants, such as urban labour market and living conditions are investigated within the scope of individual researches. Also, the majority of the migration researches set its unit of analyses either at the national level or local areas selected and demarcated by the researchers. Thus, the intermediate level, particularly district level analysis is almost absent. This is considered critical since district is an important unit for capturing migration flows as defined in census data on migration. An exception, Kaur (1996) has analysed spatial pattern of male rural-to-urban migration based on district-wise data of 1971 census. She has classified the districts into three categories, i.e., areas with relatively high proportion of rural-urban male migrants among total urban male population (24 percent and above), areas with moderate proportion (16 to 24 percent) and areas with relatively low proportion (below 16 percent). The distribution of 356 districts according to the above classification was 24.4 percent, 36.0 percent and 35.7 percent respectively. The regions having districts with high rural-to-urban male migration rates were described as those witnessed rapid development of mining, industrial activities, service sectors, considerable colonisation, and rapid expansion of administrative and security machinery due to new political and strategic importance accorded to the areas. On the other hand, the group of areas with low proportion of rural-to-urban male migrants was mainly confined to the northern half of the country. There urbanisation in the post-independent era was low due to stagnant agricultural economy and tardy industrial development. As for the differences in distance of migration, Kaur (1996) finds that the areas with relatively high proportion of intra-state rural-urban male migrants were mainly found in areas which experienced low to moderate rate of urbanisation in recent decades. In contrast, the regions with high inter-state rural-urban male migration experienced high rate of urbanization in recent decades. They included industrial-mining areas, Assam region, Punjab-Haryana tract and areas with considerable agricultural colonisation.

Kaur's (1996) study gives an overview of spatial distribution of rural-urban migration and its relationship with some urban characteristics. However, she has dealt only male migrants and her attention was directed only on economic factors. Moreover, she did not apply any statistical analysis relating to the districts' socio-economic characteristics, thus her conclusions are more or less descriptive in nature.

Work Participation and Sex Ratio

The association of work participation and incidence of migration has been extensively reported firstly as the main reason of migration and secondly as the consequences of migration. At the national level, the questions on reasons for migration have been canvassed since 1981 census for the migrants by last residence. In 1981, among the rural-to-urban migrants, 'employment' was the most cited reason by male migrants (47.5percent) followed by the reasons 'family moved' (23.5percent) and 'education' (8.1percent) (Sinha 1986). The economic motivations of migrants are found to lead to the higher work participation rate among migrants compared with non-migrant population in urban centres (Oberai, Prasad and Sardana, 1989). To the contrary, as for the female, 1981 census reported that the half of migrants (51.5percent) mentioned 'marriage' as the main reasons for urban migration while second

largest reason was 'family moved' (29.3percent) and 'employment' was cited only by 4.2 percent of female migrants. 'Education' was the primary reason for 3 percent of females (Sinha, 1986). The apparent gender differentials in the reasons of migration have earlier resulted in focusing only on male migrants as a sensitive indicator of economic implications of migration as well as development in general. It should be noted that earlier male pre-dominated in rural-urban migration but in the 1970s, there was a shift toward greater female participation in urban-ward flows. In other countries such as

Education

It has been widely observed that the propensity to migrate increases with education (Connell et. Al., 1976, Banerjee, 1986). Banerjee's study (1986) on the inter-state migrants in Delhi finds the share of matriculated and graduates among migrants in the sample was many times higher than that among the population from which they originated (in this case, Punjab, Rajasthan and UP). If we compare the educational level of migrants and non-migrants at the place of destination, broad-based information is rather limited. A study which canvassed information regarding socio-economic characteristics of in-migrants and non-migrants in three states of Bihar, Kerala and Uttar Pradesh shows that in case of Bihar and Kerala, the educational level of in-migrants is higher than that of non-migrants whereas in UP the pattern was reversed (Oberai, Prasad and Sardana, 1989).

In case of female migrants, the level of education is polarised; there are migrants, literate and employed in modern occupations and also illiterate migrants who are mostly found in occupations with generally low status (Singh, 1984). The level of education is again significantly related to regional and ethnic characteristics of migrants. Among the migrant domestic workers studied, the majority of live-out domestics who are mostly married are found to be illiterate whereas live-in workers, largely single are comparatively better educated (Neeta, 2004).

Child/Women Ratio

Child/women ratio is usually an indicator of female fertility. In the light of rural-to-urban migration, relevant information is largely limited to the marital status of female migrants. If we look at the marital status of migrants compared with non-migrants in urban areas, the share of being married is higher than non-migrants. According to 1971 census, the differences of marital status were wider in case of female migrants than male migrants⁴. The share of those being married among migrants and non-migrants was 65.7percent and 25.5 percent in case of female while it was 58.0 percent and 29.6 percent for male. Another discernible gender difference is that the ratio of being widowed and divorced is much higher among female migrants than non-migrants. As for male, the rate is almost similar (Sinha1986).

There are distinct regional and ethnic variations also in the marital status of migrants. According to Singh (1984), there was substantial number of unmarried female migrants from Kerala. Studies on domestic workers in Delhi also found substantial number of single female migrants, mostly Christian STs who are working as live-in domestics (Neeta 2004; Chattopadhyay 2005)..

The areas of origin, whether rural or urban, are not separated. It is the study done by Oberai and Singh (1983) in Ludhiana district of Punjab, which included the question regarding the effect of rural-to-urban migration on fertility. They found generally higher fertility among migrants, especially, longstanding in-migrants, than non-migrants. However, recent in-migrants have lower fertility than urban non-migrants due to the initial period of separation between spouses and uncertainties as well as costs involved immediately before and after the migration. The fertility among the migrants was also lower than the rural residents. Thus, they conclude that migration has the effect of reducing completed family size as also of lowering fertility during the period immediately following migration. It is reported that infant mortality rate among the migrant children is usually high because of lack of proper child care facilities

and support. Citing a study of migrant women in Delhi's slums, Karlekar (1990) notes the mortality rate for female children was significantly higher than for males due to less medical care given to girls than boys.

SC/ST -Social network

The importance of social network in migration is widely acknowledged. Thus, the fact that there are a large concentration of migrants belonging to scheduled caste (SC) and scheduled tribe (ST) status, especially in the informal sector (Basu, Basu and Ray, 1987; Kasturi, 1990, Neeta, 2004) suggests the positive effects of SC/STs presence in urban destinations on inducing further rural-to-urban migration. Bhattacharya (2002) in his regression analysis of intra-state rural-urban migration models on the basis of 1981 census data has examined the impact of the SC and ST status as a proxy of social network, on rural-urban migration. His unit of data is state level data and he has analysed only those who mentioned 'employment' as the reason of migration. In his findings, the presence of SC population in urban areas is found to give positive effect on the migration of SCs from rural areas while SC incidence in rural regions is seen to reduce out-migration rates. The ST status, however, was seen not have any effects on rural-to-urban migration.

References

1. Baulch, B. and J. Hoddinot, 2000, 'Economic Mobility and Poverty Dynamics in Developing Countries', *Journal of Development Studies*, 36(6): 1-24.
2. Baulch B and McCulloch N (1998). *Being Poor and Becoming Poor: Poverty Status and Poverty Transitions in Rural Pakistan*, Working Paper 79, Institute of Development Studies, Sussex.
3. Borhade, A. (2007) *Addressing the needs of seasonal migrants in Nashik*, Maharashtra Disha
4. Foundation/Population Council, New Delhi.
5. Bhattacharya, P., (1998), "The Informal Sector and Rural-Urban Migration: Some Indian Evidence", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol.33, No.21, May23, 1998.
6. Bino Paul, Sony P., Kishore B., Shaoni S., Milly S, Krishna M, Pathan J. (2008) "Educational Attainment of Youth and Implications for Indian Labour Market- An Exploration through Data", Adecco-TISS Labour Market Research Initiative, Discussion Paper no. 6, 2008, Mumbai.
7. Bino Paul, Kishore B., Shaoni S., Piu M., Krishna M., Radhika B, Purandaran, K., Venkatesh M (2009), "India Labour Market Report", Adecco-TISS Labour Market Research Initiative, March 2009, Mumbai, India.
8. CUTS International (2008) *Exploring the post-1990s trade-labour linkage in India. A set of case studies from West Bengal, Maharashtra and Gujarat*. CUTS International, Jaipur.
9. Deshingkar, P., (2004), "Understanding the Implications of Migration for Pro-poor Agricultural Growth", Overseas Development Institute, June 2004, Paper prepared for the DACPOVNEY Agriculture task group meeting, Helsinki, 17-18 June, 2004
10. Deshingkar, P., & Start, D., (2003), "Seasonal Migration for Livelihoods in India: Coping, Accumulation and Exclusion", Overseas Development Institute, India, June, 2003.
11. Deshingkar, P., and Farrington, J., (2006) "Rural Labour Markets and Migration in South Asia- Evidence from Indian and Bangladesh", Background paper for the World Development Report, 2006, India.
12. Dubey et al 2006 *Surplus Labour, Social Structure and Rural to Urban Migration: Evidence from Indian Data*. *The European Journal of Development Research*, Volume 18, Issue 1 March 2006, pages 86 – 104.

13. GoI (2007), “Report on Conditions of Work and Promotion of Livelihoods in the Unorganized Sector”, National Commission for Enterprises in the Unorganized Sector, Government of India, New Delhi, India.
14. Gupta, I., & Mitra, A., (2002), “Rural Migrants and Labour Segmentation-Micro Level Evidence from Delhi Slums”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol.37 No.2, January12, 2002
15. Harris, N., (2003), “Migration of Labour–Constructing Transnational Arrangements”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 38, No. 42 October 18-24, 2003
16. Kundu, A., & Sarangi, N., (2007,) “Migration, Employment Status and Poverty- An Analysis across Urban Centers”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 42, No.4, January 27 – February 2, 2007
17. Lall, V., Selod, H, & Shalizi, Z., (2006), “Migration in Developing Countries: A Survey of Theoretical Predictions and Empirical Findings”, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper no.3915, Working Paper Series, May 1, 2006
18. McKenzie D and Sasin M J. 2007. Migration, Remittances, Poverty, and Human Capital: Conceptual and empirical challenges, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 4272 (WPS4272), 16pp.
19. Mezzadri, A. (2008) How Globalised Production Exploits Informal-Sector Workers: Investigating the Indian Garment Sector. Development Viewpoint No 12. Department of Development Studies, SOAS
20. Mitra, A. (2004) Industry and Informal Sector in the Context of Globalisation. Institute of Economic Growth, Delhi University Enclave
21. National Sample Survey Organization (NSSO) (2006), “Employment and Unemployment Situation in India, 2005-06” , NSS 62nd Round, Report No 522, National Sample Survey Organization, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India, New Delhi.
22. Pattanaik, B., (2009), “Young Migrant Construction Workers in the Unorganized Urban Sector”, Sage Publication, 2009 Rees, A., (1966), “Information Networks in Labour Markets” *American Economic Review*, Vol. 56, No. 2, May 1966.
23. Solanki, S., (2002), “Migration of Rural Artisans- Evidence from Haryana and Rajasthan”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol.37, No.35, August 31- September6, 2002
24. Shrivastava, R., & Sasikumar, S., (2003), “An Overview of Migration in India, Its Impacts and Key Issues”, Department for International Development, London.
25. Schumacher, E., (1973), “Small is Beautiful: As if People Mattered”, Harper and Row Publishers, New York, U.S.A.
26. UNDP (2009), “Overcoming Barriers: Human Mobility and Development”, Human Development Report 2009, New York, U.S.A.